

Creation of service dashboard, department policies, and requirement for minimum institutional service

Co-Sponsors: Camisha Russell, Philosophy; Edward Davis, Earth Sciences; Gabe Paquette, Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs; Gerard Sandoval, PPPM; H Leslie Steeves, Senior Assoc. Dean for Academic Affairs, SOJC; Gyoung-Ah Lee, Anthropology; Jack Boss, Academic Music, SOMD; Mike Urbancic, Economics; Spike Gildea, Professor of Linguistics, President of the UO Senate

- 1.1 WHEREAS the Senate passed Motion [US21/22-01](#) on October 6, 2021, authorizing the formation of a Task Force on Service and also charging that Task Force, in part, to “Produce a public report for the Senate that includes a proposal for how the UO might better assign as appropriate, define, evaluate, recognize and reward faculty service, as well as more clearly delineate expectations for faculty service at the unit level, across the university, and beyond;” and
- 1.2 WHEREAS the Task Force on Service has produced a first report (see related document), which affirms the original concerns that prompted formation of the Task Force, and which contains some results of our preliminary information gathering and some initial proposals that we ask the Senate to adopt;

Section II

2.1 THEREFORE BE IT MOVED that the University takes three initial steps towards improving how we assign and assess faculty service (further elaborated in the attached report):

- (i) Authorize and request creation of a Service Dashboard to track and display publicly institutional service done by each statutory faculty member. It is understood that the hard work of categorizing different types of institutional service remains before us, but the first steps towards creating the tool can happen alongside continuing work to operationalize the units to be displayed.
- (ii) Urge individual units/departments to, by the end of spring term 2023, elaborate policies that explicitly define the department’s service expectations, procedures by which service is distributed to individual faculty members, and means by which service work is to be evaluated. So that each department is not obliged to work entirely independently in this task, by the end of fall term 2022, the Task Force will produce a document proposing norms/best practices for service.
- (iii) Create a university-wide floor (or floors) for minimum institutional service expectations. This requirement/expectation for service should have graded expectations based on rank, with at least half of faculty service expected to be institutional service. This floor would mean that it will no longer be possible for Tenure-Track Faculty to meet expectations in the area of service without dedicating at least 10% of FTE (44 hours per term) and for Career instructional faculty at least 5% of FTE (22 hours per term) to institutional service, whether to the department, school/college, and/or university. The other component of the service expectation could be met via additional institutional service, service to the profession, and/or public/community service.

Assistant Professors may have reduced expectations for institutional service as specified by individual departments.

2.2 BE IT ALSO MOVED that the Senate Task Force on Service shall continue its work for the 2022-2023 Academic Year, with Senate Leadership authorized to make additions and replacements to membership as needed. In AY 22-23, the ongoing charge of the Task Force will include (but not be limited to):

- Categorize existing named service assignments into categories that roughly represent their hourly commitment per academic term and address complications that come up during this process.
- Develop strategies to make “invisible service” legible for the Service Dashboard. In particular, the Task Force should address issues of equity in who provides service and how that can have differential impacts on their research, teaching, and wellbeing.
- Create an outline/rubric document that exposit best practices in service, including differential service done by faculty at different ranks, which departments can refer to as they develop their individual policies on service.
- Consider ways to adequately assess quality of institutional service.
- Explore ways to create more rewards for those who do high-workload institutional service.
- Consider the role and evaluation of service performed by those who do not have service specified in their FTE, such as Career research faculty, OAs and Classified Staff.