

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON FACULTY REWARD SYSTEM

University of California, San Diego

Task Force Members:

Paul Friedman
Katja Lindenberg, Chair
James Lyon
Timothy McDaniel *
Laurence Milstein *
Robert Parker
Percy Russell
Lee Talner
Barbara Tomlinson

Academic Senate liaison:

Douglas Smith

* A separate statement expressing divergent views on some issues will follow.

October 1991

PREFACE

It is the nature of university faculty to revisit issues that are central to the shaping of the academic experience. The revisitation is essential in the institution's attempt to adjust to the needs of the societies that are inside and outside its boundaries. The way we value teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service in the shaping of academic experiences for faculty and students is one of those central issues. What is our understanding of (1) the relevance of scholarly and creative activity and university and community service to teaching, (2) the contribution that each of the three categories of activities make to the development of faculty, students, and the institution, and (3) the institution's expectation concerning the performance of each faculty member in all three categories? These are the three questions that the Provost's Advisory Commission on the Functions and Values of Teaching, Scholarly & Creative Activity, and University & Community Service at California State University, Long Beach addressed in its study over the past two years. Against the background of the three questions, the commission was asked to consider how teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and university/community service should be balanced in the outlook, aspiration, commitment, and total performance of each member of the faculty so that the reputation of CSULB, its students, and its faculty would be enhanced. The report presented here proposes a re-assessment of our "philosophy" and attitudes toward values of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

- Karl W. E. Anatol
Provost and Senior Vice-President
for Academic Affairs

SUMMARY

This report envisions a fundamental change in the way the faculty of CSULB view and value their activities. The past few years have brought sharp debate among faculty over the perceived direction of the university. A survey of the faculty conducted in the fall of 1991 affirms the deep commitment of most faculty to excellence in all aspects of their profession. At the same time, many faculty share a profound concern over the future of CSULB and feel torn by their disparate roles as teachers, scholars, and members of a university community. In a deepening fiscal crisis, many fear that the fragile structures now in place to support their efforts to remain vital as teachers and scholars are doomed. At this crossroads in the history of the institution, the central role of scholarship and creative activities in creating a vibrant and healthy learning environment must be acknowledged. However, CSULB will best be served by recognizing the scholarly nature of teaching as well as the inextricable bonds between teaching and traditional scholarship. This can be accomplished through use of a broadened definition of scholarship as outlined in Ernest Boyer's "Scholarship Reconsidered." Equally important is recognition of the value of the diverse contributions made by CSULB faculty at all career stages. It is proposed that each faculty member create a renewable Faculty Career Plan that would be used both to formalize the university's commitment to supporting each person's activities and to establish benchmarks for periodic evaluations. As the system of evaluation and rewards moves to one tailored to the individual strengths of the faculty, the university must respond to the challenge of finding better ways to evaluate the collective success of the faculty in fostering student learning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The immediate goal of the University should be two-fold: (1) to renew and strengthen a commitment to student learning by placing a high value on those activities of the faculty that create a better learning climate at CSULB, and (2) to work to insure the productivity of the faculty over the life of their careers. The document that follows addresses the history and philosophy underlying those goals, as well as practical issues associated with implementation.

BROADENED CONCEPT OF SCHOLARSHIP

The Commission recommends that all units within the university establish rigorous standards for evaluation of faculty, utilizing a broadened concept of scholarship that reflect the characteristics of each particular area. Accordingly, it is recommended that the campus adopt new Retention, Tenure, and Promotion and Evaluation of Tenured Faculty policies that incorporate the broadened concept of scholarship (Discovery, Application, Implementation, Teaching).

FACULTY EMPOWERMENT

The Commission recommends that the university empower faculty at all stages of their professional life at CSULB by recognizing the value of the growth and change that occurs over a typical faculty career. In particular, personnel policies should recognize that the emphasis given to the various forms of scholarship, as well as the nature of participation in university governance, will vary.

REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS

The Commission recommends that expectations for faculty be established that are realistic within the constraints of the system. Scarce resources should be used in ways that most effectively enhance the learning environment, while assisting faculty in their professional growth efforts. When possible, expectations of scholarship should be accompanied by appropriate levels of support. Where feasible, decision making as to allocation of resources (such as assigned time and lottery funds) should be decentralized to the college level, where the dean and/or faculty committees may have a sharper picture of the critical needs in that unit.

FACULTY CAREER PLAN

The Commission recommends that each member of the faculty develop a Faculty Career Plan, beginning at the time of appointment and renewed every few years over the lifetime of a career. The plan would be designed in consultation with the dean and department chair and describe a program of professional development in the area of scholarship, including the scholarship of teaching, as well as activities in the area of University and community citizenship. The plan would be long-range, encompassing three to five years and become the basis for evaluation of an individual's performance. As a mutual agreement among the faculty member, the chair, and the dean, the Faculty Career Plan would also include commitments of support by the chair or the dean. The Faculty Career Plan would also be flexible and open to change as needed. Finally, the Faculty Career Plan should reflect the strengths of the individual faculty member, as well as the growth and change that typically occurs over an individual's career.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

The Commission recommends that the implementation schedule included with this report be followed.

elsewhere has developed a few wobbles. In particular, it is inappropriate to categorize many activities as "teaching" or "scholarship" or "service." In addition, both the professional activities and the teaching styles that are appropriate in one discipline may take an entirely different form in another. In a university with as much breadth as CSULB, the expectations for faculty scholarship and creative activities need to reflect the great diversity of disciplines and their individual requirements. These expectations might even vary dramatically for individuals within the same discipline, depending on the individual's subspecialty and role in the degree program. In the discussion that follows, three rules have been applied.

(1) The activities of the faculty will not be considered separately as "teaching," "research," or "service." Instead, the new paradigm must acknowledge the frequent overlaps and blending of these traditional areas.

(2) The new paradigm must be flexible enough to encompass the needs of all the disciplines represented at CSULB, and to acknowledge that differences exist among individuals in particular areas.

(3) The standards by which faculty are judged must be rigorous. These standards must be carefully considered, realistic, and relevant to the mission of the University. Evaluation must focus on quality rather than quantity. The University is not well served, as former Stanford University president Donald Kennedy has noted, by "deans who can count but can't read."

Once clearly defined goals are established for individual faculty, measuring quality and merit should become less arbitrary. Even though specific expectations will differ across fields, the faculty in all disciplines should be doing work that is highly regarded, challenging, and contributing to the knowledge base of their fields. Likewise, although modes of instruction may vary, all disciplines should define effective teaching as that which most successfully promotes learning.

A New Definition of Scholarship

Across the country, universities have been rediscovering their role in fostering student learning, and effective teaching is gaining respect even at the most elite "research" universities. Comprehensive universities such as CSULB have always valued teaching, but they have been hobbled by confusion over the relative merits of "teaching," "research," and "service." Ernest Boyer's monograph, "Scholarship Reconsidered," speaks to the concerns of the research universities but the publication offers perhaps its best suggestions for comprehensive universities. Boyer proposes a redefinition of scholarship, with greatly broadened boundaries, to acknowledge both the value of many of the professional activities of the faculty and the interfaces between the traditional categories of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Boyer notes that "the time has come to move beyond the tired old teaching versus research" debate and give the familiar and honorable term scholarship a broader, more capacious meaning, one that brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work." He defines four separate, yet overlapping, categories of scholarship: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of

application, and the scholarship of teaching.

The scholarship of discovery refers to conventional research, the discovery of new knowledge, and the origination of creative works. This form of scholarship may include not only the more traditional research activities within discipline specialties, but also research addressing issues associated with the practice of effective teaching and student learning. The scholarship of discovery is alive and well at CSULB; its existence is vital to the success of its graduate programs, and it clearly enhances the undergraduate experience as well. This type of scholarship is disseminated in many ways; scholars may publish the results in journals (peer reviewed or otherwise), patent a discovery, present papers in public forums, write books or monographs, or otherwise communicate the results with others in their field. Creative works, likewise, are presented to the public locally, nationally, and internationally. The work of creative artists (composers, choreographers, painters, sculptors, writers, film makers, designers) and performers (actors, dancers, and musicians) has long been considered equal to that of the traditional researcher at CSULB. The end results, in the forms of concerts, plays, readings, video and film presentations, gallery shows, and design exhibitions, greatly enhance undergraduate and graduate education as well as the public's image of the University. The process often joins the scholarship of discovery with the scholarship of integration.

The scholarship of integration is closely related to discovery. In this case, however, while individual scholars may or may not have participated in the discovery of new knowledge, they have applied a critical analysis to existing knowledge from many scholars, or from more than one field, to advance the discipline or disciplines involved. Those individuals engaged in interdisciplinary studies find themselves also engaged in the scholarship of integration. The scholar who chooses to write a definitive review of an area, or to produce a book that will integrate knowledge in a field, is also engaged in this type of scholarship, as are those who serve as reviewers of books and scholarly papers. Effective teachers must also engage in the scholarship of integration. Faculty are constantly called upon to give meaning to isolated facts, to place them in perspective in a larger context. The act of teaching nonspecialists, in turn, gives the faculty unique opportunities to see where disciplines overlap and to sort out and interpret information in the process of making a subject comprehensible.

The scholarship of application is concerned with the application of theory and the solving of real life problems. A marine biologist may work with a coastal community to mitigate the effects of an oil spill. A specialist in elementary education may collaborate with a local school district to try out a new approach to teaching geography. While examples of this type of scholarship may be found in nearly all disciplines, it is perhaps most commonly practiced by the faculty involved in professional training programs. In many cases, scholarship of this sort can strengthen ties between the University and community as well as address societal needs. In addition, students may participate in this form of scholarship as part of their professional training.

The scholarship of teaching encompasses the work that goes into effective teaching. Faculty members must have both depth and breadth of understanding of the discipline being taught. They must also have excellent communication skills, as well as the ability to perceive students' problems in understanding the material.

Diligent work is required in preparing lectures and class materials. The scholarship of teaching can be applied on the "local," classroom level, but it can also be applied more broadly. Thus, the individual who devises a new curriculum (a process that also clearly involves integrative scholarship) or practices innovative ways of teaching may influence generations of students. Participation in national curriculum discussions can have broader impact still.

It has always been a difficult challenge to evaluate the teaching--learning process. With an acknowledgment that teaching is a scholarly activity, CSULB must be as committed to careful evaluation of teaching and learning as it should be to the evaluation of more traditional forms of scholarly output. This will require the development of new and better strategies for assessment. On a course-by-course basis, relevant evidence might include course materials, student products (such as completed exams and reports), peer classroom observations, a critique of the instructor's efforts in preparing the course, and the review and interpretation of evaluations by students and faculty of themselves and each other. To the extent that it is possible, the most important criterion for evaluating teaching should be the outcome: to what degree did the students learn? One should also consider the individual faculty member's activities as an advisor, mentor, or research sponsor, since these activities also enhance the learning climate. In evaluating the efficacy of a program, one can look more carefully at long-term outcomes: whether the graduating seniors progressed significantly compared to entering students; whether they are employable; whether those seeking advanced degrees are successful; whether alumni are satisfied with the education they received.

Three aspects, as related to CSULB, should be obvious from the descriptions of these four types of scholarship. First, much of what the faculty at CSULB do with their time (at least the productive parts) is encompassed in this broadened definition of scholarship. Second, even with four areas of scholarship, it is still apparent that some activities are associated with more than one category. Finally, it should be clear that the distribution of scholarly activities that, for example, would fit the career goals of an assistant professor of physics, might be very different from those that would characterize the professional activities of a full professor of literature. In the next section, ways are addressed to make use of a broadened concept of scholarship, while recognizing the special talents of the faculty and acknowledging the ways in which faculty interests and skills change over a career.

Expectations Across a Faculty Career

The model proposed here, based on an integration of varied forms of scholarship, student learning, and citizenship in the university and the community, must also reflect a pattern of growth and change over a faculty career. The contributions new faculty can best make to their disciplines and students are quite different from the breadth and leadership roles that can be expected of an experienced member of the university. Patterns of growth and change can be acknowledged and valued through the development of a personal career plan for each faculty member. Such a plan would be developed by the individual, in consultation with the Dean and Department Chair, and would be renewed periodically and used as a basis for evaluations. As the plan must vary from individual to individual, and from discipline to discipline, to reflect the variety of

I. Statement of the charge

The Senate-Administration Task Force on Faculty Reward was appointed by Vice-Chancellor Marjorie Caserio and then-Chair of the Academic Senate Douglas Smith early in 1991 to consider a broad set of issues related to the faculty reward system. The original appointment letter, dated February 21, 1991 and signed by Vice-Chancellor Caserio and Chair Smith, stated the charge as follows:

"At issue is the effectiveness of the review system to evaluate and reward excellence in teaching and service. A call to examine the criteria used in peer review of academic personnel is a key recommendation of the 1990 All-University Faculty Conference on Graduate Student and Faculty Affirmative Action. The following statements from the conference report are self-explanatory:

The faculty should foster and encourage affirmative action efforts at all levels and should acknowledge and reward effective participation in such efforts through the personnel process.

Evaluation standards and procedures should be implemented such that the totality of a faculty member's contribution is considered and counted. Therefore, the Academic Senate should join with the Administration in charging a joint task force to evaluate the incentive and reward structure to ensure that faculty efforts to realize campus affirmative action goals are encouraged and given full recognition.

How effectively we reward faculty service in affirmative action is but one of the issues that the Task Force should address. More generally, the question is whether the criteria for advancement and their interpretation adequately recognize and reward faculty who engage in substantive public and university service.

Another issue is the evaluation of and reward for excellence in teaching. This is not a new issue, but criticism (nationwide) of the quality and amount of instruction at research universities has greatly intensified, and the view is widely held that faculty advancement is driven by research accomplishments only. The Task Force should address whether or not the campus peer review system appropriately values and rewards excellence in teaching. Is the current emphasis given to research, teaching and service in balance or should it be reexamined?

A Universitywide task force has recently been appointed by President Gardner to address the issues of faculty incentives and reward. Professor Karl Pister from the Berkeley campus is the Chair, and Professor Harold Simon is the San Diego representative on the task force. It will be advantageous for the subject Task Force to work in parallel with its Universitywide counterpart as it will place UCSD in a strong position should we be asked to respond to a Universitywide

report. The campus should proceed independently, however, and we ask that the Task Force provide us with a report by the end of the 1990-91 academic year."

The Task Force requested a more focused summary statement of the charge. The following summary statement was provided on March 13, 1991:

"Advise whether current practice in the interpretation of the peer-review criteria for advancement in the professorial series creates a reward structure that is consistent with UC's mission in teaching, research and service. More specific requests follow.

Advise whether or not the campus peer review system appropriately values and rewards excellence in teaching. Is the current emphasis given to research, teaching and service in balance, or should it be re-examined?

Advise on whether the *interpretation* of the criteria for advancement adequately recognizes and rewards faculty who engage in substantive public and university service.

In particular, should faculty be encouraged and rewarded through peer-review advancement for substantive work in affirmative action and/or outreach activity in K-12 education? Or should recognition for service and exceptional educational activities be rewarded outside of the peer review process?

Please comment on whether the focus of the peer review process places undue emphasis on the quantity of research publications rather than quality. Should changes be made in the way in which research achievements are reported (e.g. by placing a limit on number of publications reported)?

Other points of importance will undoubtedly surface in your discussions and should be included in the Task Force report, as you see appropriate."

for activities they are expected to do may well feel that the institution gives them responsibility without appropriate recompense. They - and others outside the university - may question the commitment to teaching (and service) of an institution that fails to attach meaningful reward to excellence in such endeavors.

A limited interpretation of meritorious contributions discourages some individuals from performing to the best of their abilities and interests, and undercuts faculty morale. The predilection for individuals with a strong inclination toward original and independent research should continue to be satisfied through our criteria for hiring and tenuring. Research motivation should continue to be reinforced by a reward system that recognizes and prizes research achievements, but it is ultimately counterproductive to deny rewards for achievements in a broader range of scholarly, educational, and service activities. The reward system as it is now implemented is based on the notion that research or creative scholarship should continue at an even pace (at least) throughout our careers. The Task Force is of the opinion that withholding rewards from already tenured individuals by the application of this narrow view of meritorious performance discourages excellence in teaching and service without significantly stimulating an improvement in research performance. The proposed modifications make it possible to accommodate a changing range of activities throughout the career of an individual, as well as the natural variations in rhythm that may occur over time.

The Task Force notes that the criteria for advancement stated in the PPM and APM leave broad room for interpretation of the degree to which different activities should be recognized and rewarded, and that the proposed changes are consistent with the stated criteria.

2. Develop evaluation criteria:

To do proper justice to teaching and service contributions within the reward system, it is necessary to develop evaluation criteria and documentation methods to supplement those now in use. These criteria will most likely have to be, at least to some extent, discipline-specific.

Insofar as categorization of faculty activities is necessary, the Task Force prefers to use the (overlapping) categories of scholarship, transmission of knowledge, and service. In this section the discussion concerns the way in which the reward system might deal with accomplishments in the areas of transmission of knowledge and service. We discuss subsequently the views of the Task Force concerning the proper rewards for scholarship in the narrow sense of research as well as a broadened sense which includes other scholarly activities.

The transmission of knowledge embraces a broad range of activities such as various forms of classroom and laboratory instruction, the direction of or participation in graduate student dissertation work, reading groups, and clinical apprenticeships in the Medical School. It includes studio teaching, seminar and symposium presentations, tutorials, and independent study

endeavors. *In the opinion of the Task Force, these "contact teaching" activities closely follow research or creative scholarship in importance.* The transmission of knowledge also includes the organization of certain professional events such as conferences, exhibits, and theater presentations. It encompasses the writing of textbooks or of software. We mean these examples to suggest that there is no clear distinction between the transmission of knowledge and scholarship in the broad sense, or between the transmission of knowledge and service. Indeed, some forms of service have as their principal purpose the transmission of knowledge, as do some forms of scholarship.

Service contributions should be assessed seriously and individually for quality. They might include activities of academic or campus leadership such as presiding over a national organization, serving as editor of a premier journal, as chair of certain Senate committees such as CAP and CEP or of the Academic Senate, as chair of a department or of the faculty of the School of Medicine, as chair of certain search committees and review committees, and various public service contributions including participation in certain affirmative action and outreach activities. They might include reviews of journal papers, books, and grant proposals when these can be shown to be major scholarly tasks. A number of these activities also have a strong "transmission of knowledge" component. Other types of service such as membership on campus committees, ad hoc committees, and departmental committees are expected of the faculty. Consistent refusal or failure to participate in such activities should be weighed in the proposed advancement.

The evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of an individual's contributions in the transmission of knowledge and in service activities is admittedly difficult, but not as difficult as some faculty seem to believe. A great deal of experience has been gathered on the subject - especially on teaching evaluations - in institutions where research is not the principal activity and where other activities entirely determine the reward level. A variety of these evaluation methods are presented and discussed in the report of the Universitywide Task Force on Teaching Evaluation (1980), a report that should be reexamined and reconsidered. Many of the methods discussed in that report as well as some others are in fact implemented with varying degrees of success in many other institutions.

Other methods should be incorporated to evaluate teaching and to reduce our reliance on student end-of-course evaluations such as our CAPEs or departmental equivalents. In so far as we continue to appeal to CAPE, an effort should be made by the Senate to work with that organization to improve the questionnaires. Other information that might prove useful in evaluating classroom teaching effectiveness includes an analysis of course materials such as the syllabus; reading lists; an exam that earned a B grade together with a grade distribution for the class; classroom visits by colleagues; the assessment of student preparation for subsequent courses by colleagues who teach these courses; and evaluations by Teaching Assistants who have assisted a faculty member in a course. A description of the course and its goals would be useful and may include a self-evaluation statement on the achievement of these goals. The input of colleagues in team-teaching situations would also be valuable. Information gathered from graduating seniors and alumni would provide yet other input. Evaluation of other forms of teaching might be presented as appropriate via input from individual students or student committees at the

graduate level (as done currently at SIO and at the Medical School), PhD graduates, and post-doctoral students. Input from peers who have attended presentations would be informative. The particular method(s) of evaluation selected for traditional teaching scenarios must be suitable to each situation and must recognize the differences among lower-division and upper-division instruction, large and small classes, required and elective courses, laboratory courses and lecture classes, tutorials and independent study, clinical apprenticeships, graduate classes and seminars, individual graduate student supervision, field work, studio work, and seminar presentations. Each of these should be evaluated by methods best suited to that mode of communication. Departments should develop appropriate evaluation procedures which may differ not only from one department to another but from one individual to another depending on the particular forms of teaching.

A comprehensive assessment of other forms of dissemination of knowledge and of service contributions can also be attempted, though not all contributions in these areas can be documented in the same way. First, each file might contain a description and perhaps a self-evaluation of such contributions. This is perhaps the principal component to clarify the quantity and nature of the activities that have been performed. Insofar as such contributions are to be used to support a promotion beyond their usual listing, they must be further documented. Supporting material might include peer evaluation by others who shared in that service activity, reports that resulted from that service, and statements from beneficiaries of the service, be they individuals or institutions. For example, the quality and quantity of service as Chair or as a member of a major campus committee can be documented by a description of the nature of the position, the amount of time that it involves, and statements of other members of the committee as to the contributions of the individual. The quality of service as department chair can be documented through chair reviews if available, and through the input of department members, perhaps department staff, and other members of campus committees on which the chair serves by virtue of being chair. Service that contributes significantly to the achievement of the University's affirmative action, equity, diversity, and outreach goals can be documented with input of statistical information and statements from beneficiaries, administrative staff and other faculty who interact with the candidate in this capacity. Editorship of a journal or organization of a conference or symposium can be documented in a number of ways that include commentaries of some who publish in that journal or attend the conference. Textbooks can be evaluated by individuals who have used the book as instructors or as students. Clearly, the specific procedures of evaluation and documentation depend on the nature of the activity.

The Task Force does not mean to imply that all files must contain elaborate documentation of all faculty activities. Files that currently satisfy merit reviews by providing evidence of substantial research accomplishments, satisfactory teaching, and adequate service should be submitted as they now are, perhaps supplemented by faculty self-description of teaching and service activities. The variety of options suggested here is designed to provide an opportunity for individuals to present a case for a merit increase or even an acceleration primarily on the basis of the quality and quantity of contributions other than research. In that case, these contributions must be well documented and evaluated. These avenues will only be significant if reviewers agree to