

Notes from the Faculty-Only Meeting on April 14, 2023

I. Values regarding shared governance and service

Representation (faculty voice)

Equity (sharing of workload; what is invisible and what is measured; contributions and hours vs. slots)

Efficiency (good use of people's time)

Inclusivity (broad engagement)

Identifying what's critical for the institution and things we want as faculty (prioritization of faculty involvement and use of resources)

Alignment of one's expertise and strength with committee work

Choice (respecting difference in desire to serve; interests and preferences)

Transparency/visibility

Growth and community-affirming (value in participating in a committee that was not chosen; ways to get to know colleagues and the institution)

Separating governance and service – the two are not exactly the same

Service should be valued and empowering (productive vs. reproductive labor; should support investment in service; service mandate may inadvertently make service a box to check; service work should be meaningful)

Some issues and questions: pros and cons of not asking junior TT faculty to do service early on; NTT faculty's involvement in service (participation vs. burden); participation in the decision-making process and potentially consequential work vs. consultation and performative work

II. What the current system does well in relation to the values

Equity and transparency is improved compared to previous systems (people are cycled onto committees; required service cycle increases participation; people gain a general idea of the work being done by governance committees)

Signaling that committee work matters and service matters

Effectiveness (in the sense that committees do deliver, but may not be so effective in terms of, e.g., assessment of service)

Providing opportunities to get to know more people on campus and the institution

Predictability (in terms of when one will serve and for how long; ability to plan)

Providing certain compensation for service (e.g. credit release for ATC, PC and some committee chairs)

Some alignment (e.g. preference sheets)

III. What the system could do better

Representation (e.g. academic staff; NTT faculty – should be compensated for their service; not enough eligible faculty for the seats/ballots; committees may not represent the full range of interests/perspectives)

Better matching of interests, skills, and committee needs/roles

Trust between faculty and administration (do faculty matter in rooms where big decisions are made?)

Making service more meaningful and effective (how to assign service that “counts”; how to assess quality of service; get the popular committees off the mandated list?; current system makes service feel like a burden – need to amplify the joy of participating in service; lack of engagement from some faculty; not rewarded in a way that is relative to its necessity; not empowering and often reactive rather than proactive; no auditing of effectiveness and potency of service work)

Who is doing what (non-governance service; different types of service; invisible work; different workloads across committees; distribution of work across departments and programs)

Some possible alternative models: a credit system for all service work; work- or task-based system (instead of standing committees) that will accommodate people’s interests and expertise; fixed meeting schedule for all committees (e.g. an hour block without classes reserved for service)