REPORT

OF

TASK FORCE

ON FACULTY

ROLES AND REWARDS

January 31, 1995

The University of Memphis

J. Ivan Legg, Provost

FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS TASK FORCE REPORT

I. BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

The task force of 26 members (see Appendix I) was appointed by Provost J. Ivan Legg in September of 1993 to assess the current faculty roles and reward system and to make recommendations for changes. At the initial meeting in October, the Provost gave his charge to the task force and furnished materials such as Ernest L. Boyer's book, Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate, that dealt with faculty roles and rewards.

During the Fall Semester (1993) a library of documents including official University documents, University and Faculty Senate reports, reports from other universities, and other articles and books that focused on faculty roles and rewards was organized. Three subcommittees dealing with teaching, scholarship, and service were formed. Reports of these committees were discussed and modified by the task force as a whole at the end of the semester. The co-chairs discussed the work of the task force at the Administrative Retreat in November (1993), and obtained initial feedback there.

At the beginning of the Spring Semester (1994) four members of the task force who had attended a national forum of the American Association for Higher Education, which was devoted to faculty roles and rewards, reviewed for the task force relevant information presented at the conference. A document that integrated the three reports from the previous semester was reviewed and revised, and three new subcommittees were formed to deal with communication, implementation, and rewards. At the end of the Spring Semester the reports of these three subcommittees were discussed and modified by the entire task force, and an initial integrated report was drafted. This was followed by a brief report of the year's activities of the task force to the Faculty Senate by the co-chairs, and a panel discussion at the Faculty Convocation led by six members of the task force.

During the Summer Term (1994) the co-chairs of the task force met with the department chairs in each of the colleges of the University to outline the activities of the task force and to arrange for two members of the task force to meet with the faculty in each department at the beginning of the Fall Semester (1994). A subcommittee began drafting a first draft report of the task force using the revised reports of the six subcommittees and the integrated report.

At the beginning of the Fall Semester (1994) one or two members of the task force met with the faculty in each department to give a progress report and to obtain feedback on the working ideas of the task force. During this same period the co-chairs presented some ideas from the task force to the new faculty, gave progress

reports to the Faculty Senate and to the Executive Council of the President, and solicited feedback. Also, the co-chairs of the task force met with departmental chairs to discuss the working ideas. Then, the entire task force used the input from the departmental visits, information obtained at other meetings, and the rough draft document produced by the drafting subcommittee to produce the draft report. Three documents (Faculty Handbook, Scholarship Reconsidered, Proposed Evaluation System for MSU) were reviewed by members of the task force to identify commonalities and differences with the draft report.

During the Fall Semester (1994) the draft report was made available to all faculty through their departments, to members of the Faculty Senate, to chairs of each department, to the deans of each college, to the Provost, to the Executive Council of the President, and other key administrators for their feedback. In November and December it was discussed at the Administrative Retreat, in a meeting of chairs, in a meeting of Student Government Association leaders, and with the Research Board of Visitors, as well as with many individual faculty members and administrators. Over 30 written responses were provided by individuals and groups of faculty members.

On the basis of this considerable feedback, the drafting subcommittee and entire task force met in December and decided upon changes to make in the document. The co-chairs then met in late December to review these changes and other recommended additions and revised the document in early January (1995). The revised document was distributed to the drafting subcommittee the second week in January for further editorial suggestions. The co-chairs revised the document and distributed it to all members of the task force during the third week of January.

Four members of the task force who had attended the 1995 national meeting of the American Association for Higher Education focusing on faculty roles and rewards reviewed the document and identified areas for further discussion at the January 23 meeting of the task force. At a final working meeting of the task force (January 23), the document was reviewed again, and final changes were made on January 24. The final document was distributed to task force members on January 25, and each member had an opportunity to submit additional remarks by January 30 for inclusion with the final document. On January 31 the final document of task force recommendations, the working documents, the signature sheet, and additional remarks by individual task force members were submitted to the Provost. A meeting between the co-chairs and the Provost was set for February 2 to discuss the document, and a lunch meeting was called by the Provost on February 7 with members of the task force.

III. ROLES

Each faculty member is expected to demonstrate a commitment to and competence in teaching, scholarship, and service activities. In a university community, teaching, scholarship, and service are communal responsibilities. However, variation will naturally occur among departments and among faculty members within departments as to the balance among these activities. It is important to emphasize that teaching, scholarship, and service are interrelated, and some activities may span more than one area. For example, journal editorship might be considered scholarship, service, or both, and dissertation supervision might be considered teaching, scholarship, or both. Teaching, scholarship, and service should be evaluated individually and collectively during annual review and at the time of tenure and promotion decisions.

A. TEACHING

Definition

Teaching encompasses classroom instruction, course development, mentoring students in academic projects including dissertations, testing, grading, and the professional development of the faculty member as a teacher.

Key Points

(1) Teaching is central to the purposes and objectives of The University of Memphis, and it should be evaluated, rewarded, and encouraged in ways parallel to those for scholarship.

(2) The evaluation of teaching should be adaptable to differences among disciplines.

(3) The evaluation of teaching should be formative (to improve teaching skills) as well as summative (to judge teaching skills). Opportunities for faculty enrichment should be made available.

(4) Since the evaluation of teaching is primarily a qualitative process, multiple sources of evidence should be employed. This should increase the validity of the evaluation.

(5) One source of evidence will be student evaluations, to be obtained for all classes in all departments for all semesters, including summer sessions. The student evaluation instrument should include a standardized questionnaire with a substantial narrative portion to be used across the University. Departmental sections should be added to address the special nature of the disciplines and the mode of instruction in different classes.

(6) Mentoring students at all levels is an important aspect of teaching activities and should be taken into account in faculty evaluations.

(7) Creative and effective use of innovative teaching methods and curricular innovations should be encouraged and constructively evaluated.

B. SCHOLARSHIP

Definition

Scholarship is a discipline-based or multi-disciplinary activity that advances the fund of knowledge and learning through producing new ideas and understanding. In the course of advancing scholarship, faculty members demonstrate their scholarly contributions, among other things, through products such as books, articles, chapters, films, paintings, musical performances, and choreographic design which are evaluated by peers. In the university setting, scholarship is demonstrated through products that are appropriate to the discipline and can be evaluated by peers. Scholarship includes the following five subcategories (in alphabetical order):

Application: The scholarship of application adds to existing knowledge in the process of applying intellectual expertise to the solution of practical problems, and it results in a written product that is shared with other people in the discipline or field of study. The scholarship of application could include activities of the following kind, when such activities result in written products open to peer review: the development of content-based seminars and workshops; the provision of technical assistance; and the evaluation of public and private sector institutions, processes, and policies.

Creative Activity: Creative activity should be fully accepted as scholarship in departments where such work is appropriate to both professional specialization and teaching. Such work would include, but not be limited to, activities such as choreography and dance performance; creative writing; direction and design of plays; exhibitions of visual arts such as paintings, sculptures, and photography; direction of film and video; and musical composition and performance.

Inquiry: The scholarship of inquiry involves rigorous investigation aimed at the discovery of new knowledge within one's own discipline or area of study. In many ways, inquiry serves as the basis for other forms of scholarship. Evidence of activity in this area includes scholarly publications, funded research, and presentations at professional meetings.

Integration: The scholarship of integration makes meaningful connections between previously unrelated topics, facts, or observations. Examples are cross-disciplinary synthesis, and the conceptualization of an integrative framework within a discipline.

7

Evidence of activity in this area includes publications and presentations in a suitable forum.

Teaching: The scholarship of teaching focuses on transforming and extending knowledge about pedagogy. Examples would include writing an appropriate textbook or educational article in one's discipline. Innovative contributions to teaching, insofar as they are published or presented in a peer-reviewed forum, would also constitute scholarship of teaching.

Key Points

(1) Each department, considering its relevant discipline or disciplines, may emphasize contributions in some subcategories more than others, as described in its mission statement and other relevant documents prepared by the department. Individual faculty are not expected to contribute in all five subcategories of scholarship. There is some overlap in the meaning of the five subcategories of scholarship, and a particular scholarly contribution may fall under more than one subcategory.

(2) The "scholarship of teaching" is not equivalent to teaching. Classroom teaching and staying current in one's field are not relevant criteria for evaluating faculty on the "scholarship of teaching."

C. SERVICE

Definition

Service includes University service, service to the profession, and outreach. These functions may overlap in some instances. Examples of University service include participation in committees and task forces, advising student organizations, and serving on the Faculty Senate. Service to the profession includes association leadership, journal editorships, article and grant proposal review, and guest lecturing on other campuses among a wide variety of possible activities. Outreach refers primarily to sharing professional expertise with parties outside the University but, under very rare circumstances, may include non-professionally related activities outside the University. Outreach should directly support the goals and mission of the University.

Key Points

(1) Most faculty members will perform basic citizenship service activities within the University. Basic citizenship within the University includes, but is not limited to, serving on departmental committees, advising students, and membership on college and University committees.

8

(2) Academic advising of students is an important aspect of the University citizenship of many faculty members and should be taken into account in faculty evaluations. Therefore, academic advising should be evaluated, and effective performance should be rewarded.

(3) Some faculty members may accept more extensive citizenship functions such as a leadership role in the Faculty Senate, membership on a specially appointed task force, serving as faculty advisor to a University-wide student organization, and membership on a University search committee. Effective and substantial citizenship service should be rewarded.

(4) As an urban University, we need to value service, particularly in terms of community outreach activities. We must also recognize that some departments and disciplines would be more involved in outreach than some other departments and disciplines, given the nature of their typical professional work.

(5) Faculty members are encouraged to perform outreach and professional service in addition to basic citizenship activities, and such service should be rewarded.

f. Chairs will respond to each annual report with a narrative evaluation as well as a rating of teaching, scholarship, and service and then overall performance. The faculty member will review the chair's evaluation and sign the evaluation form if there is agreement-with the evaluation. In the case there is a disagreement, it may be indicated or the form or the faculty member will have the option to address a grievance to the dean.

g. The administration should send the annual report forms to the chairs at least four weeks before they need to be returned to the dean.

(2) Evaluation Categories: The current ten-point evaluation scale and specific evaluation categories should be eliminated. Instead, three areas of performance should be encompassed: teaching, scholarship, service. Based on the information provided by the faculty member, and in some cases peer input, chairs should evaluate each faculty member for the three areas of performance using at most four descriptive categories.

After evaluating each of the three performance areas, the chair should evaluate the overall performance of the faculty member on the basis of the initial planning record in each performance area, areas of emphasis of the faculty member, and specific accomplishments over the year. The chair should assign an overall rating using the descriptive categories mentioned above. In addition, the chair should write a narrative of approximately one-to-two paragraphs describing the rationale for this overall evaluation. The overall rating should not necessarily be an average of the performance in the three areas, but should be a holistic evaluation with explicit reference to the relative contribution of each of the three areas. In years when there are available funds to support merit increases, an overall rating in the top two categories would qualify a faculty member for a merit increase (see Appendix III).

(3) Compilation of Materials Related to Faculty Members' Teaching, Scholarship, and Service: "Physical" evidence, such as syllabi, student evaluations and selected course materials for teaching, copies of published articles for research, and other documentation of service and outreach activities should be collected by faculty and updated on an ongoing basis. Content will vary according to the discipline. Faculty and chairs should consider making such materials part of the annual spring review and planning process. It is recommended that faculty members keep these materials together in a file containing evidence of contributions and accomplishments so that the necessary work to develop a file for midterm pre-tenure and tenure and promotion reviews can be expedited.

(4) Potential Use of Internal Peer Review Committees: When part of the departmental annual review process, internal peer review committees within departments could also (1) participate in planning with individual faculty members, (2) evaluate faculty's annual performance, and (3) provide evaluations to departmental chairs.

(5) <u>Makeup of Internal Peer Review Committee</u>: When a formal committee is used, the makeup of the committee should reflect the department's diversity, and membership should rotate among faculty members through the use of staggered terms. Although the majority of the committee responsible for annual peer reviews should be tenured, the inclusion of untenured faculty should be seriously considered in order that newer faculty may learn both the planning and evaluation process and performance expectations within their departments.

C. SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

(1) <u>Improvement in Annual Review Process</u>: In order for the annual review process to be fair and effective, it is strongly recommended that support for department chairs' and deans' development and training in the evaluation process be an administrative priority.

(2) <u>Faculty Enrichment</u>: When a faculty member is not performing as successfully as he/she and the chair believe is necessary and/or desirable in any of the three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service), a plan should be developed by the chair and the faculty member to make use of available resources of the University and/or programs on or off-campus in order for the faculty member to develop the necessary skills in this particular area.

Similarly, significant resources need to be provided to enhance faculty career advancement since that benefits the University community. Faculty enrichment should also be viewed as a potential career change. This can be initiated by the faculty member and/or chair not necessarily in light of a weakness on the part of the faculty member, but possibly in terms of new needs of the department and new interests of the faculty member.

(3) <u>Grants and Other Funding</u>: The evaluation of professional activities should be based upon the merit of the activity, not simply on the basis of whether or not it is financially supported. Obtaining external funding should be encouraged when possible and appropriate and should be rewarded, but it is not an end in itself.

An important objective of the University is to support outstanding scholarship activities. However, the relative importance of externally funded scholarly activities varies from department to department. For some departments the generation of outside funding is necessary in order to continue the overall work of the unit. In these cases, an appropriate balance must be struck between funded and non-funded scholarly activity in the annual review process. The necessity of obtaining external funding can occasionally dominate a department's other activities, and every effort should be made to minimize this occurrence.

(4) <u>Promotion to Professor</u>: In the annual review, Associate Professors should get feedback regarding their progress toward promotion to Full Professor.· In order to be able to provide this evaluation and feedback, each department will need to have clear guidelines for promotion to Full Professor which are consistent with those of the college and the University. These guidelines should be part of the overall tenure and promotion guidelines of the department.

D. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TEACHING

(1) All instructors who are in the classroom -- including full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and teaching graduate assistants -- should be evaluated at the departmental level. The review process should be structured in such a way as to emphasize faculty development and the improvement of instruction. The process should take into account the nature and level of the courses, goals of the particular program, and the interpretation of grade distributions. The results of these annual reviews should become an integral part of the tenure and promotion review process.

(2) Items to be routinely included in the documentation of teaching:

- Statement of teaching philosophy
- Course materials
- Systematic student evaluations for each course each semester, including the summer and the previous spring semester.
- Grade distributions, plus any comments the faculty member chooses to make about the relation between the grade distribution and the nature of the course
- Evidence for supervision of student projects and other forms of student mentorships

(3) As part of the annual review, departments should choose additional types of items such as the following:
- Open-ended or other student input
- Student products
- Teaching recognition
- Teaching scholarship
- Peer input
- Evidence of professional development in teaching
- Evidence of disciplinary or interdisciplinary program or curricular development
- Alumni surveys and student exit interviews
- Other evidence of excellence in teaching and/or mentoring

14

E. ANNUAL REVIEW OF SCHOLARSHIP

(1) Individual departments should determine those subcategories which will be emphasized from among the five possible scholarship subcategories in a way which is consistent with its mission and the current standards of its discipline. This will be specified in its departmental guidelines. Departments should also specify how to weigh scholarly accomplishments and contributions such as publications with multiple authors, projects with multiple personnel, edited publications, and foreign language translation projects. This should be done with the review of the college-level faculty advisory committee and approval of the dean and the Provost.

(2) For each subcategory of scholarship considered by the department, normally only peer-reviewed items should qualify as scholarly contributions. For example, publications in journals, books, and other written media have traditionally constituted appropriate documentation of scholarship in most departments. Professional scholarly papers presented at international, national, and regional meetings might be appropriate to include. Written reviews and evaluations by qualified peers, either in person and/or aided by other forms of reports, are appropriate for performances, compositions, and artistic creations. This information would be included in a faculty member's documentation.

F. ANNUAL REVIEW OF SERVICE

(1) Individual faculty members are encouraged to pursue service activities that support the stated mission and goals of the University, college, and department. Community outreach is especially valued given the urban mission of the University. In some circumstances this may mean that faculty are engaged in service activities that are not strictly related to their professional training and/or discipline. Generally, however, faculty members would be expected to give priority to service activities that are related to their professional expertise.

(2) For faculty members who advise students, the quality of advising needs to be evaluated, and good advising should be rewarded. In many instances, chairs will have valid first-hand knowledge about the quantity and quality of advising. In other instances a variety of means might be used such as random exit interviews, retention of advisees, and peer input.

(3) A planned program of service activities is preferred. This pertains to University citizenship, professional service, and community outreach. While service may require or lead to opportunities for spontaneous efforts of faculty members, these would likely be an outgrowth of planned activities.

(4) The communication of service activities is an important component of the service

roles. The impact of service is increased when the faculty member clearly communicates the nature and value of service activities. The need to communicate extends beyond "mere reporting." The faculty member is encouraged to be a resource for interested parties, both inside the University and off-campus.

(5) Faculty members should document the nature, scope, and value of their service activities.

B. CORE RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) <u>Professional Leaves</u>: Professional Development Assignments should be renamed Professional Leaves, and support for them should be expanded. This term better reflects the nature and spirit of the current system, since these leaves are available both for conventional scholarly activity and for professional development activities such as pursuing new directions in one's scholarship or teaching. Guidelines for Professional Leaves should be clearly articulated and well publicized among the faculty.

(2). <u>Faculty Summer Fellowships</u>: The University should establish Faculty Summer Fellowships to provide summer salary support for faculty members to do full-time scholarly activity during the summer. These fellowships should be for an amount equivalent to the amount the faculty member would earn doing 6 hours of teaching during one summer term. They should be awarded competitively, and award decisions should be made within the individual colleges. Awards should be based entirely on scholarly merit. Untenured faculty members would qualify and should be urged to apply.

(3) <u>Professional Travel</u>: Financial support for professional travel is very important in relation to the professional development and accomplishments of faculty, and in relation to the University's mission. The University should give high priority to providing adequate funding of departmental travel budgets. Additional travel money should be available at the college level to provide backup financial support for worthwhile professional travel by faculty, including travel related to matters of teaching, professional service, and scholarship (e.g., to conferences in which new teaching methods are addressed).

(4) <u>Teaching Innovations</u>: The University should provide financial resources to individual departments for support of teaching innovations such as the development of new courses, new teaching materials, or new teaching techniques. These resources could be used, for example, to enable redistribution of the work load for faculty, or for summer salary support for faculty, or to hire consultants on matters such as test design and instructional methods.

(5) <u>Creative Rewards</u>: Departments should be encouraged to institute non-monetary rewards, including procedures for celebrating and publicizing faculty accomplishments. Examples include departmental newsletters for circulation to faculty, alumni, and current students in the department; departmental bulletin boards displaying publications by faculty and/or photos of faculty members plus information about their areas of scholarship; departmental faculty-appreciation banquets; annual department lectures by a departmental faculty member. A system of giving immediate, small rewards for special accomplishments should be established.

(6) <u>Distinguished Service Award</u>: In addition to the existing University Distinguished Teaching and Research Awards, a Distinguished Service Award should be established. Additionally, the Distinguished Research Award should be renamed Distinguished Scholarship Award.

(7) <u>Honorific Distinguished Professor</u>: The University should initiate a program to establish an honorific award for Distinguished Professor to recognize sustained outstanding performance in scholarship, service, and teaching. A limited number of these awards should be available. Some additional resources such as travel funds might be allocated to these professors.

VIII. COMMUNICATION OF FACULTY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

It is important that pertinent information concerning individual faculty members' activities be disseminated within the University to administrators, faculty, staff and students, and outside to alumni and the larger community. Such dissemination promotes awareness of faculty interests, expertise, and accomplishments and fosters connections between interested parties within and outside the University.

While some faculty are capable of and enjoy carrying on extensive public relations activities on their own behalf, many others are hesitant to do so. Therefore, it is in the best interest of the University that the communication of faculty accomplishments should be centered in the colleges and departments rather than left to individuals. Toward that end we recommend the following:

(1) One faculty or staff member from each department should be assigned to gather and keep a record of faculty activities and accomplishments. If it is a faculty member, this would be considered part of that faculty member's normal citizenship contribution. Relevant information would be sent directly to Update and to the college public relations liaison.

(2) Someone at the college level should be appointed public relations liaison to both the press and the University Media Relations Office. This person would gather information from department representatives and prepare releases and articles for college newsletters, the local press, and other relevant outlets. These efforts would be coordinated with the University Media Relations Office to avoid duplication of effort and to assure maximum media saturation.

(3) Both representatives should keep individual faculty members aware of any dissemination of information pertaining to them. This would include sending them copies of press releases, news articles, etc.

(4) An updated curriculum vitae for each faculty member should be maintained in electronic form, so that all information about publications, exhibitions, performances, etc. for each year will not have to be generated by faculty ad infinitum.

(5) Departments and/or colleges should produce a newsletter for distribution to alumni and students.

(6) Colleges and departments should explore suitable mechanisms for promoting their potential as a community resource.

APPENDIX III

IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

Once the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force Report has been accepted and/or modified, it is recommended that ad hoc committees be convened which will propose specific means for implementing the recommendations.

Among those issues which will need to be addressed are:

a. Exploration of needs, resources, and options for faculty development.

b. Finalizing a new faculty planning and evaluation record form.

c. Developing guidelines for the new evaluation system.

d. Reviewing available student teaching evaluation questionnaires**.

e. Revaluating the appeals process for tenure and promotion.

f. Establishing a procedure and guidelines for "stopping the tenure clock" for special circumstances.

g. Developing mechanisms for dealing with unsatisfactory performance.

** A thorough assessment of student teaching evaluations must be completed before a final questionnaire is selected to be used across the University. This questionnaire should include no more than 10 questions and should contain an open-ended narrative. Additionally each department should add questions to reflect the special nature of the discipline and the mode of instruction in different classes.