

Faculty Personnel Policies Council Minutes  
Meeting #5  
November 6, 2020

Present: Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Erlyana Erlyana, Rebecca Sittler, David Wallace, Don Haviland, Jalal Torabzadeh, David Stewart, Kirsty Fleming, Leslie Andersen.

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes.

- Agenda approved without revision
- Minutes approved without revision

2. Announcements

- Senate continues to look at graduate student employment sent from FPPC to Senate end of last year.

3. RTP Policy revision

- Al took a pass at coding, Don member checked his initial codes.
  - UNIV pertains to the University RTP document
  - COLL/DEP pertains to College or Department RTP documents
  - PROC refers to more procedural or process related points, not necessarily something that will be part of an RTP document
  - PANDEM refers to those few entries related mostly to pandemic-related concerns
  - OTHER was the catch-all for everything else (i.e., not UNIV, COLL/DEP, PROC, or PANDEM)
  - SERVICE for service
  - INSTN for instruction and instructionally-related activities
  - RSCA
  - LOAD refers to discussion about differential loads or weighting teaching, RSCA, and service (differently)
  - SPECIFIC refers to discussion about making expectations more specific, less specific, or clearer. Coded general statements here (“make expectations clearer”), rather than something saying be more specific and count a particular kind of publication, or evaluate teaching in a particular way.
  - EQUITY refers to discussion about burdens or unique conditions faced by faculty of color, women, etc.
- Dave: at what level do we set the bar for a category? Can we divide into thirds and just work on the university level piece? Al: Many issues fall to UNIV and COLL. Jalal: where, at what level, do we specify on issues that overlap?
- Dave: Service suffers because it is vague.

- Richard: the bar question isn't different from now as Dave articulates it. Rather, more robust language to inform college and department decision-making. Not bar.
- Kirsty: [concurring that it isn't about moving the bar] To include what the sorts of things are that get you over the bar. Including taxation of underrepresented faculty.
- Al: How wide or narrow the bar is. (Concurring with Kirsty) What are the things that count for RSCA or Service. As you become more specific you run the risk of leaving some people out.
- Kirsty: specificity happens at the department level (including how many publications or if you publish). The university policy embraces all forms of scholarship. That which is particularly department can then be articulated there. They don't need to accept all forms.
- Jalal: expectation at different levels and how we define. What is service. It varies even within the department.
- Richard: supporting Kirsty - clear framing language that then gives the specificity to the department level, making clear that this is the specific parameter to use for the college and beyond.
- Al: Scholarship about teaching and learning is an example of what counts in the univ document that was not included previously in college or dept docs.
- David W: Process comment. It will be impossible to address all things particularly as they want to address it. What are the big problems we are trying to solve. E.g, Applied Research, Research for the Public Good, Research on Teaching and Learning. Clarity about Range of Service (e.g, some experience in shared governance expected, but other things count). Perhaps for teaching the misconceptions that show up in the data are corrected. Are there other issues that are broad enough problems? Otherwise, we will get lost in minutia.
- Kirsty: how people think about the UNIV RTP is important. Many may not even read it.
- Rebecca: Time to think about those lists and where they are more expansive. Eg.
  - 2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities [text pasted in chat]
- Kirsty: University embraces all of them. Some will hear that they must embrace all, otherwise will think they get to choose. When you look at those lists is it clear these are only illustrative?
- Al: Clarification: Suggesting we pull out certain sections of the current RTP based on feedback we got in the spreadsheet.
- David W: There are some teeth in the university policy. When I am looking at a split decision, I look at the university policy on that. Early promotion criteria, for example, is the clearest question.

- Dave: Agree: two functionalities that need to be kept in line.
- Jalal: the question is about *how* we create clarity despite cultural differences and interpretation. Clarity sometimes becomes confusion.
- Al: In the data there is clearly a hunger for clarity.
- Kirsty: the cases in grievances are often where it is very clear. Eg 1 publication every year you need one per year or you get a “no”. More flexibility often needed.
- Leslie: the desire last time was to make it more flexible but how much that happened at dept level varies. Also lack of clarity on what is an implementation as opposed to a policy problem. Many of the issues in the survey are an implementation or interpretation problem.
- Jalal: there is no teeth in that which we passed. Al: concur. The last time through there was more interest in RSCA. Now, the environment and faculty are changing, more interest in social justice and equity. Newer faculty have grown up in a different educational system. They have been tested more, expect more specific expectations.
- Erly: Issue of weight. Everyone weighs things differently. Ex. CHHS trying to quantify service based on meeting schedules, etc.
- Al: So what should this council do with this? Our goal is to revise the document in a way that reflects as much as the campus as possible. The more specific the campus is, the more likely it is worthwhile to us.
- Don: What are the problems we are trying to solve? Rebecca’s point: address the problems we are identifying. If so, we need to figure out what principles, what problems. Then, we can go out in a more targeted way for their take on principles and problems.
- Leslie: is the problem with the university RTP or more with the college and dept policies? Most of the comments are on implementation (college and dept policy).
- Jalal: agree. not just the policy, it is implementation.
- Don: Practice and implementation *and*, if those are flawed, then it suggests how directive do we want to be at the university level.
- Kirsty: Observation. This was referred because of equity. Things do change over time and the policy needs to reflect current and future thinking. You have a process where most people succeed. So, why is it a problem? It is an implementation problem. We should be gathering information on the big questions: e.g, specificity vs flexibility. University level guidelines more equitable.
- David W: one thing we receive from this process and a whole bunch of people will come through with complaints and make for an impossible document to write. What stage of the conversation should be – only changes to university

policy first. Three issues to address: updating. Have we not explicitly included enough language about service, teaching, research on social justice. (Should it be part of the “social good” in the president’s language?) Flexibility-Specificity issue.

- Richard: Point of clarification for David W: to mean *about* service, teaching, research on social justice or also *implementation*? (Agreement it is also the latter)
- Distilled questions for Senate (Council concurs):
  - Specify we will limit discussion to issues related to univ rtp
  - Discuss what needs to be updated because it's old?
  - Discuss whether there's enough language about kinds of activities that contribute to social justice/equity/contributing to the public good?
  - Discuss the flexibility vs specificity issue ... should univ rtp say something about the issue (clarity about univ standard, and that it's not specific, coll/dep can be more specific)?
  - Discuss how the RTP can better/best reflect principles of equity and social justice.

#### 4. Emeritus Policy

- We added the text in red in section 1 about the criteria and process to become emeritus. Do we believe the policy needs to include criteria for revoking emeritus status? Line 27 gives it the prerogative to the president.
- Richard: Philosophical question. Is it intended to be solely recognition or is it meant to extend the concepts of academic freedom in the tenured faculty process?
- David: Are there other related policies? I will do investigating on the side.
- Al and Jalal: none known.
- Dave: Retired faculty on the senate must be Emeritus. Al: Retired faculty should have a role in determining how they are represented.
- Jalal: labs, office space, serving on committees.
- Discussion about line 25: recommendation letter from chair. Specified chair or dean. Richard: change “recommendation” – Don: “Letter of Support”. All approve.
- Do we need additional changes? Consensus: no.
- Amended policy was approved unanimously.

Next scheduled meeting is November 20<sup>th</sup>.