

Faculty Personnel Policies Council Minutes  
Meeting #9  
February 19, 2021

Present: Al Colbürn, Richard Marcüs, Jo Brocato, Robin Richesson, David Wallace, Jalal Torabzadeh, Leslie Andersen, Norbert Schürer, Kirsty Fleming, Terry Ross.

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

- Agenda approved without revisions.
- Minutes approved without revisions.

2. Announcements

- Council approved piloting modified SPOT procedure allowing tenured faculty volunteers, possibly only full professors, to choose some closed ended items from the ACE item pool. At least one closed ended item from current SPOT form will still be present. Follow-up interviews with volunteers are possible.

3. RTP Policy revision – Discussion focused entirely on drafting a list of big ideas or guiding principles, especially ones currently not present in the policy

- Academic citizenship is an important way to frame ideas.
- Jo: Importance of service to *community* Norbert: yes, but may be discipline-specific
- Al: the perception of service is increasing.
- Norbert: “take it easy on research” – we have been increasing expectations everywhere and something has to give.
  - Al: Some in CNSM split on this issue
  - Richard: I am sure there is a split in CLA as well. How do we create a balance between the need to be a research and do research but not being R1 or overly ratcheting up expectations given our contracts? Robin: echoes the concerns.
  - Leslie (in chat): "teaching intensive, research focused" Isn't that part of our mission or something like that?
  - Robin: Mark Wiley made a comment: what is the main reason people don't get tenure? He said it is for RSCA.
  - Kirsty: Applying early is the most common reason. I think that statement is misleading because it is so unusual to get turned down.
  - Richard (in chat): RSCA may be the #1 reason for not getting tenure, but it is very rare not to get tenure. It seems like the bigger issue is how to create balance during your academic journey.
  - Jalal: 1. Grants. 2. Need a statement about balance. 3. Not just a work balance, but a life balance. 4. Goes to expectation – of the candidate at entry
  - David W (in chat): Would a way to capture our discussion of research emphasis be to put the teacher/scholar model up for discussion? Is it still relevant; what does it mean in the current context?
  - Kirsty (in chat): It is an idea I have heard Al mention and it is on the list. My experience with it is that people agree upfront the weight that will be assigned to each area and work accordingly. Typically it is not a lifetime decision but can be renegotiated periodically. Sometimes an option that is not available until after tenure.
  - Jo: People sometimes stay at Associate, usually that is due to RSCA.

- Al: Differential loads is not 100% of one and 0% of another.
- Kirsty (in chat): The contractual reassigned time is not limited to research. Any department/college provided reassigned time can be focused on what the department/college chooses.
- Kirsty (in chat): I also think we have flexible workloads - not everyone takes the same path to promotion and tenure - but they are not clearly articulated.
- Leslie: We are no longer a teaching college. We have growing graduate programs. You can't do that and not have faculty engaging in research.
- David: Don't like differential workloads. I would need to understand what problem we need to solve. Tenure line has a research expectation. If we raised the amount of teaching (tenure-line) they become a lecturer. On the other hand, it would be useful to have different kinds of faculty (clinical, professors of practice).
- Al: once tenured we have a lot of flexibility on how we create balance.
- Big Ideas: To work into "guiding principles" though unclear if it will be a separate section or current 1.2. Also unclear how we will operationalize.
  - Value diversity, need equity, and recognize cultural taxation has the potential to create inequities within [all three] faculty evaluation areas
  - Recognize widely varied and ever-changing ways of creating and disseminating scholarly work
  - Recognize diverse ways faculty use their strengths to contribute to the university's mission, i.e., more than one path to success
  - Mentoring, advising, and other interpersonal communication valued for role creating supportive, collegial environment benefitting everyone, even if it's difficult to document
  - It's important that everyone (tenured faculty?) contribute to the process of shared governance at some level as part of good academic citizenship
- Discussion of Section 1, how does the list get placed or emphasized in the document
  - Leslie: we need principles or statements that can be enforced down to the college level.
  - Kirsty: didn't see this as a standalone list but rather a way of thinking about all elements.
  - Norbert: Still like bullets to make clear - then lace in document.
  - Leslie: I understand our biggest emphasis to be Section 1.
  - Jalal: This list, in section 1, guiding principles can be in addition to 1.2, applies to all areas of evaluation.
  - Terry: I like it as bullets under 1.1. It is punchy.
  - Richard: support, but want to have the survey results before wordsmithing.
  - Leslie: when will we have the survey data? Robin: Closes the 26<sup>th</sup>. Al: MAYBE we will have it for next time.
  - Al: We will hold off on wordsmithing.
  - Discussion: Should we take it to the Exec yet? Conclusion: we need the data to support it first.
- Al: Possible to complete RTP revisions this term? Conclusion: it depends on the data we receive. We are working on the hard part now.
- Next Steps

- Individually review for wordsmithing and some asynchronous work.
- Robin (in chat): Also look at where we might finesse the sections