Breakout Room #1 Changes in Work

Question: **What sections of the document need to be updated to reflect how faculty work has changed during the last decade?**

Responses

- Service section - how is service valued, rewarded and recognized in RTP process? (It's often the same people doing service - and the work is time-consuming and not valued in same way
    - sense that service duties have grown (even as FT faculty might be fewer)
    - Maybe main issue may be how service is weighted relative to teaching and research? Faculty come here in part b/c they want a balanced load especially b/t teaching and research
    - Also relevant – is what *counts* as service and do we need to look at that as well.
    - Issue of gender inequity in terms of who DOES the service
    - Some service is more visible than others too and it often is what gets rewarded
    - In last decade – faculty more engaged in supporting students, issues are more challenging (e.g., mental health) - need to be recognized as service (or maybe instruction?)
- RSCA
    - We need to start recognizing community based practice (to impact community) - which is blurred in some ways with service
        - CHHS (Sandhya) - community based health care research
    - Or open source publications – are they valued? How much?
    - Policy needs to recognize challenges of publishing with so many other demands on time
    - Univ policy should address differential labor across gender, racial and ethnic lines especially related to service
    - Also maybe say something about assoc professors to put emphasis in different areas of work
    - Maybe it's the guiding principles that need to change? Maybe this is where we signal what we value – equity, service, new forms of scholarship, recognize differential labor and a commitment to address that and honor the labor that happens
    - Our research expectations maybe *should not* be equal to teaching; if you look at our contracts, the 40 hours does not account for research – so perhaps we need to dial back our research expectations
        - Comment: that's b/c RSCA is easier to quantify and *seems* more objective
        - What kind of knowledge is created and valued? We do need to be creating to knowledge not just imparting it? (But then the question might be what scholarship do we value – can we be more expansive in what we value and accept?)
    - Focus on impact factors of journals, a local/regional journal – often not valued at dept level (so should univ policy speak to this?)
        - Could the impact of faculty scholarship *on the community* be something that we speak to as another dimension of impact
    - Should address open access publication and how/whether they're valued
    - In terms of balancing Teaching, Research, Service
        - Would we want to articulate the %s? 40/40/20?
        - Might be problematic, locking in over the course of the career
    - Look at Standard 2: colleges and departments define the standards – so maybe the focus needs to be there
        - Real question about whether the university document can go much further than it has

- Maybe the problem is the variation in implementation at the dept and college level?? Not sure.
    -
- Should the university be looking at its broader mission/value statement (section 1.1) given the conversations of last few years related to campaign

Breakout Room #2 Equity and Public Good

Question: **How can the University RTP document better reflect our shared principles of equity and social justice? Is there enough language in the document about the kinds of activities that contribute to the public good?**

Responses

- Surprised at the lack of specificity regarding the three areas particularly contributing to the public good and equity – need guidance
- University did include equity language in other directives but not in the specific policy
- University policy changes take time but used to have specificity around instruction with general guidance on RSCA but put responsibility to the colleges which could be great or NOT if shared values/university mission is not shared
- Is there language in hiring etc towards equity? Policy at UC. Link UC policy:
- https://www.ucop.edu/faculty-diversity/policies-guidelines/eval-contributions-diversity.pdf
- Practice of implementation is where things have been added (equity etc) not in the policy itself...
- Candidates needed to be more specific about what they are doing- more precise and specific to address equity issues on the faculty affairs website.
- Policy is old- 2009- but are there directives from others about issues of implementation regarding what we are actually doing
- Looking at the question #2- question is awkward.. We (CFA) have seen trends- question 2 is framed from the perspective about how the candidate is reviewed but RTP is a communal process... Mentoring may or may not happen- how they are situated (race, gender, etc) seems to be a filter through which the product in evaluated. Equity thru RTP will require significant changes for the other members of the community. We represent women of color who have been bullied by RTP committee causing miscarriage.... Faculty issue...toxic committees.
- Make up of committee members? Change the culture? Faculty affairs, PD Center CFA is involved... can we "mandate" training of all members of the committee? Unconscious bias or???? In the policy/document? Can be written into the policy. But do we want to add more work to being on a committee? We already have trouble filling committees.
- Might it be an option to have the equity advisors from another college?? Tricky.. Speaking in the language of the college/dept but you are known... does an outsider have credibility?
- Responsibilities of each of the members of the committee- can we call out the public good? Behaviors and training? Professional development on what it takes to evaluate your colleagues?
- RTP process is an added workload for Faculty of Color to mentor faculty and students which may not be valued/recognized in the RTP process- specifically Black faculty- cultural taxation...
- Training? Module? Issue of cultural taxation needs to be included and valued.

- UC Policy included—has lang. about serving diverse students is all additive- should also consider X- should this not apply to all faculty?
- If community based research etc in the mission of the university how is this less than other activities- should be included equally
- Need protections for women of color faculty who are doing community based work and for faculty who set boundaries around their time commitment. Darned if you do and darned if you don't...
- Formal mentoring program??? Maybe a separate policy on anti- bullying?
- Reviewer behavior.
- Need to be more explicit about the value of community service?
- Community based service is equal or what all must do? In terms of research I need to see how this translates into public good. How will this harm me?
- In many spaces community service work/research is undervalued.

Breakout Room #3 University Policy Flexibility

Question: **How can the University RTP Policy guide departments and colleges in the revision of their RTP documents that are specific yet flexible enough to value wide ranging RSCA and service activities?**

Responses

- Different disciplines (art for example) have different requirements.
- Guidelines are needed to be more specific on College and Department levels, but provide guidance: both for the candidates and for evaluators.
- The evaluators need to make sure to consider all 3 areas in the policies.
- Service is very demanding, and people are spread thin – they are on may committees, and that has not been considered/valued properly – needs to be considered valuable.
- In terms of WTU most of our time is for teaching – how to relate this to the 33% for each research, teaching, and service that may have been the model years ago
- We are a teaching-focused institution, but most of our evaluations are based on RSCA
- Current workload = 12 units for teaching, 3 for service, and research on top
- In pandemic-online – we are valuing teaching...and being evaluated for how we teach online
- From chat: A more diversified RTP committee at the department and college levels such as having an external member in RTP committee esp. for small departments may minimize biased feedback and conflict of interests.
- Over-arching goal of the university to reach out the community in new ways is not often valued
- How we evaluate teaching and mentoring
- We cannot decouple mentoring and teaching from research in enringing and natural science
- Inequity in service – people put time in RCSA and avoid service
- Research fades after tenure – people will be overwhelmed with teaching and service
- From chat: How many researchers are teaching 4/4 teaching loads plus doing research and now having heavy service loads. I agree with Aparna, Andreas, and all. This definitely calls for more flexibility. Faculty do change over the years, and our RTP often does not value those who are really the volunteers doing all of the service while others you rarely see beyond 2-3 days per week.
- People dichotomize: focus on 2 out of teaching, research and service

- Research is done with undergrads, and that takes much longer to produce publishable work (due to the amount of training)
- Departments that have specific policies seem to have more faculty who is promoted
- If individuals devote great deals of time to service that should be rewarded and valued
- Although we are a teaching-focused institution (4/4 load in the CLA) it seems like the element that is valued the most in RTP (at least going up for Tenure) is research. Usually, faculty who are not granted Tenure failed to fulfill research expectations, not teaching or service ones.
- How to involve junior faculty in this conversation – the department may not be "safe"