Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Input in the RPT Process
2019-2020 Report and Proposal for Revised Policy 6-303
March 30, 2020 Academic Senate Meeting

Co-chairs: Devon Cantwell, Sarah Projansky
Committee Members: Anna Marie Barnes, Brittany Coats, Darryl P. Butt, David Hill, Elaine Clark, Kaitlin McLean, Lori McDonald, Mark St. Andre, Martell Teasley, Mary Elizabeth Hartnett, Maureen Mathison, Patricia Hanna, Robert Flores, Robert Fujinami, Stuart Culver, Thomas Cova, Wendy Hobson-Rohrer

- This Committee's **primary recommendation** is that University Policy 6-303 eliminate the RPT-SAC vote and the concomitant ability of RPT-SAC to send a case to UPTAC.
    - Attached, please find (1) a redline version of Policy 6-303 and (2) a description of the project that provides background and highlights the changes we propose.

- **Additional recommendations**:
  1. The University should oversee RPT-SAC training, which at minimum should include:
      a. Implicit bias training
      b. Context of the specific RPT process for each candidate
      c. How to review the materials from an impartial perspective
      d. Expectations for RPT-SAC report:
          i. The evaluation should be linked to the evidence
          ii. The full discussion should be captured. If there is disagreement amongst the committee, it should be explained in the report.
          iii. It is the department chair's responsibility to ensure each part of the report is filled out correctly, before placing the report in the file.
  2. We recommend that there be a way to verify that all RPT-SAC members have had training before participating in the meeting and in writing the report.
      a. One possibility is for the University to train college/department trainers.
      b. Training should address timelines, so that the trainers and RPT-SACs are not taken by surprise when it is time to train and then produce the report.
  3. RPT-SACs should have access to more than just course evaluations. This material could include but not be limited to: CV, teaching philosophy/statement, syllabi/other course materials, anonymous surveys of students, interviews with students, etc.
      a. Regardless of the type of material, it needs to be systematic and non-prejudicial.
      b. We note that some department RPT-SACs already use multiple sources of evidence. We recommend consulting with departments to identify types of evidence and means of collecting evidence that have worked well.
  4. We encourage departments/units to develop a way to measure mentoring.
      a. This could include being sure a member of a candidate's lab is on the RPT-SAC, it could include focus groups, it could include anonymous surveys, etc.
  5. We encourage departments/units that have multiple types of trainees beyond traditional undergraduate and graduate students (e.g., post-docs) to create multiple RPT-SACs.

6. After the review is complete, the Department Chair and the RPT-SAC could meet to discuss next steps for the candidate's teaching. The Chair could explain how any of the concerns raised in the RPT-SAC report are being addressed, or how the strong mentoring that the RPT-SAC identified in the report will be recognized, etc. This would help students know that their contributions to RPT are taken seriously and have impact.
7. Because units do not always enforce RPT-SAC policies/guidelines, we recommend that the university develop a means to ensure appropriate procedures are followed.
8. We recommend that a plan be put in place to ensure that this conversation continues, with both faculty and students participating. This plan should include a way to identify what is working and what isn't working with the new system, and to tweak as needed.