

FPPC Minutes
Meeting #8
February 4, 2022

Present: Don Haviland, Richard Marcus, Alan Colburn, Gary Hytrek, Frank Cardinale, Barbara LeMaster, Jalal Torabzadeh, Tianjiao Qiu, Leslie Andersen, Jo Brocato, Shireen Pavri, Rebecca Sittler, Kirsty Fleming

1. Approve minutes from meeting #7. Approved.

2. Announcements

- COVID impact task force. AI met to discuss help with Section 3 Committee membership structure. February 21st meeting they will discuss.

3. Revision of University RTP Policy 09-10, section 2.3 Service

Discussion centering on evaluation criteria and/or candidate expectations

- Lines 324-327 - discussion about how we distinguish between service to university, community, and profession.
 - Kirsty: These are categories. Within the categories are levels (eg department, college, university)
 - Shireen: Those lines are not as clean as they once were. For example: outreach, service learning, clinical placement. This makes the categories difficult and pushes service to be considered ad hoc.
 - Don (chat): And in some cases 4: programs within departments. THEN as Shireen says - we also have committees and associations that do not even fit into those categories, I think, like affinity groups.
 - Gary: First paragraph. Then a section university service, community, etc. AI: Yes. Gary supports. Not convinced the collapsing of university and community service is so universal. Instead, articulate and give value to community service.
- Jalal: Part of the activity is our job - we get time. Other parts are service - we don't get time. Who is the beneficiary? Is it the students, the department, the university, etc? In addition to the nature or type of service is who is the beneficiary and what is the outcome.
- Kirsty: Shireen wasn't disagreeing, it was another facet. Certain types of activities don't fit neatly into categories. We probably need some language like: some activities may fit into more than one category.
- AI: if categories are evaluated the same way we can lump them together (?)
- Don: I am comfortable with the three categories. But, appreciate they aren't discrete. Eg "we do not see these categories as discrete or mutually exclusive"
- Barbara (in chat): we do not see these categories as discrete or mutually exclusive
- Leslie: The rest of the document we have made it so put onus on the colleges and departments. But, I am concerned about the lack of recognition for types of service.

- Shireen: What are we referring to with university service. Traditionally it has been shared governance. Beach2030 and a center for public good. We need to clarify what we mean. It is about clarifying for committees. Helpful to explain what service means.
- Richard: we seem to concur that we need clearer support for community and for a traditional university service, but, as Leslie said, the sticking point is whether a university document requires departments and colleges to accept it.
- Tianjiao: service assigned time vs not. Clarify.
- Leslie: Is "assigned time" considered part of service or is it a type of award?
- Jo : the three discrete categories are sufficient for the first paragraph. Later in the document we can give some examples. Everything reflects back on the university so it is all university service – only for the first paragraph.
- Barbara: saying these categories are not discrete introduces ambiguity for faculty.
- Jalal: the nature of service is changing; people who are evaluating this should have some guidelines for this change
- Al: has anyone been dinged for service? Kirsty: because it is the worst done. It isn't well done, isn't really valued, but it is a huge equity issue. Service load is disproportionately carried by women and women of color particularly harming other parts of work.
- Shireen: Types of service can impact early tenure and promotion decisions
- Leslie: why are we deleting the first sentence? Al: Moved not deleted.
- Jo (in chat): one person in my department was not awarded promotion because of service. In 2011.
- Kirsty: Is assigned time service or type of award? Where they join together is for example if one faculty member was given compensation for an activity and another not for the same activity you might credit them differently.
- Gary: community service is commonly not appreciated. Barbara and Shireen agree.
- Don: Agree.
- Discussion of list of items to include in types of service
- Richard: To what degree is this a problem of defining service vs respecting it (from committee) – particularly community service?
- Richard: Are we creating a distinction between community service and community voluntarism? If so, what is that line? Al: I draw that line at whether you are using your academic expertise. Shireen (in chat): Benefit to the University seems to me to be the distinction between volunteerism and community service. Gary: has to benefit the university in some ways. Perhaps working with a soccer group could be important...it may depend on context and it is up to the candidate to demonstrate the relevance. Rebecca: or how it connects to their expertise.

- Leslie: Difficulty here is the concept of community service. We need to somewhere emphasize that it has to be connected to your academic expertise. Agree with Richard that this needs to be captured in a workable way.
- Jo: Reviewing grant proposals (regionally and nationally).
- Shireen (in chat): Professional service typically includes participating in peer review, accreditation, etc.
- Continued significant discussion of what counts as service. An extensive list was created.
- Richard: Contractually we are intended to spend 20% of our time on service. We tend to talk about service like it is volunteering. We have a finite time - 1/5 - that is service. That should not be compensated elsewhere. But, more than that is truly volunteering your own time and shouldn't be expected unless it is compensated.
- Shireen: Agree with Richard. Time is finite. We need to rethink our faculty governance. Maybe we don't need 24 people on a committee. Maybe one from a college is enough so that others can contribute to the community in other ways. To do faculty governance and community service together is too much of an expectation.
- Al: Does the list include "cultural taxation" or do we need more?
- Kirsty: I think it is implicit but not explicit. Eg Advising who is not a named advisor can be overlooked. Al: Adding "informal" advising. Rebecca: Advising also comes down to advising that has to do with life advising and help.
- Leslie: Line 329. Is the message that each category is equal? Instruction, RSCA, and Service. And, it is up to them to divide? It is a philosophical question. Al: Point taken. The feedback from elsewhere on campus is that service should be valued more than it is. But, do we need to say it counts as much as other areas? No. Beach 2030 has a lot of discussion about differentiated loads.
- Kirsty: Equal weighting is really confining. Faculty want to be flexible at different points of their careers. Skeptical of systems that quantify things as opposed to quality. It also reveals differences between colleges. Example: number of students in a class.

4. Next steps

- Don: Is the goal to categorize the list we created?
- Jo: Brainstorming types of service (only)?
- Don: Try to map the list back to "university" "community" "profession." We are trying to operationalize it by giving concrete examples.
- Decision: we will all do this as homework and then bring back for discussion.

Future meetings

Feb 18

Mar 4

Mar 18

[Apr 1 is spring break]

Apr 15
May 6