

Report from the Senate Task Force on Service Spring, 2023

Executive summary

This report reviews the activities of the Senate Task Force on Service for Academic Year 2022-2023. The sections listed below should be relatively self-explanatory. This document has three main purposes: (i) To explain the Task Force’s proposal for categorizing institutional service roles/tasks, assigning expected effort values to each role/task, and then converting these expected effort values to Service Points; (ii) To explain the Task Force’s proposal to collect annual service information from each faculty member so as to display that information on a public dashboard; and (iii) To discuss many of the issues that have come up while doing this work, highlighting those that will require future work by this task force or a new Senate committee dedicated to addressing policy around service.

Table of Contents

The Charge from Senate Motion US21/22-23, passed June 1, 2022	2
The composition of the Task Force, year 1 and year 2	3
1. Preamble.....	4
2. Introduction to Task Force Recommendations.....	6
3. Identifying and classifying visible service tasks into categories.....	6
3.1. Categories of currently recognized service.....	8
3.2. Invisible Service	8
3.2.1. Definition of Invisible service	8
3.2.2. Identifying examples of Invisible service	9
3.2.3. Invisible Service Narrative and Tracking Calendar	11
4. Begin to assess the effort and institutional importance associated with different service.....	11
4.1. Establishing points for specific service tasks	12
4.2. Creating an inventory of tasks and expected effort	12
5. Consider the question of how compensation for service interacts with the assessment of other professional duties, such as research and teaching	17
6. Concluding thoughts on outstanding issues that must be addressed	18
6.1. Differential assessment for compensated service.....	18
6.2. Distributing institutional service.....	19
6.3. Some concerns we have heard, along with our initial responses.....	20
7. Summary of requests to units and individual faculty	21
Appendix A: Suggested reading.....	24
Appendix B: Preliminary list of Categories of Recognized/Visible Service	25
Appendix C: Some suggested categories and examples of Invisible Service	29

The Charge from Senate Motion US21/22-23, passed June 1, 2022 (highlights ours)

2.1 THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED 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 the service, both institutional and external, 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. While there should be a mechanism for departments to request an exception for particularly significant external service, for most, 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.
- (iv) Assistant Professors may have reduced expectations for institutional service as specified by individual departments.

2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED 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.

<https://senate.uoregon.edu/senate-motions/us2122-23-creation-service-dashboard-department-policies-and-requirement-minimum>

[Initial Report of the Senate Task Force on Service](#), April 2022.

Composition of the Task Force

The Task Force on Service was created pursuant to Motion [US21/22-01](#), which passed the Senate on October 6, 2021. The original charge asked the Task Force to collect data in fall 2021, to analyze the data and hold public listening sessions in Winter term, 2022, and to produce a public report with a legislative proposal in Spring term, 2022. The main focus of the Task Force was specified as faculty service. In addition to reporting on findings, the Task Force was directed to report on outstanding issues that they are not able to address in the initial proposals.

The membership of the Task Force was selected by Senate leadership, with a goal of ensuring that a wide range of perspectives would be represented. First, the faculty members of the Task Force have always representation of Senate leadership, faculty of color, female faculty, and members of United Academics. In addition, we have sought to include a broad sample of administrators, including leadership from the Office of the Provost and Schools and Colleges, as well as current and former Department Heads and Program Directors.

Year 1 membership

Chair: Spike Gildea, Professor of Linguistics, CAS Humanities; President, UO Senate

- Camisha Russell, Assoc. Professor of Philosophy, CAS Humanities
- Gerard Sandoval, Professor PPPM, School of Design, UO Senate
- Gyoung-Ah Lee, Professor of Anthropology, CAS Social Sciences; Convener, Women of Color Project
- Mike Urbancic, Senior Instructor 1 of Economics; United Academics
- Edward Davis, Assoc. Professor of Earth Sciences, CAS Physical Sciences; United Academics, UO Senate
- Gabe Paquette, Professor of History, CAS Social Sciences; Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs
- H Leslie Steeves, Professor and Senior Assoc. Dean for Academic Affairs, SOJC
- Jack Boss, Professor of Music Theory and Composition, Head of Academic Music, SOMD, UO Senate

Year 2 membership

Fall/Winter Chair: Spike Gildea, Professor of Linguistics, CAS Humanities; Past President, UO Senate

Spring Chair: Gerard Sandoval, Professor PPPM, School of Design, Vice-President, UO Senate

- Deanne Unruh, Research Professor of Special Education, COE
- Tannaz Farsi, Professor of Art, School of Design
- Mike Urbancic, Senior Instructor 1 of Economics; Interim President, United Academics
- Edward Davis, Assoc. Professor of Earth Sciences, CAS Physical Sciences; United Academics, UO Senate
- Gabe Paquette, Professor of History, CAS Social Sciences; Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs
- Troy Elias, Assoc Prof Advertising, SOJC and Associate Vice-Provost for Diversity and Inclusion
- Collette Niland, Assoc. Dean Advising & Student Experience, LCB
- H Leslie Steeves, Professor and Senior Assoc. Dean for Academic Affairs, SOJC
- Jack Boss, Professor of Music Theory and Composition, Head of Academic Music, SOMD, UO Senate
- Angie Whalen, Clinical Professor of School Psychology, Director of School Psychology Program, COE

1. Preamble

The Senate Task force on Service was created in 2021: <https://senate.uoregon.edu/senate-motions/us2122-01-creation-task-force-university-service>. The Task Force was motivated by the observation that allocation of service is a serious, long-term problem at the UO. One pattern, which is clear both at the UO and in the academy more broadly, is that women and faculty of color carry heavier service loads; this, in turn, contributes to the documented trend that women and faculty of color are promoted more slowly. A dimension of the problem that is becoming increasingly clear is the “cultural taxation” of invisible DEI work performed by faculty of color, creating differential workloads that are “not experienced by their white colleagues and also not acknowledged or heavily weighted in the tenure/promotion process.” (Assensoh *et al* 2021: 5). A similar asymmetry in service work, for both faculty of color and for female faculty, has been documented across higher education (cf. references in the revised [White Paper on Service](#) produced by Gabe Paquette; for an important gender-focused precursor to these studies, see also *Why so Slow?: The Advancement of Women* [Valian 1999]). A reciprocal pattern is that the pool of faculty who offer to serve in committees and positions critical to shared governance is extremely limited, as seen in the mere 8-14% of Statutory Faculty who even submit their annual Senate/Committee Service Survey. While these patterns are clear in the aggregate, for individual faculty members, there is no transparency about who does what service, and it is not always clear what tasks should count as service.

These extremes, of those who choose not to perform important recognized service and those who perform heavy loads of unrecognized service, are from one perspective the outcome of service choices made by individual faculty. However, an important thesis of the larger-scale studies is that such choices do not merely reflect individual preferences, which just happen to be skewed along lines of gender and ethnicity. Rather, they are shaped by cultural and organizational incentives that consistently result in such skewing. The Task Force on Service is charged with identifying the existing incentive structure and changing it such that it incentivizes behavior that is healthier both for the UO community and for individual faculty who compose that community.

We were additionally inspired in our efforts to understand “Invisible Service” by an excellent (and very readable) book, [The No Club: Putting a Stop to Women’s Dead-End Work](#). We encourage everyone who is interested in this topic to spend a few hours with *The No Club*. Among other things, it provided us with the term “non-promotable tasks” (NPTs).

A non-promotable task matters to your organization but will not help you advance your career... It’s clear that organizations recognize that some tasks are important but unrewarded. In a 2021 report, McKinsey & Company, in partnership with Lean In, conducted an extensive survey of 423 organizations and 65,000 employees about issues related to women in the workplace. Eighty-seven percent of companies reported that employees’ work to support their co-workers’ well-being was critical to the functioning of the organization, yet only 25 percent of companies reported that such work was formally recognized in performance evaluations. The same is true for diversity, equity, and inclusion work, where 70 percent of companies reported that this work was critical to the organization, yet only 24 percent of companies reported that such work was formally recognized. (The No Club, pp. 17-18)

...jobs of [tenure-track faculty members] have two main currencies in a research-based university: educating students and conducting research that advances the arts, humanities, and sciences. Promotable and non-promotable tasks are clear-cut, and

advancement is based on research and teaching. Anything else faculty do is called *service*, and because service fulfills important needs of the university, everyone is expected to help out by taking on tasks like special projects, governance committees, or advising students.¹ Service has all the hallmarks of non-promotable work: it takes time away from promotable work (research and teaching duties) while being largely invisible, often routine, less instrumental to the university's currency, and rarely developing one's [promotable] skills. (*The No Club*, p. 41)

Multiple studies ... all concluded that female faculty spend more time than male faculty on the type of work we characterize as non-promotable. As an example, at one large public university, women's overrepresentation on faculty senate corresponded to them carrying a load that was almost twice that of men... Research focused on academia also shows that time spend on non-promotable work differs by race. One study found that faculty of color spend three more hours per week on non-promotable service work than do white faculty. This finding is confirmed by numerous other studies showing that the problem of NPTs is worse for people of color, with Black and Latinx faculty spending more time on service activities relative to white faculty. The evidence points to a stark fact: while NPTs are a problem for women in general, they are an even bigger problem for women of color... (*The No Club*, p. 42-43)

An important thesis of *The No Club* is that women are disproportionately asked — and disproportionately agree — to do important work that is not formally recognized and is thus non-promotable. Another important thesis of the book is that the problem cannot be solved by encouraging women, as individuals, to become more assertive in declining such work because the problem is actually rooted in organizational structures. Put simply, it is counter-productive to create a culture where the best path to success is for individuals to behave in a less generous and community-spirited way. Seen from this perspective, the problem is not primarily that particular individuals (or classes of individuals) have trouble saying no, the problem is that organizational practices create situations where much important work is unrecognized and unrewarded. In this situation, such important non-promotable tasks will disproportionately fall to those who are more deeply invested in specific kinds outcomes (e.g., DEI work and other forms of community building) or to those who are willing to meet organizational/community needs even when it means reducing the time they can dedicate to promotable tasks like research. Further, the effort to achieve diversity in representation on governance committees essentially “taxes” individuals belonging to categories that are underrepresented on the faculty.

Although the category of service is specified in the job descriptions of most UO faculty, it is clear to us that the University of Oregon is an institution like those described in the quotes above, where much of our important work is not recognized and where the individuals who do more of this work face disadvantages in promotability and compensation compared to those individuals who do less and instead focus on promotable tasks. This is, in part, due to the lack of transparency that surrounds service: there is no mechanism by which other members of the community could know what service roles each faculty member might serve at any given time, nor is there a formal mechanism for evaluation of service — we need a system to make service more scrutable and recognized.

¹ Note that advising is categorized as a part of teaching rather than service in many parts of the UO. That said, advising — especially of MA students — is surely a good example of a non-promotable-task in that it is not explicitly assessed like classroom teaching, nor is quantity of advising considered in determining course load.

As such, the Task Force on Service proposes to change the system within which the University of Oregon identifies, evaluates, and rewards important work in the domain of service.

2. Introduction to the Task Force Recommendations

Our overall policy vision is embodied in the Senate Resolution reproduced on page one of this document:

- Figure out how to identify all important university service in a clear and consistent way, including making invisible service visible; also establish value for university service in a quantifiable way.
- Create a public dashboard to display the service (both university and external) done by every faculty member on campus.
- Establish a minimum level of university service that each faculty member must perform in order to meet expectations for the purposes of review and promotion.
- Propose mechanisms by which the quality of university service can be evaluated

Obviously, this overall vision is ambitious and will require years to achieve. During this academic year, the Task force on Service took some steps towards the first point above, beginning to:

- Identify and categorize most kinds of service done by faculty at the UO, including, to the extent possible, “invisible service”. We discuss how we went about this work in section 3; we give our initial categorization of currently recognized/visible service in Appendix A and of currently unrecognized/invisible service in Appendix B.
- Begin to assess the effort and institutional importance associated with different individual service tasks — both currently recognized/visible and currently unrecognized/invisible —and establish a procedure for various units on campus to build on this work. We frame this process in section 4; our initial assessment of effort is also a part of Appendix A.
- Consider a process by which the service of individual faculty members can be fairly attributed to them in a public record like a dashboard; we propose this process in section 5. While the Task Force is not charged with selecting or setting up such dashboard software, we recommend that the Task Force be included in the decision-making process as the software is selected and implemented.
- Consider the question of how compensation for service, especially administrative positions, interacts with the assessment of other professional duties, such as research and teaching. We provide our initial thoughts on this question, along with assessment of institutional service, in section 6.

3. Identifying and classifying visible service tasks into categories

For this step, we began from the model developed at the University of Maryland, which is discussed in two of the articles listed in Appendix A. O’Meara *et al* (2020) argues that publicly accessible dashboards that report faculty service work increase transparency of faculty workload, thereby establishing a basis for more equitable workload distributions amongst all faculty. O’Meara *et al* (2021) is a report on the results of an NSF project at the University of Maryland, which was published by the American Council on Education. This report includes concrete steps that the authors recommend on the basis of the results achieved at Maryland. They specify six conditions that are linked to creating more equity in faculty workloads: **Transparency** of workload, **Clarity** of assessment for work, giving **Credit** to those who expend more effort, creating **Norms** that commit to seeking fair faculty workloads, accounting for the **Context** in which faculty strengths and faculty workloads should be aligned, and putting into place

mechanisms to ensure **Accountability**. Our Task Force work this year has focused on transparency, credit, norms, and (at least in a preliminary way) accountability.

The Maryland model is designed to be both transparent and easy to implement. Essentially, it categorized named institutional service commitments into a 3 x 3 matrix, in which the columns represent three institutional levels from which service tasks originate (department, college, and university) and the rows represent three degrees of expected time commitment (high, medium, and low). This matrix is illustrated in Figure 1.

Example 2. Service Credit Dashboard

Example: Committee Service Matrix

Expected Time Commitment	Department	College	University
High	Merit/ Salary Review	Director or Assoc. Dean Search/ Review	Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee
	Graduate Admissions	Accreditation Review	Search Committee for Provost or Dean
	Faculty Search	Scholarship/Fellowship Selection	Provost/Senate Task Force or temporary ad-hoc task force
	Chair Search/Chair Review	College Committee Chair	Review of Executive-level Administrator
Medium	Undergraduate Recruitment	College Promotion and Tenure Committee	Chair of a Senate Committee
	Staff Search	Facilities Committee	Standing Campus Committee (Research Council, Sustainability Council, Living-Learning Review, etc.)
	Priorities/Strategic Planning	Awards Selection Committee	Faculty Board for General Education
Low	Technology Committee	College Administrative Council	Campus Senate
	IRB Committee	Diversity Committee	Senate Committee or Council
	Graduate Colloquium	College Senate	Graduate Council

Figure 1. An illustrative schematic for the University of Maryland Dashboard categories

A great strength of this model is that it is maximally easy to implement, requiring only that known categories of institutional service be categorized for institutional level and for expected time commitment. Then individual faculty members fill out a sheet every year listing their service commitments and the results go into a public dashboard. The result was a transparent system, in which anybody in the university could see the service commitments of anybody else in the university, which greatly facilitated clarity of assessment, giving credit to those who expend more effort, creating norms to facilitate more equitable faculty service loads, and allowing the creation of mechanisms to ensure accountability. We believe that emulating the Maryland approach would rapidly resolve most issues with those who choose not to engage in institutional service.

However, this approach only considers already-recognized institutional service, meaning it does not address our more troubling concern, that of invisible service. In addition, it does not represent external service, both to the profession and to the broader public. As such, while we recommend establishing a public dashboard for service, we are recommending that the University of Oregon find a way to use that dashboard to represent both invisible service and external service. To do this, we have devised a system

in which expected time commitment converts not into “buckets” of high, medium, and low, but rather into more granular points, as described in section 4. In the remainder of Section 3, we first identify categories of currently recognized service (3.1), then we turn to the question of how to identify currently invisible service.

3.1. Categories of currently recognized service

To begin the task of categorizing service, we have started with the CVs of several Task Force members and generated lists of different kinds of service, sorted into superordinate categories that should be recognized by all units:

- Service to the University
- Service to the School/College (often considered Service to the University)
- Service to the Department
- Service to the Profession/Discipline
- Service to the Public, including both community and governmental service

Within these superordinate categories, there are multiple kinds of tasks, which typically include:

- Performing in **enduring roles**, like Department Head, Program Director, Senate President, Disciplinary Association President, etc.
- Serving in **ad hoc roles**, like Dean’s or Provost’s Fellow for X, CoDaC Fellow, Conference Director, Workshop Organizer, External Reviewer for promotion and tenure cases, Program Evaluator for other universities, providing expert witness testimony to governmental organizations or in courtroom cases, etc.
- **Serving on/chairing standing committees**, like Senate, School/College, departmental, and Disciplinary Association committees, governmental commissions, etc.
- **Serving on/chairing ad hoc committees and task forces**, like search committees, internal program review committees, the Task Force on Service, etc.

The results of our preliminary work at categorization (with illustrative examples from Senate Committees) appear in Appendix A to this document. We propose that:

- The Task Force on Service be responsible for providing initial estimates of ranges of time commitment (+ importance) for the rest of the university-wide service roles and committees.
- Each relevant unit — schools /colleges and departments/programs — be made responsible for providing a list — modeled on the Task Force lists — of ongoing service roles and committees, along with initial estimates of the range of effort and importance associated with each.
- Whenever new or *ad hoc* roles/committees are proposed, the unit that creates them should simultaneously propose an initial estimate of the range of time commitment and importance.

3.2. Invisible Service

Our concern in this section is to define invisible service (3.1), so that it can be identified, both by individuals and by units. This should, in turn, enable it to be tracked. To ensure that administrators and others understand the nature of the invisible service work that each faculty member engages in, we propose that faculty produce a narrative description of their invisible service (3.2), which can then be assigned points on the basis of expended effort (section 4).

3.2.1. Definition of Invisible service

Invisible Service is vital academic work activity that is not formally recognized, measured, and compensated as a part of a faculty member's service requirements. By definition, these work activities

are non-promotable tasks in that they are outside of a faculty member's job description, typically occur behind the scenes, and thus are insufficiently credited and not directly tied to career advancement. Because invisible services typically occur outside the university committee or task force structure it is difficult to identify, to quantify, to evaluate, and hence to reward. Invisible service also contributes to inequitable workloads. Invisible service related to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) needs particular attention, as it disproportionately falls on the shoulders of people of color and women. These hidden tasks are a form of 'cultural taxation', adding to the already recognized formal DEI work activities and emotional labor carried out by people of color and by women.

We have developed the above definition, viewed through a DEI lens, to help guide the identification of unrecognized, unpromotable, invisible service. We propose to use this definition to begin the qualitative task of identifying invisible service work, so that we can then begin to quantify it. This identification should be from the bottom up, beginning with the individuals who perform these tasks. Then, as the categories of currently invisible service become visible, individual units will add each task to the list of recognized university service, along with an estimate that quantifies the range of effort that we anticipate might be associated with such tasks. Once they are visible, it will also be possible to determine the relative importance of these tasks *vis-à-vis* other kinds of service tasks. In an ideal world, the matrices across the university would be calibrated to prevent introduction of new inequities in the assessment of service work across faculty who belong to different units. We use this definition to frame the examples of invisible service provided below, in the hope that this will help faculty identify the invisible service they are currently conducting.

3.2.2. Identifying examples of Invisible service

In identifying non-promotable tasks at the UO, we considered the characteristics of NPTs according to *The No Club* (pp. 23-27) which are:

- *NPTs are not instrumental to increasing the organization's currency.* We interpret this to mean that they do not contribute directly to the primary academic mission at the UO: producing excellent research and doing excellent teaching.
- *NPTs are often not visible — when work is done behind the scenes and no one knows what you did, you cannot get credit for doing it.* The only way people can get credit for their work is if that work can be identified and recognized as part of their jobs.
- *NPTs may not require specialized skills. Many people can do them (not just you).* This is particularly salient in light of recent decreases in support staff at the UO, which has led to increased need for faculty to spend time doing tasks that were once done by staff.
- *The No Club's Top Ten NPTs*
 1. Helping others do their work and filling in when people are absent
 2. Organizing and coordinating (but not managing) the work of others
 3. Editing, proofreading, and compiling, especially the work of others
 4. Logistical planning and special events
 5. Governance work, such as safety committees, ethics committees, diversity committees, climate committees, and review committees
 6. Recruiting
 7. Resolving conflict among coworkers
 8. Helping coworkers with their personal problems
 9. Onboarding, training, and mentoring
 10. Office housework such as getting coffee and cleaning

All of these kinds of labor are required to make the UO function well, but only number 5 is clearly and consistently counted as faculty service; numbers 2, 4, 6, and 9 are sometimes associated with named roles and 3 is often an implicit task of committee chairs, but the value of these roles towards promotion or salary increases is not clearly articulated. Numbers 1, 4, 7, and 10 clearly do not fit with faculty training or job descriptions, but for the university to function, this kind of work must be done; during a time of cutbacks to support staff, these tasks increasingly fall to faculty. The one item on this list that does not seem like a good candidate to be considered faculty service is item 8, helping coworkers with their personal problems — friends talk to friends about their problems, and while we hope that many of our faculty will also be friends, the university should not be in the business of paying (untrained) faculty to serve as personal counsellors for other faculty.

More than one Task Force member observed that faculty time is expensive, and faculty are uniquely qualified to meet university goals of producing excellent research and fantastic teaching. As such, we encourage the university to invest of resources to free up faculty time currently spent on work that could be done by support staff. We identified multiple examples of the university moving in the opposite direction, cutting support and thereby increasing faculty time spent on larger university goals. Of these, we highlight the reduction in staff for CSBO or budget and accounting services. This has led to support offices becoming backlogged, such that faculty have to pick up the slack, doing work that would once have been done by support staff. Another prominent example is the introduction of the Concur system for all institutional travel, which requires faculty time to accomplish tasks that were once more efficiently accomplished by support staff with specialized skills.

Some umbrella categories of invisible service (NPTs) that we discussed in the full Task Force are:

- **DEI related work.** This category was a primary focus of the Invisible Service Subcommittee, citing the finding of Assensoh *et al's* (2021: 5-6) CoDaC report, that the “cultural taxation” of invisible DEI labor was an important component of the university’s difficulties retaining faculty of color. We expand on this particular category below.
- **Mentorship outside of teaching or formal academic advisor roles.** This could include more formal mentoring of new faculty or more informally being a “resource person” to others in one’s unit in whatever area one has expertise. On the one hand, some have argued that mentoring as an activity properly belongs to research and teaching, as well as to service, and they are reluctant to see mentoring pigeonholed into the category of service. On the other hand, time spent mentoring is rarely visible to the larger university, so it is one of the prototype examples of a non-promotable task. To ensure that it not remain invisible, we explicitly include it here.
- **Advising of non-PhD student theses or terminal MA/MFA/MM and BFA degrees.** Academic advising of undergraduate students is universally considered a service role, one often compensated with course release. Advising of PhD students is universally considered a teaching role, and some have argued that having PhD students may also provide a boost to one’s own research productivity. We have also heard that some units give faculty a course release when their number of PhD advisees reaches a specified threshold. However, the role of advising students to completion of terminal projects/theses, e.g., for CHC, for MA/BFA/MFA/MM degrees, or for other professional graduate degrees, is not similarly clear and well-defined across units. In most, this is treated as an (uncompensated) teaching role, in some as an (uncompensated) service role. In this same umbrella category one might put serving on an MA or PhD committee and serving on (or chairing) a doctoral examination committee. Whether counted as teaching or as service, this work appears to qualify as a NPT.
- **Unit-level accreditation and/or licensing efforts.** Every department goes through a regular 10-year review for accreditation and some units (Education, Music and SOJC are specific examples)

must complete additional periodic program reviews, site visits, and annual reporting requirements for national accreditation (e.g., Clinical, Counseling, and School Psychology, Communication Disorders & Sciences) and/or approval from state credentialing agencies (e.g., Education, Music). This work must be done for the unit to continue to function, but it usually takes more time for faculty members than they should be dedicating to their service portfolio. In addition, sometimes it is not recognized as “service” in unit promotion and tenure policies. IN addition, the Office of the Provost requires periodic program reviews, which require work with a similar profile, i.e., a necessary but unrecognized NPT.

- **Department-level reviews of teaching and overall academic performance.** Into this category we put peer reviews of teaching, participation in personnel review committees, reviews of GE performance, etc. Some individuals and/or units do track this work, but others do not.
- **Advising of affinity groups.** For example, some faculty advise university student groups because of race/ ethnic/gender/sexual orientation affinities, particularly around traumatic world events that the university is slow to respond to or doesn't respond to at all.
- **Advocacy for Areas of Focus or Academic Fields.** Examples of this would be explaining to outsiders (and administrators) why one's program/field is important — this can even amount to justifying the continued existence of specific programs, Similarly, faculty sometimes must advocate for studio-based or other experiential classes that do not fit the standard model of teaching. Another example comes from CoD, where past safety issues on the Northsite led to many faculty hours spent documenting unsafe conditions to initiate a study and commitment of funds to rectify the situation.
- **Public service not tied to university initiatives.**

These activities are ones that further the university's public service mission but are not directly tied to university programs or initiatives. Examples are serving on government boards or commissions that take advantage of faculty's areas of expertise, or community development service work done outside the university.

Our very preliminary list of currently unrecognized/invisible service is given in Appendix B. We turn next to a tool that we hope will be useful to individual faculty as they identify the invisible service they engage in, which will, we hope, be instrumental in expanding the list of invisible service.

3.3.3. Invisible Service Narrative and Tracking Calendar

An invisible service narrative would provide a qualitative description of each invisible service task identified by faculty, highlighting – particularly for women and people of color – the DEI invisible service tasks undertaken. The purpose of this narrative is to help make invisible service visible to those who do not carry out such service. The narrative should include a description of individual invisible service tasks, where possible estimating also the amount of time spent on each task (ideally in hours per year; below, we suggest one way to do such an estimate). The narrative should note how these tasks are outside of formal service (e.g., it is not a responsibility assigned to them via a named role, or as part of service on a committee or task force). Alongside this narrative, we suggest that individual faculty should track their time spent on service tasks across a few representative weeks of the academic year, so as to have an empirical basis for beginning to estimate the number of hours spent on service, both visible and invisible. The goal is to document the impact that invisible service work has on the employee, so that formal service work can be adjusted to balance the invisible service being carried out. We anticipate that the first iteration of this service narrative and tracking calendar will require substantial effort, especially for those engaged in a lot of invisible service, but we anticipate that many of the descriptions of individual tasks be repeatable in future years, reducing the effort required to produce future narratives.

4. Begin to assess the effort and institutional importance associated with different service

Key to establishing equitable service workloads across faculty is creating a mechanism by which different kinds of service work can be meaningfully compared with each other. The University of Maryland model classifies all service work into one of three buckets: high, medium, and low expected workload. Following the Maryland model, the basis of our system is also expected workload. However, unlike Maryland's three buckets, we estimate workload on each task according to number of expected hours spent per year, then assign one point for every 10 hours of expected effort. These time-based points can then be enhanced for those tasks that are considered to be of greater institutional importance. In section 4.1 we discuss the general process for assigning points to categories of service tasks. In section 4.2 we consider the process by which individuals can claim the annual service points that will be posted on the public Dashboard.

4.1. Establishing points for specific service tasks

A primary goal of our work is to encourage transparency by helping individuals and administrators to establish a standardized estimate of expected hours of effort per year for all named service roles/tasks. This conversion will then serve as the basis for a points system, in which roughly every 10 hours of expected effort translates to one service point. We began our catalog of standardized time estimates from the Senate Committees, based on the list of expected time commitments for members of each committee: <https://senate.uoregon.edu/committees>. This has five categories of time commitment, which we convert to points as follows (see Appendix B for the full list):

- 0-20 1-2
- 20-40 3-4
- 40-60 5-6
- 60+ 7+

The point system will need to be extended to institutional service tasks originating at different levels of the university: schools/colleges and individual departments should create the lists of their specific service tasks and assign points according to estimated effort required (cf. section 3.1). In addition, the points system provides a flexible enough framework to accommodate estimations of effort required for internal invisible service tasks, as well as for tasks dedicated to external service, both to the profession and to the broader public.

Another way that a points system provide greater flexibility is that, in addition to the original basis of the points in expected effort, it is also possible to enhance the points value of certain tasks that we, as an institution, see as priorities. For example, there is some work — often difficult, regardless of how much time it takes to complete — without which departments/schools/colleges could not function. Also, there is some work — like that dedicated to enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion — which is critical to our becoming the kind of institution we want to become. Providing additional points to these roles/tasks may provide a guide/incentive to all faculty as they decide where to allocate their service effort.

4.2. Creating an inventory of tasks and expected effort

In order for this points system to function, we need a complete inventory of service tasks at each level of the institution, with each task assigned points based on the unit's estimate of expected effort plus, for a limited number of high priority tasks, enhanced points. While invisible service roles/tasks are likely to exist at every level of the institution, we presume that they are most likely to be found at the departmental level, so we propose that estimates of expected effort and their associated points be determined by departments.

- The Task Force must finish compiling an inventory of university-level service tasks (expanding beyond the Senate committees), assigning to each an estimate of expected effort; the Senate and central administration should seek agreement regarding which tasks are to receive extra high-priority points.
- Schools and Colleges need to compile an inventory of their service tasks, assigning to each an estimate of expected effort; school/college level administrators should decide if any specific tasks/roles receive extra high-priority points.
- Individual departments need to compile an inventory of their service tasks, assigning to each an estimate of expected effort. Similarly, we anticipate that the departments will be the appropriate level to reach agreement on expected efforts/points for different types of invisible service tasks, professional service tasks/roles, and public service tasks/roles.

In perusing existing merit policies for individual departments, there are some that use points in quite a detailed fashion, thus providing possible examples of the kind of thinking we hope to stimulate. For example, the Political Science Merit Policy lists the following service tasks as those meriting points in their merit evaluations:

1. Participation on more than one standing departmental committee (1 pt.)
2. Chair of departmental committee (standing or subfield) (1 pt.)
3. Participation on university committee (1 pt.)*
4. Chair of university committee (1 pt. in addition to #3 above)*
5. Undergraduate Advisor, Director of Graduate Studies (1 pt.)
6. Chair or panel discussant at major convention (1 pt.)
7. Editorial board member of journal (1 pt.)
8. Executive officer of national or regional professional association (1 pt.)
9. Participation on National Selection or Advisory Committee (1 pt.)
10. Lecture at another university or college (1 pt.)
11. Reviewer of grant proposals and applications for foundations (1 pt. for each three proposals reviewed)
12. Reviewer of promotion files for other universities (1 pt.)
13. Editor or Associate Editor of a journal (3-5 pts.)
14. Organizer or program chair of a regular conference (1-3 pts.)
15. Participation in a search committee (2 pts)
16. Chair of search committee (1 pt in addition to #15 above)
17. Participation on departmental or university ad hoc committee (1 pt)
18. Chair of departmental or university ad hoc committee (1 pt in addition to #17 above)
19. Community-engaged teaching projects, such as prison-engagement courses (2-4 pts; points dependent on number of contact hours)

* A maximum of 16 points for the combined categories of #3 and #4.

Obviously, our proposal will entail that the list from Political Science be greatly expanded, and that the points be calibrated to reflect expected effort. We resort these tasks into our categories as follows, to provide an illustration of the kind of thinking necessary to convert existing systems to the one we envision.

Department Service

1. Participation on more than one standing departmental committee (1 pt.)
2. Chair of departmental committee (standing or subfield) (1 pt.)

3. Undergraduate Advisor, Director of Graduate Studies (1 pt.)
4. Participation in a search committee (2 pts)
5. Chair of search committee (1 pt in addition to #4 above)
6. Participation on departmental *ad hoc* committee (1 pt)
7. Chair of departmental *ad hoc* committee (1 pt in addition to #6 above)

School/College/University Service

1. Participation on university committee (1 pt.)*
2. Chair of university committee (1 pt. in addition to #3 above)*
3. Participation on departmental or university ad hoc committee (1 pt)
4. Chair of departmental or university ad hoc committee (1 pt in addition to #17 above)

* A maximum of 16 points for the combined categories of #1 and #2.

Professional Service to the field/Discipline

1. Chair or panel discussant at major convention (1 pt.)
2. Editorial board member of journal (1 pt.)
3. Executive officer of national or regional professional association (1 pt.)
4. Participation on National Selection or Advisory Committee (1 pt.)
5. Lecture at another university or college (1 pt.)
6. Reviewer of grant proposals and applications for foundations (1 pt. for each three proposals reviewed)
7. Reviewer of promotion files for other universities (1 pt.)
8. Editor or Associate Editor of a journal (3-5 pts.)
9. Organizer or program chair of a regular conference (1-3 pts.)

Public Service — community, state, etc.

1. Community-engaged teaching projects, such as prison-engagement courses (2-4 pts; points dependent on number of contact hours)
2. Serving on State or Local government boards (2-4 pts)

A second example shows how a department might go about building a list from scratch via a single brainstorming session (the original form of crowd-sourcing). IN a single meeting led by Department Head Jack Boss (also a member of the Task Force on Service), the Department of Academic Music (SOMD) generated the following list, which mixes together all kinds of service.

- Area and department chairs
- SOMD committees
- Search committees
- Departmental committees: THEME (Prof. Development/guest lectures)
- Hosting other guest lectures (Trotter)
- Directorships of festivals and symposia: educational and administrative tasks
- Participation in cross-campus programs (affiliate faculty in Folklore, Psychology, German, etc.)
- Oregon Humanities Center boards
- Teaching Academy and CIET committees
- ARC directorships (and membership on the Stakeholder's Board)
- Outreach for admissions
- Coordinating admissions and recruiting
- Reviewing admissions and GE applications
- Hosting high school and middle school visits
- Helping with audition days
- Preparing students for conferences, research symposia, concerts
- Advising student groups—Duck Samba, Latinx Male Alliance
- Licensing conversations with schools and state board
- Coordinating student teachers

- Creating area policies pertinent to students
- Exam committees (particularly in areas other than the professor's home)
- Non-adviser member of dissertation committee
- Creating and administering diagnostic entrance exams for undergrads and grads
- Guest teaching for others in and out of SOMD
- Mental health care for both students and faculty
- Informal advising for non-advisee students
- Helping the GEs respond to accessible education requests
- Program and arrangements committees for national and regional conferences
- Reading articles and books for journals and publishers—whether on the editorial board or not
- Editing journals, editing book series
- Community service: public lectures for concert series

Even this more extensive list is far from complete, but it is a really helpful starting point that reflects both traditional named service tasks alongside some tasks that do not currently count towards faculty promotion or employment reviews. And again, by way of illustration, we suggest a way to sort these tasks into our categories:

Academic Music Department

- Area and department chairs
- Search committees
- Departmental committees: THEME (Prof. Development/guest lectures)
- Hosting other guest lectures (Trotter)
- Directorships of festivals and symposia: educational and administrative tasks
- Outreach for admissions
- Coordinating admissions and recruiting
- Reviewing admissions and GE applications
- Hosting high school and middle school visits
- Helping with audition days
- Preparing students for conferences, research symposia, concerts
- Coordinating student teachers
- Creating area policies pertinent to students
- Exam committees
- Non-adviser member of dissertation committee
- Creating and administering diagnostic entrance exams for undergrads and grads
- Guest teaching for others in and out of SOMD
- Informal advising for non-advisee students
- Helping the GEs respond to accessible education requests

SOMD

- Area and department chairs
- SOMD committees
- Licensing conversations with schools and state board
- Exam committees (particularly in areas other than the professor's home)
- Guest teaching for others in and out of SOMD

University

- Participation in cross-campus programs (affiliate faculty in Folklore, Psychology, German, etc.)
- Oregon Humanities Center boards
- Center for Latino/a and Latin American Studies grant evaluation committees

- Teaching Academy and CIET committees
- ARC directorships (and membership on the Stakeholder’s Board)
- Advising student groups—Duck Samba, Latinx Male Alliance
- Helping the GEs respond to accessible education requests

Professional

- Program and arrangements committees for national and regional conferences
- Reading articles and books for journals and publishers—whether on the editorial board or not
- Editing journals, editing book series
- Evaluating research grants for professional academic institutions

Community

- Community service: public lectures for concert series

Based on a number of exercises like this, it is clear to the Task Force members that building our complete lists of service roles/tasks will require an iterative process — of course our initial lists will not be complete, and for at least some of the items, initial estimates of effort expended will err in one direction or the other. We are already learning a fair amount about invisible administrative “non-promotable tasks”, including unit-level certification / accreditation, organizing recruiting and other events, non-PhD advising and informal mentoring at all levels, and tasks that used to be carried out by support staff that are now done by faculty (especially Department Heads). On the one hand, this means that we should get started with the process sooner than later, so that we have a foundation to improve upon; on the other hand, it means that we should be patient with the limitations of our initial results.

The process that results in categorizing and assigning points to invisible administrative service tasks will need to be supplemented by a different type of crowdsourcing to create explicit lists of invisible service tasks/roles related to DEI work. Here, we expect tasks/roles to arise in a bottom-up fashion from individual invisible service narratives, which should both document various categories of invisible service work and (via the associated tracking calendars) provide at least an initial estimate of effort expended/expected for each type of task. From these narratives and departmental discussions of them, we expect to learn a great deal about invisible service, especially the invisible DEI work that is contributing to our issues with faculty retention.

An important component of systematizing the invisible service will be department-level discussions of which tasks should be considered paid service. For example, many of us are convinced that the university should not be paying faculty to provide mental health services for each other or students. Similarly, some among us think it is important to go out for coffee or a drink with colleagues at fairly regular intervals, to check in on how they are doing as individuals and to learn of any issues they might be having with what is happening in the departmental community. As important as such meetings might be, not everyone is convinced that the university should compensate faculty for what could be characterized as having a beer/coffee together.

The take-away lesson for us is that it is not always automatic to identify legitimate invisible service and we cannot count on universal agreement amongst our faculty. For the categorization of invisible service to function well, individual units, administrators, and union representatives should be prepared to engage in a deep discussion of which activities should qualify as paid service and to distinguish those from activities that are important to community morale, but that nonetheless should not make the list of activities that are to be compensated.

5. Initial proposal for a process to track service work of individual faculty

The third major goal of our work this year was to outline a possible procedure by which the university can arrive at a reasonable and fair assessment of the service effort of each individual faculty member with a relatively low additional expenditure of effort. This assessment would be done annually and then be available for posting on the Service Dashboard proposed in Senate Resolution 21-22/23.

Our proposal is to create a spreadsheet template (inspired by the template used in the University of New Mexico Linguistics Department) with headings for known categories of service roles and a column each for:

- The titles of service roles/tasks
 - Ideally selected from a list with as complete a representation as possible of all university-level, school/college-level, department-level, and external roles/service tasks, to be maintained in a central spreadsheet, perhaps maintained by OtP in association with the service dashboard.
- The range of possible points allowed for each role/task
 - This would come from the same central spreadsheet.
- The number of points the faculty member determines is appropriate for the role/task
- A space for the faculty member to provide details, e.g., to justify a situation in which they want to claim more or fewer points than expected for a given role/task.

In addition, there will be a row for “other” in each category, so as to allow faculty to list service roles/tasks for which there is not yet an entry in the centralized list. For the “other” categories, the faculty member will almost certainly need to provide additional explanatory details (probably along with a reference to their invisible service narrative)

In early versions of this proposal, we also included a column for an administrator to determine the final number of points received, which might not be the same as the number of points requested by the faculty member. We decided to let go of this step, first because it represented a certain friction point that would require regular interventions to resolve disputes, and second because, given that every request for points will become public on the dashboard, we anticipate that peer pressure will provide sufficient disincentive for faculty members to inflate the number of points requested.

Service Commitment	Points Possible	Points requested	Details
Participation on university or school/college committee	(see template)		
Committee on Committees	2-4	2	https://senate.uoregon.edu/committees/committee-committees
Faculty Advisory Council	4-6	4	https://senate.uoregon.edu/committees/faculty-advisory-council
Faculty Search Committee	2-3	3	
Chair of university or school/college committee	1-2 per committee	1	
Chair, Faculty Search Committee	1-2	2	

Other		4	Mentoring <name>, a Native American undergraduate major. Spent some 40 hours in 2021-22.
-------	--	---	--

We envision a procedure whereby over the course of the academic year, each faculty member adds service tasks to their spreadsheet and tracks the rough amount of time taken by each, such that by the end of spring term, they will have a complete list of their service activities during the preceding year, along with whatever detail is necessary to justify their request for the appropriate number of points for each activity. Whenever a faculty member asks for points beyond the range that is pre-approved in the central list or asks for points for a role/task that is not included in the central list, a committee at the appropriate level (department, school/college, university) would need to approve the points requested. After collection, all of these columns would be imported into the public dashboard, so that the service commitment for each faculty member would be a part of their public record, equal in visibility to the more promotable activities that are usually featured in CVs, like publication record and records of courses taught, etc.

6. Concluding thoughts on outstanding issues that must be addressed

This section is more heterogenous than previous sections, first outlining two issues that the Task Force has discussed without arrived at consensus recommendations (sections 6.1-6.2), then responding to some of the thoughtful concerns we have heard from the multiple audiences with whom we have shared our work in progress (section 6.3).

6.1. Differential assessment for compensated service

One issue that has come up consistently is whether we can define a fair method to evaluate service roles/tasks that are compensated vs. roles/tasks that are not. Here, the nature of the compensation should matter as well, depending on whether the compensation is in the form of a stipend, a course release, or a combination of the two. For example, in their *ad hoc* roles, Provost's Fellows receive course releases; members of the Faculty Personnel Committee, which the Senate categorizes as a time commitment of 60+ hours per year, receive a stipend of \$1000 each; Department Heads receive both course releases and stipends. In contrast, many notable service roles, such as chairing a Dean's search, reading promotion files for the Dean's Advisory Committee, or serving on the Task Force for Service, receive no compensation at all. How can we make our system sensitive to these distinctions between compensated and uncompensated service?

In this regard, we propose to distinguish the kinds of compensation. Financial compensation for specific service roles, such as a salary stipend or additional research funding, is generally used to make it easier for individuals to accept particularly onerous service roles and from our perspective, this is a difference that does not make a difference. For example, the small stipend offered to members of the FPC in no way approaches the cost of the time that this service takes away from promotable tasks, so it should not impact the points assigned. In contrast, when service is compensated via course releases, this implicitly acknowledges that the time needed to accomplish the service would go beyond the amount allocated to service in the faculty member's contract, and so the time for service must be augmented by diminishing the time dedicated to teaching. A common example is that the Director of Undergraduate Studies in a department might receive one or more course releases for this service role.

When compensation is via course releases, we advocate making an explicit change to the faculty member's job description, such that the percentage of FTE represented by the course release be shifted to service. In this case, when faculty performance is assessed, the division of labor reflects the actual

compensation received for each component. For example, for a Tenure-Track Faculty member in the Humanities, the standard course load of 5 is considered 40% of the workload, so each course should be equivalent to 8% of full time effort. When a service task comes with a course release, the faculty member's review criteria should shift such that 28% of the portfolio is service and only 32% is teaching. There are obvious issues that complicate this simple scenario: e.g., for NTTF with a standard course load of 9, each course represents 10% of full time effort; for TTF in a department with a standard course load of 4 or 2, each course represents 10% or 20% of full time effort, respectively. These asymmetries mean that a policy would have to be tailored to a given faculty member's situation, so that a simple one-size-fits-all policy would not be workable. Also, there are clear cases like that of Department Heads, where even with multiple course releases and increases to salary, the time freed up generally does not feel adequate to provide the time needed to do the job well.

6.2. Distributing institutional service

We have barely begun to discuss this topic — so far we have identified four clear questions we want to address, but we anticipate that more will arise.

- What should be the minimum institutional service (measured as Service Points) required of all faculty members? This is to prevent the (unquantified but anecdotally frequent) practice of full professors who do no meaningful institutional service. This will vary depending on the teaching load in a given department (as discussed in the preceding paragraph), career stage of a faculty member (second question, below) and the size of the department (third question, below).
- How do we formalize the practice of assigning different service expectations for faculty at different stages of their careers? This is particularly relevant to the widespread practice of “sheltering” Assistant Professors from excessive service while they build their tenure case; it is also relevant to those units that explicitly have higher expectations for service from full professors, giving space for Associate Professors to advance more steadily to Full.
- How do we balance the competition between different units for the service work of individual faculty? For example, small departments require the same number of service roles but have fewer faculty to share the work; should these faculty have reduced expectations for participation in school/college or university service? Also, when Department Heads are overloaded by departmental administrative tasks, is it reasonable for them to choose to reduce or altogether forego school/college or university service? In the other direction, should there be a mechanism for faculty who do heavier university service, like serving on the Faculty Personnel Committee, to seek balance by reducing (or altogether foregoing) departmental service? In an ideal scenario, all faculty would, over time, distribute their service tasks at various levels of the university, but it might also be reasonable to imagine that some faculty might choose to specialize in specific kinds of service.
- While the implications of very low service point totals over long periods of time are obvious, how should the institution react to a situation where a given faculty member consistently has very high service point totals? There is currently no mechanism by which points earned in the domain of service can be used to meet research requirements, nor (in the absence of administratively assigned course releases) can service points be used to meet teaching requirements. Our initial thought is that this will be a signal to the faculty member (and their Department Head) that the system has identified an individual service overload, which entails a need to reduce the amount of service that the individual faculty member performs.

6.3. Some concerns we have heard, along with our initial responses

Why do we need points? Wouldn't it be easier to just guesstimate buckets?

Yes, it would be easier, and it would work for already visible service tasks (as seen in the example of the University of Maryland). However, it is not clear how we would distribute invisible service tasks into the various buckets, nor whether that more coarse-grained approach would serve equally well as a proxy for time commitment plus the bonus points assigned for institutional priorities.

Why have a range of point spreads for each task?

It would surely be cleaner to just decide how many points each role/task receives and leave no flexibility, but it would just as surely be less accurate in that different individuals put different effort into the same tasks, and also the workload for individual committees may vary substantially from year to year. Having a range of points for each role/task makes it possible to capture this variability.

Won't faculty just claim the maximum points available every time?

This is an empirical question. In earlier versions of this proposal, we envisioned requiring low-level administrative approval for the number of points to be awarded for each task. The drawback to this approach is that it invites regular, small-scale conflict, which is likely to create an adversarial spirit that will require adjudication. To avoid such headaches, we propose to require an upper limit to the points available for each specific role/task and then to require some sort of committee or administrative approval in the rare event that someone wants to request more points for that role/task. We presume that most faculty will be honest in their point claims, and that the public nature of the dashboard will provide a check for those who might be tempted to always claim top points for their work when they have not, in fact, dedicated commensurate time to their roles/tasks.

What if, once we make all this service explicit, the needs for service are greater than faculty FTE allocated to service?

It is entirely possible that the needs for service are greater than the faculty FTE currently allocated to that service. However, even if it is the case, this proposal will not change either the service needs, or the FTE dedicated to service. What would change is that the new system would provide the data to make the problem explicit, and that problem would become something that the university is required to address.

Smaller departments require departmental service from all faculty, with less space for service free-loaders and less bandwidth for university, professional, and community service. What if recognizing invisible service means still less faculty service FTE is available for vital roles/tasks in smaller departments?

See the answer to the preceding concern — our goal is to make such problems explicit so that they can be addressed.

Who assigns service? How do we assure that it is equitably assigned?

This needs to be built into explicit unit-level policies, both identifying the mechanisms by which faculty receive their service roles/tasks and the flexibility for faculty to serve in multiple levels of the university.

What kind of guidance will departments have as they work through this?

Good question! This Task Force is charged with creating rubrics/templates to guide the initial work to be done by departments and schools/colleges. In addition, we think it would be best to identify people who can help train current Department Heads and visit departmental faculty meetings to help talk through the issues. FTE for this role is not built into the job description of anybody on the Task Force, so it should best come from the Provost's Office.

What about quality of service? How will we assess that?

This is an issue that the Task Force has not addressed in any detail. For external service (professional, public / community), it's not clear that we can assess either quantity or quality — we will have to trust our colleagues. For invisible service, we are similarly unlikely to have good assessment tools. For committee service, an obvious strategy would be to add attendance to the minutes of each meeting, on the obvious assumption that consistent (or even frequent) absence from meetings cannot correlate with satisfactory performance. Another suggestion is to take a few minutes at the last meeting of the year to have each committee member do a brief peer assessment of all other committee members, including the chair of the committee. A similar semi-formal peer review process could contribute meaningfully to assessment of performance of service in departmental roles.

What will we do if the university chooses dashboard software that is not a good fit with this proposal?

We need to make sure that the dashboard software vendor has the capacity to categorize our recommended measurement tools.

What if this doesn't work? Will we be locked into a bunch of extra work with little extra benefit?

This is a valid question because any new process has the inherent risk of imposing the costs of change without realizing the benefit of solving the problem that motivated the work in the first place. In the absence of an alternative proposal, the risks of starting something new need to be measured against the costs of not acting. Given what we have learned about the problems with identifying and assessing service, we do not see maintaining the status quo as a viable option. The key to our proposal is transparency — even if we end up changing other components of this proposal, we believe transparency about service loads will provide benefits that justify the costs of change (and also of our labor on this Task Force).

7. Summary of suggested requests to units and individual faculty

We conclude this report with a summary of the questions that we are asking individual faculty members to begin thinking about and that we ask individual units to implement by the end of the next academic year (i.e., spring of 2024).

For individual faculty members, consider answering Questions 1.2 and 1.3 in *The No Club* (pp. 29-31): *What do you do at work?* and *How much time do you spend on your tasks?* They describe these steps:

- Start a list of all tasks you perform.
- Look through the last month's calendar, email and text correspondence, job description, and recent performance evaluations and add tasks that were not on the original list.
- Create a table/spreadsheet with a column for the tasks and a column for hours/week each task requires. In the book, they add a column for promotability of each task, which is an interesting exercise (not all service is created equal) but is not germane to the information we need at the moment.
- Estimate the time you spend on each (sub-)task in a typical week. For tasks that do not happen weekly, estimate the monthly time.
 - To help with these estimates, keep a detailed calendar for a full week, recording every activity you do for your job and how much time you spend on each activity. This can be done by entering start and stop times on a digital calendar, or filling in a spreadsheet template divided as finely as you find reasonable.

This activity is especially critical for faculty who feel the weight of invisible service, as it is a tool by which that invisible service will become visible to you, a necessary prerequisite to making it visible to the larger

university. Those who do not schedule their time in a detailed way are often surprised by what they learn in this activity. For example, Spike assigns a time management exercise to his FIG class every fall, then he joins them in doing the activity — every year, he is surprised anew by the discovery of how he spends at least some portion of his work time.

For units like departments and schools/colleges, the focus is on creating an inventory of all service tasks in your unit. For departments, we recommend dedicating parts of two faculty meetings to compiling this inventory. In the first, ask each faculty member to create their list of activities and estimate the time they spend per activity. Prior to the second meeting, compile the lists from each individual faculty member into a single large table and circulate it to the group, so that everyone is prepared to discuss service at the level of the entire unit. The questions that should be answered via this process are:

- What are all the named, recognizable service tasks in your unit?
 - Make as full an inventory as possible.
 - Make an estimate of the range of hours per year that each task might require
- What are the currently invisible service tasks in your unit?
 - Make as full an inventory as possible
 - Be prepared to discuss/debate what should “count” as part of paid service
 - Make an estimate of the range of hours per year that each task might require
- Which tasks should receive extra points as a reflection of their priority to the unit?

For the Task Force: over the course of spring term

- Complete the list for non-senate university-level committees and provide a first estimate of expected effort for each.
- Prepare a template or workbook to units to guide their elaboration of policies, to provide guidance lest they go off in a thousand different directions.
- Prepare a proposal for the Senate for what the renewed charge of the Task Force will be for next year.

Suggested deliverables over the next year:

- (i) Building on Appendix B, create an exhaustive list of visible service roles/tasks currently being done at the UO. The Task Force will do this for recognized university-level service. We will also suggest a preliminary list of school/college-level and individual department-level tasks. After schools/colleges and individual departments expand on the Task Force’s initial lists, the Task Force will need to compile these lists to arrive at a more complete listing of institutional service, which can be made available publicly.
- (ii) Building on Appendix C, create a more comprehensive list of invisible faculty service at the UO. After individual units build their local lists at their relevant levels, the Task Force will need to compile the lists, discuss which roles/tasks individual units have decided to exclude from the list, and make the finished list available publicly.
- (iii) Assign the range of points possible for each task. The initial range of points available for each role/task should reflect the expected effort (measured as time); this initial range may be modified to reflect the importance of the task to the institution. The lowest value would be simply a conversion of one point for each 10 hours spent on the task per year. For example, the Academic Council (AC) is a Senate committee that is categorized as having a time-commitment of 0-20 hours per year. Based solely on anticipated time spent, the AC would have a possible value of 0-2 service points. However, the work of the AC is central to shared governance, in that

it vets proposed Senate legislation by any of the committees it represents, as well as any motion proposed by any other entity when the motion “may affect academic excellence.” This leads us to increase the service points available to 1-4. During the pandemic, the AC gained emergency powers, met more frequently, and made major decisions about academic procedures. A member of the AC during the pandemic could reasonably request the higher end of points and explain the situation in the “details” column.

- (iv) Begin conversations about criteria and procedures for assessment, i.e., given that a specific faculty member amasses enough points to meet expectation for service, how can administrators (from Department Heads on up) assess whether the quality of that service also meets expectations. Establishing these criteria is specifically postponed until after creation of the catalog of tasks and assignment of the range of points for each task. Among the initial ideas floated in our meetings (and mentioned in section 6.3) is to have committee chairs record attendance, such that individuals who frequently miss meetings cannot claim the full points for their (absent) service, and to have peers assess performance of all committee members and named roles in departments.

Appendix A:

Suggested Reading List for service-related research and best practices (many cited in this report)

Babcock, Linda, Brenda Peyser, Lise Vesterlund, & Laurie R. Weingart. 2022. [*The No Club: Putting an End to Women's Dead-End Work*](#). Published in the US by Simon & Schuster, in Great Britain by Piatkus.

[*White Paper on Service*](#), written in 2021 and revised in fall of 2022 by Gabe Paquette (a member of the Task Force through January of 2023). A condensed overview of research about service inequities in academia in general, outlines the “state of play” at the UO, considers some potential interventions, and lists some next steps in preparation for the work of the Task Force.

[*Transforming the University of Oregon's Racialized Climate: Five Factors Shaping Faculty of Color Retention*](#), written in 2021 by Kwadwo Assensoh, Gerard Sandoval (a member of the Task Force), Charlotte Moats-Gallagher and Hatsue Sato, sponsored by the UO Center on Diversity and Community (CoDaC). In addition to a wealth of other thought-provoking information, this document specifically calls out the phenomenon of “Cultural Taxation”, a cover term for the earlier, heavier, and sometimes institutionally invisible service burden that faculty of color assume for the benefit of the institution.

[*Equity-Minded Faculty Workloads: What We Can and Should Do Now*](#), a 2021 report by Kerryann O'Meara, Dawn Culpepper, Joya Misra, & Audrey Jaeger, published by the American Council on Education. This report presents the results of a National Science Foundation funded project at the University of Maryland that studies workload distribution in the academy and then proposes a series of best practices for addressing systemic asymmetries in faculty workload and rewards for work. [*Equity-Minded Faculty Workloads Worksheet Booklet*](#).

[*Faculty Work Activity Dashboards: A Strategy to Increase Transparency*](#), a 2020 article by Kerry Ann O'Meara, Elizabeth Beise, Dawn Culpepper, Joya Misra and Audrey Jaeger in *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 52:3, 34-42, DOI: 10.1080/00091383.2020.1745579. This article addresses how a specific tool, publicly accessible dashboards that report faculty service work, increases transparency of faculty workload, thereby establishing a basis for more equitable distributions of that workload amongst all faculty.

[*Gender Differences in Accepting and Receiving Requests for Tasks with Low Promotability*](#), a 2017 article by Linda Babcock, Maria P. Recalde, Lise Vesterlund, & Laurie Weingart in *American Economic Review* 107(3): 714-747, <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20141734>. This article speaks specifically to the gender asymmetry in service: “Gender differences in the frequency of requests and in the acceptance of requests for less-promotable tasks may help explain why women advance at a slower rate than men in the workplace.”

Two 2017 reports on UO focus groups, one giving results of a [*UO Women of Color Faculty Focus Group*](#), the other results of a [*UO Women of Science Faculty Focus Group*](#). Both focus groups identified Service as an area where they experience asymmetries in their workload, with the perception that they are asked (and accept) to do more service work; for the women of color group, the perception is that some kinds of service work they do is not recognized and acknowledged.

Valian, Virginia. 1999. [*Why so Slow? The Advancement of Women*](#). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Appendix B:

Preliminary list of Categories of Recognized/Visible Service (and how to weight some of them)

Service inside the University of Oregon

- **Service to the University**
 - University or Faculty Senate 2-4
 - Senate Committees (and subcommittees, where relevant)
 - Academic Council 1-2
 - Academic Requirements Committee 2-4
 - Career Faculty Committee 1-2
 - Committee on Committees 2-4
 - Committee on Courses 4-6
 - Committee on Sexual and Gender-based violence 2-4
 - Continuous Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching 4-6
 - Core Education Council 4-6
 - Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee 1-2
 - Equity, Inclusion and Diversity Committee
 - Faculty Advisory Council 4-6
 - Faculty Grievance Appeals Committee 1-2
 - Faculty Personnel Committee 6+
 - Faculty Research Awards Committee 2-4
 - Graduate Council 2-4
 - Library Committee 2-4
 - Promotion-Tenure-Retention Appeals Committee
 - Scholastic Review Committee 2-4
 - Senate Budget Committee 1-2
 - Senate Executive Committee 2-4
 - Senate Rules Committee 1-2
 - Study Abroad Programs Committee 2-4
 - Undergraduate Council 4-6
 - University Committee on Sexual Orientation Attraction Gender Identity and Expression 2-4
 - President/Provost-appointed roles, committees, or Task Forces
 - Administrative committees
 - Campus Planning Committee
 - Committee on Scholarships
 - Honorary Degrees and Distinguished Service Awards
 - Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Committee
 - International Scholarships Committee
 - Officers of Administration Council
 - Policy Advisory Council
 - Student Conduct Advisory Committee
 - Student-Faculty Committee on Grievances
 - University Appeals Board
 - Other bodies
 - Provost Teaching Academy
 - Williams Council
 - Faculty Group Mentoring Program

- UO Portland Academic Committee
 - Faculty Excellence Award Selection Committee
 - Search committees
 - Task Forces, Panels, etc., e.g.
 - CAS Task Force
 - Roles / Fellow positions
 - Provost's fellows for X
 - CoDaC fellows
 - Other
- Other university-wide Task Forces or Panels, e.g.
 - Task Force on Service
 - Diversity Excellence Scholarship Advisory Committee, Division of Equity & Inclusion
 - Other
- **Service to the College/School**
 - College/School Assembly
 - College/School curriculum committee
 - Faculty Personnel Committee (e.g., CAS Dean's Advisory Committee)
 - Executive leadership/advisory group, e.g.
 - CAS "Wise Heads"
 - COE Executive Leadership Team
 - Standing Committees, e.g.
 - College DEI committee
 - Graduate and Undergraduate Affairs committees
 - Dean or Director-appointed Task forces, Panels, etc.
 - Dean's Faculty Advisory Committee
 - Course Scheduling Committee
 - Named roles within College/School
 - Center Director / Co-Director
 - Other
- **Service to the Department**
 - List named service roles inside the Department
 - Head
 - Associate Head
 - Director of Undergraduate Studies
 - Director of Graduate Studies
 - Curriculum Coordinator
 - Other
 - List departmental standing committees, e.g.
 - Executive Committee (chair)
 - Curriculum committee (chair)
 - DEI Committee (chair)
 - Other
 - List *ad hoc* departmental committees
 - Personnel Committees (chair)

- Search committees (chair)
- New Faculty Mentor (name faculty)
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Admissions (evaluation of files, interviews) and recruiting

Service at other Universities or Institutions

- Service activities at other universities or institutions

Service to the Discipline/Profession/Interdisciplinary Areas

- Editorships
 - Editor or Associate/Section Editor, Journal/Book series, dates
 - Also Editorial Board memberships, Journal/Book series, dates
- Reviews
 - For journals (list journals, dates)
 - For granting agencies
 - Service on review panels (Agencies, review panel names, dates)
 - Program reviews (universities, professional organizations, funding agencies, etc. with dates, places, focus, etc.)
 - Jurors for Artistic/Creative works (venues, dates)
- Professional society activities
 - Leadership positions (President, VP, secretary, treasurer, area chair, etc.)
 - Service on Committees/Task Forces/Boards/Panels
 - Specify when chair
 - Organization of Conferences, workshops, panels, symposia
 - indicate if served as chair or co-chair, member of organizing committee, etc.]
 - [include dates, organization/society if applicable, nature of work, etc.]

Service to the Public

- Service to governmental agencies
 - Serving as public official for State agencies
 - Testifying to State legislatures or US Congress
 - Serving as Expert Witness in trials
- Service to communities in Oregon
- Service to US communities outside of Oregon
- Service to International communities
- Service to non-governmental organizations
 - Consultant, The World Bank

Here's a list of examples combining items in a e-mails from Leslie and from Mike. This certainly isn't everything. Other & overlapping things listed elsewhere in this report- 'the NoClub's top 10' & umbrella categories:

Largely Invisible Service

- (informal) mentorship of undergraduate students: emotional support, cultural orientation, institutional guidance, hidden curriculum
- similar mentorship for graduate students; both formal and informal advising/mentorship
- similar mentorship for faculty colleagues

- outreach to potential students of diverse backgrounds
- support for and engagement with student affinity groups; advising student organizations
- serving as a local expert on DEI issues for one's unit
- bringing in speakers to units or to campus to engage with DEI issues
- Hosting other events and guests
- advocacy work (at local, state, national, or global levels)
- efforts to build community for students or faculty at UO or beyond
- public facing service in the broader community
- crisis response: addressing current events when the need arises (e.g., the critical illness or death of a student or colleague)
- internship supervision (especially relevant in professional schools)
- experiential learning projects and excursions (many are co-curricular, or if in-load, constitute much more work/logistics than the credits students earn)
- case preparation committees for P&T- very time consuming for the chair and/or the one assigned research
- peer teaching reviews
- attending departmental and other unit meetings (note that many faculty are MIA from many meetings with no repercussions)
- curriculum development and new course proposals (Courseleaf is not easy to navigate)
- reference letters/phone calls
- continued mentoring of alums and junior colleagues elsewhere
- external examiner and P&T external reviewer letters

Appendix C:
Some suggested categories and examples of Invisible Service

Service inside the University of Oregon

- **Service to the University**
 - Advising of DEI affinity groups
 - Serving on DEI strategies groups

- **Service to the College/School**
 - Documenting requirements for state certification
 - Presentations to colleagues re. one's program/field

- **Service to the Department**
 - Mentorship of new faculty, non-advisee students
 - Advising of students earning terminal MA degrees.
 - Serving on an MA or PhD committee
 - Serving on (or chairing) a doctoral examination committee.
 - Giving placement or diagnostic exams for incoming students.
 - Work on 10-year review
 - Documenting requirements for state certification
 - Peer reviews of teaching
 - Participation in personnel review committees
 - Reviews of GE performance

- **Service at other Universities or Institutions**
 - Participating on PhD committees
 - Reviewing and evaluating grant proposals, academic journal submissions

- **Service to the Discipline/Profession/Interdisciplinary Areas**
 - DEI efforts for academic professional associations
 - Selection groups, like conference track field leaders, that select conference participants

- **Service to the Public**
 - Providing consultations on social policy issues
 - Sharing knowledge of expertise
 - Presentations to outsiders re. one's program/field

These are examples of DEI invisible service from CODAC's report: *"Voices of University of Oregon Faculty of Color: External Consultant's Active Retention Report*

"First and foremost, faculty of color should be valued and respected as scholars and educators. Their invisible DEI service to the UO needs to be acknowledged – made visible – and rewarded". 7

This includes responding or processing acts of implicit bias, prejudice, and bigotry alone or in isolation; feeling pressured to serve as a cultural resource officer for colleagues about race or diversity issues; and/or concealing the racial labor they expend from white colleagues to preserve collegial relations or to mitigate distractions from the review process. 9

This extends from seeking employment without any special outreach activity but, nonetheless, feeling the need to overcompensate for the perception that they did not “earn” their appointment and/or promotion, to continually assessing who among their colleagues, undergraduate and graduate students, and staff are indifferent, hostile, or supportive of their success. In the process, they are forced to reconcile the contradictions between the university’s commitment to diversity with the struggle for validation of their intrinsic value as Black scholars as well as scholarship on Black culture and people within the university. 12

These range from funding and promotion, compliance consultation and investigative processes, career partner employment, to the development and execution of programmatic activity in support of research and curricula about the Black experience and drivers of well-being. 12

Recruiting other faculty of color during job candidacy visits. 12

Expectations for their regular participation in Native student events, such as the weekly potluck and the evening study hall at the Longhouse; 16

Continual rallying to react to an act of oppression, such as the condemnation of vandalism against pioneer/settler statues that were pulled down without recognition of the offensiveness of the statues to Native people; or the dismissal of Native students without consideration for their lived circumstances; 16

Perpetual service on search committees to help identify faculty and administrators who are not close-minded and oppressive; 16

Perpetual advocacy for Native program budgets; 16

The provost is seeking to establish a center on anti-racism and has called upon faculty of color to attend meetings to give him their recommendations for it. Although this involves lots of extra non-recognized service time for Native and other faculty of color, the faculty of color are dismayed that the one basic factor that the provost sees as critically important is empathy. 17

Because such behavior is not curtailed, it is treated as “normal” and its continued application results in trauma in many Native people. One faculty member stated that it was not unusual for there to be a “parade of people coming into my office and crying.” 17

The informal infrastructure developed by Native people for the Native community on campus should be recognized and supported by the University. Everything “shouldn’t be labor on Native faculty backs.” 18

‘The vast majority of associate professors don’t get to full here because the workload is so heavy.’ 23

‘The community work we do needs to be taken into consideration [workload] and valued.’ 23

We are an extension of the UO and considered ‘ambassadors’ for the community and their request for our engagement . . . so faculty of color all called upon a lot

to help address DE&I issues. This work is increasing and needs to be taken into consideration in terms of our current workload.’ 23

My question here is why are the deans not aware of and/or enlightened by what is really happening here?’ This interviewee is describing racist behavior by students that results in faculty of color receiving negative evaluations which the faculty do not get to challenge. 24

‘Relationships and community engagement and community services is the lifeline for faculty of color.’ 25

‘We are an extension of the UO and considered ‘ambassadors’ for the community and their request for our engagement . . . so faculty of color all called upon a lot to help address DE&I issues. This work is increasing and needs to be taken into consideration in terms of our current workload.’ 25

According to the respondents, the racialized category of Asian/Asian Americans has been problematized in large part at the University of Oregon because of the way they have been positioned as “convenient” minorities and people of color. In other words, depending on the situation, they are or are not counted or recognized as part of a minority group or people of color. 40

When advocating for more diverse faculty hires for their department, a senior colleague at a public meeting stated that ‘We are a department that does not have any people of color’. I went up to him afterwards to say, “Why did you say that? There are at least 2 Asian Americans in the department including me?” And he said “you don’t count.” 40

Faculty of color speak to the cultural taxation in which they are expected to provide service that is related to diversity and inclusion. Oftentimes, this service is in addition to their “regular/normal” service and are not counted in the same way or at all. Examples of diversity and inclusion related service include outreach and recruitment of students of color to their programs, presenting at diversity related events, representing the university at community diversity events, and specific to APIDA faculty, working with international students. Some of this work is formal, while other times it may be informal as faculty see the need to support other fellow faculty or APIDA students, other students of color, and women. 44

All kinds of students of color are going to feel such faculty are more likely to be receptive to the emotional difficulties that they’ve experienced as a student. So it’s not just the number of students, and therefore also the amount of time, but it’s also the emotional burden of attending to students. This is not limited to issues of race, it also occurs on issues of gender, of sexual identity and orientation and all factors of minority demographics. But in many ways, race is the hardest nut to crack. So when you have a high ratio of students of color to faculty of color, then you’re going to have that burden. And it’s one of the primary reasons why retention is difficult. 44

According to the faculty interviewed, the University of Oregon has made strides to enroll more students of color. Yet without a fully developed and coordinated eco-system to help BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, people of color) succeed, thrive, and feel a sense of belonging, many of these students inadvertently seek out APIDA and other BIPOC faculty to provide additional academic and emotional support. As the ratio of students of color to faculty increases, so do the demands on the time of BIPOC faculty, including APIDA faculty. 44

So having them [university administration] understand the invisible labor that we go through when you are literally trying to make sure that your colleagues don't jump off the ledge, because of harms that they experience here. 44