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INTRODUCTION

“The normal expectation is a 3/3 course load or its equivalent for faculty demonstrating an active program of scholarship”

(Faculty Roles and Rewards Final Report, December 7, 1998, p 7.)
Provost’s Charge
Academic Affairs Task Force on Faculty Workload
2-11-2010

Context

The existing faculty workload policy has been in place for some time and is published annually in the Faculty Guide to Academic Practices and Policies at Brockport. The policy was last examined by the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee and the current policy reflects the recommendations made in their final report. The intention of the policy is to ensure that there is a fair and equitable distribution of effort and to encourage an ongoing program of scholarship throughout the career span of our faculty.

Over time, the policy has been applied inconsistently across departments. While there may be many reasons for this, at least one reason is that the policy does not provide guidance with respect to implementation.

At this time, the College also faces unprecedented financial challenges and we must ensure that our human resources are fully deployed in advancing the mission of the College. At the same time, it is important to appreciate differences across our disciplines and to value the collective contributions of all faculty.

Charge for the Academic Affairs Task Force on Faculty Workload

The Task Force on Faculty Workload is charged with developing guidelines that will allow for consistent application of the existing policy. The guiding principle for these guidelines should focus on the policy’s intent – a fair and equitable distribution of effort. An overarching principle should be a shared understanding of how best to value everyone’s 100% effort, being particularly mindful of disciplinary differences and stage in one’s career.

While the Task Force is not being asked to revise the policy, recommendations for minor adjustments that would make it easier to implement the policy are welcome. Finally, the Task Force may wish to revisit the final report of the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee for background.

The Task Force should make every effort to keep the College community informed about its progress and engaged in the process as it carries out the charge. Avenues for broad input should be sought. The recommendations must be submitted to the Provost by April 30, 2010. The goal is to begin to systematically and consistently implement the existing policy during the 2010-2011 academic year.

Task Force Membership
Chair – Betsy Balzano
Staff Support – Cindy Krautwurst
Task Force Members – James Zollweg, Charles Edwards, Mark Chadsey, Phyllis Kloda, Lauren Lieberman, Kathleen Peterson-Sweeney, Greg Garvey, Stuart Tsubota
Our Research

Over the past ten weeks, the Task Force on Faculty Workload has:

- developed website
- reviewed workload policies and Faculty Roles and Rewards Final Report
- met with all Deans (Appelle, Prioleau, Short, and Scheidt) and interim Dean (Fox) who were asked to describe both practice and position on the application of the existing workload policy
- met with Christopher Price, Director of CELT, to discuss faculty development in reference to scholarship
- sought feedback from all full-time faculty, tenure track and tenured, through a three question survey
- surveyed all department Chairs relative to the number of full-time, tenured faculty not at rank for scholarship
- reviewed Department Chairperson Handbook, 2009-2010 – there is much language already in the Chair’s Handbook that mirrors the goals/results of our committee work.
- reviewed Faculty Guide to Academic Policies and Practices at Brockport, 2009-2010
Summary of Meetings with Deans and Director of CELT

The Task Force met with all the Deans and Chris Price. The Deans shared their practices and ideas about the implementation of the current workload policy.

A summary of Deans’ comments:

- Expectations for scholarship are appropriate. Scholarship is an expectation of faculty as part of the three expectations of teaching, scholarship, and service.
- The normal (workload) expectations is a 3/3 course load or its equivalent for faculty demonstrating an active program of scholarship.
- An active program of scholarship was defined as an activity that leads to peer reviewed product. Need to take into consideration the discipline which introduces characteristics unique to the discipline.
- Best place to review faculty member’s performance is annual report.
- Any guidelines for implementing current policy should not take away from discretion of the Dean’s review.
- Current policy is clear and evaluation of faculty is primary responsibility of department Chair in consultation with the Dean.
- Assignment of 3/4 or 4/4 is responsibility of the Dean in consultation with the chair.
- Department Chair needs to give feedback to faculty.

Christopher Price, Director of CELT, met with the Task Force. He reinforced the role of CELT as primarily focused on faculty/staff development in areas related to learning and teaching.

How can CELT help us to support scholarship and research?

- CELT is best at bringing together faculty from different disciplines, whereas scholarship tends to remain within the discipline.
- CELT supports funding for conference attendance and literature that are related to teaching and learning. CELT could provide some type of funding for scholarship related to teaching and learning.
- CELT has sponsored two faculty learning communities (FLCs). FLC is good for people who need reinvigorating. The social sciences along with computer science worked on a project together and there was also a FLC on qualitative research issues.
- A survey found that faculty would like to have CELT sponsor a program to somehow match up interests for faculty collaboration. This information might be pulled directly from faculty annual reports. Chris will look into ways to link up with other campuses.
- Better training for grad students (training them to be teaching assistants) might free up faculty for research/scholarship.
- Grad student placement might be reviewed.
Qualitative overview of written responses to Faculty Workload Survey:

Summary:
The Workload Taskforce solicited input from full time faculty regarding: (1) incentives to invigorate scholarship; (2) procedures for implementing current workload policy; and (3) “fair” workload for faculty who do not have clear program of scholarship. Sixty-one faculty responded with responses ranging from 10 to 300+ words. These responses addressed a range of issues within and beyond the three items above.

Responses identified a number of areas that negatively affected workload and scholarship or conversely, could facilitate scholarship. Relevant themes include:

1. A consensus that the current policy is appropriate;
2. A general consensus that criteria for defining an active program of scholarship should reside in the department, although some advocated for cross-school standards as well.
3. Concern that heavy service obligations and/or inadequate time impinge on scholarship;
4. Concern that reward system may not be implemented evenly across programs;
5. Concern that some faculty do not carry their weight or “do a full day’s work for a full day’s pay.”
6. Concerns over equity of effort may affect morale.
7. Suggestions for facilitating, and where necessary, reinvigorating scholarship. These include (1) providing more funds for conference travel regardless of whether one is presenting a paper or performance; (2) expanding CELT’s functions to include support for scholarship; (3) facilitating mechanisms for faculty to collaborate on scholarship; (4) facilitating writing groups where faculty with similar interests can support each other’s writing.

Background:

Although the charge to the Task Force on Workload was to focus on implementation of the college workload policy, we thought it appropriate to elicit faculty perceptions of the relationship between scholarship and teaching loads as they relate to equity, expectations, and assistance that might help tenured faculty “jump start” scholarship.

To this end, we solicited input from faculty via the Academic Affairs Workload Task Force web page (http://www.brockport.edu/acadaff/workload/):

“We invite full-time faculty to leave comments via our online form) on the following questions. We are limiting logins to the NetID, but all responses are anonymous.

1. If your scholarship/research needs invigorating, what types of incentives would help you get on track?
2. What issues do you think the Task Force on Faculty Workload should consider in designing procedures to implement the current policy on workload?
3. What is “fair” workload for faculty who have no clear program of scholarship?”

Sixty-one (61) faculty responded to the solicitation. Although this is a small sample of Brockport faculty, the responses were for the most part reflective, relevant and constructive; and some addressed these issues in depth (200-300+ words). The result was a 14000+ word transcript.

As might be expected with an open-ended questionnaire, the responses went beyond the specifics of each question, which affected how we analyzed the results.

And, given the size of the sample, a few caveats are in order:

1. We do not know how representative the 61 respondents are in relation to the total full time faculty at Brockport.
2. Nor do we know the relative motivations of the faculty who responded to the survey and those who did not.

However, the issues raised in the responses, and the recommendations made by the respondents, are telling in their own light. The entire transcript is appended to the end of this report.

Methodology:

Because of the volume of the transcript (14,000+ words) and the complexity of the responses (answers to single questions often addressed multiple issues) it was difficult to tease relevant issues and concerns out of the responses on a question-by-question basis.

To resolve this, the text of the collected responses was first analyzed using the AnalyzeText 1.1 concordance software package (www.wuffwuffware.com). AnalyzeText (1) imports and analyzes a text document, generates a list of every word in the document, and provides the frequency and location of each word in the document. The resulting list (or concordance) can be sorted alphabetically or by the frequency with which the word appears.

Selecting word from the concordance (E.g. “DSI #22”) reveals each of the 22 occurrences of the word “DSI.” In a separate panel, it displays “DSI” in its original context as it appears in the text. This allows one to isolate specific terms and themes in the contexts of the original narratives. AnalyzeText also has a search function that can search for all occurrences of a specific word or phrase (E.g. “service creep”) and provide its locations and original contexts.

So AnalyzeText provides a simple way (1) to estimate which topics received the most attention, and (2) to isolate the contexts for these topics.

It should be noted, however, that there is inevitable redundancy, as respondents may use a particular term more than once, or may use different terms to refer to the same topic. So, individual responses that devote extensive space to one topic may inflate the results for specific terms. So, for the results to be meaningful, one must still review the individual responses in their larger, original contexts.
Application to the faculty responses:

AnalyzeText generated a concordance (word list) from the faculty response survey. The investigator then referred to this concordance to identify terms that might inform specific issues raised in the three questions, above, as well as other items that were not explicit in the questions but relevant to the Taskforce. These terms were then grouped into larger categories (E.g. The category “Scholarship” incorporated the words scholarship, writing, publication, etc.).

The table below was abstracted from the concordance and identifies broad topics that reflect areas of concern among the respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP/PUBLISHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>TEACHING (incl. courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>SERVICE/ADVISEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>WORKLOAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>POLICIES/FAIRNESS/CLARITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>SUPPORT/RESOURCES: (travel, statistical help, workshops, mentoring, support groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>DEPARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>TIME TO DO WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>DSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PRODUCTIVITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = the number of times a word related to a specific category appears in the combined faculty responses. For example, words relating to “SERVICE/ADVISEMENT”—service, advisees, committee(s), etc.—appeared 138 times.

Note: This is not the actual concordance, which contains several hundred words. This table is derived from the larger concordance and identifies those categories relevant to this report.

Given the nature of the survey, it is not surprising that terms relating to SCHOLARSHIP/PUBLISHING (n=303) and TEACHING (n=269) received a lot of attention. However, SERVICE/ADVISEMENT (n=138) was also near the top, and, as we will see below, service was a major area of concern. TIME TO DO WORK (n=48), often bundled with responses relating to SCHOLARSHIP and SERVICE/ADVISEMENT, was another concern that will also be addressed below.
Review of the faculty responses:  
AnalyzeText provides a window into the language of the respondents and to specific concerns, issues and themes. Its primary value, however, is in identifying and locating related themes within the original text. So, using the concordance as a guide, the investigator was able to review the individual responses systematically and thematically.

Results:  
Responses fell into several broad categories reflecting: (1) understanding and implementation of current policy, and (2) issues of equity, time, resources and institutional support affecting scholarship. Specific recommendations offered by the respondents for facilitating faculty scholarship are embedded in each category.

The issues and recommendations raised by the respondents can be placed in discrete categories and subcategories. For this reason, and for efficiency, the results are presented in outline format.

(1) Understanding and implementation of current policy:  
   a. A majority of respondents who addressed the current policy were aware of that policy: the normal teaching load is 3/3 for faculty engaged in an active program of scholarship. Only two respondents described the current policy as 4/4 with a reduction for scholarship.
      i. Overall, respondents considered the current policy to be appropriate.
      ii. About 15% of respondents expressed concern for how criteria were developed for defining and evaluating an active program of scholarship.
         1. Of those who expressed an opinion, a majority argued for keeping it at the departmental level; and that criteria be clear and/or explicit.
         2. However, some were concerned with equity across programs and schools--that some departments may maintain different standards regarding scholarship.
      iii. A majority of respondents considered scholarship an important or essential faculty role.
      iv. Some, however, expressed that scholarship was defined too narrowly and that other activities outside of traditional peer-review publication or performance should be included.
      v. Tellingly, 58 of the 61 of the respondents who answered Question 1 “If your scholarship/research needs invigorating, what types of incentives would help you get on track?” identified constraints that affected their ability to maintain “an active program of scholarship” or “scholarship at rank.” These constraints include:
         1. Heavy service obligations (“service creep”)
         2. Heavy teaching obligations that accompany large section General Education Courses or other courses with heavy writing requirements.
3. Time and energy-consuming programmatic obligations associated with program certification, academic advisement in large programs, program review, etc.
4. A discord between the published and actual weightings given to teaching, scholarship and service: That is, for some, time/energy actually devoted to service exceeds the weightings provided in the APT documents.
5. Lack of support in critical areas such as conference travel, technical expertise (statistics, etc.) that hinder scholarship.
6. Desire for a mechanism to encourage collaboration among faculty to provide mutual feedback on writing, research etc.

vi. Faculty differed over the time frame for assessing an active program of scholarship. The majority of those who addressed a time frame argued for a several-year review period that takes into account other faculty obligations.

vii. Respondents were divided over how “punitive” the mechanisms for addressing faculty who do not meet rank in scholarship should be: Variants include:
1. Two respondents described it a simple matter of equity: Faculty should “put in a full day’s work for a full day’s pay.”
2. A majority advocated some form of positive inducements to get faculty back on track.
3. Few addressed the issue of DSI, but those that did made competing arguments:
   a. Faculty who do not have an active program of scholarship are de facto ineligible for a DSI; or
   b. Faculty who do not have an active program of scholarship may compensate in other ways, and may thus qualify for a DSI.

b. Implications:
   i. We cannot assume that this is a random sample of faculty, so we should hold judgment on how faculty across campus understand and interpret the policy.
   ii. Faculty who responded to the survey generally understand the intent and appropriateness of the 3/3 vs. 4/4 policy;
   iii. There is some consensus that the criteria for scholarship and research should be defined at the departmental level, but that equity across programs is important.
   iv. There is a widespread perception that the overall workload for active faculty has increased, especially in the service area
   v. There is some concern that DSI distributions do not necessarily reflect workload.
   vi. Respondents report that their scholarly productivity would be enhanced though more institutional support.
   vii. Workload should take into account the range of faculty obligations
viii. It was not clear how familiar faculty were with their own departments’ APT policies. However, some responses suggested that respondents did not understand the APT document or disagreed with it vis-à-vis scholarly expectations.

(2) Equity, time, resources and institutional support that affect scholarly performance.

a. Equity: Concerns over equity (or fairness) were raised in about one third of the responses, and appear, at least in this sample, to be a source of contention. Respondents addressed several dimensions:
   i. Equity across individuals. These focus primarily on rewards and work load.
      1. Perceptions that faculty without an active program of scholarship may not compensate in other areas (teaching, service) as well. This places an increased burden on those who carry their weight in all three areas.
      2. Concern that some tenured faculty have the ability to perform above rank in scholarship by performing at the minimum level in service, student interaction, advisement, etc.
      3. Perceptions that some tenured faculty do less than full-time work by doing no scholarship and the minimum in the other areas.
   ii. Equity across departments/programs: These focus on work load, rewards and institutional culture, criteria for promotion, etc.:
      1. Perceptions that rewards are not allocated consistently across departments or schools.
      2. Perceptions that the culture of certain disciplines or departments may not foster the same levels of scholarly productivity.
      3. Perceptions that it is easier to get DSIs in some disciplines than in other.
   iii. Equity across institutions: several respondents argued that our scholarly expectations exceed those of comparable-sized institutions and may match those of R-1 institutions, but we lack the research/teaching assistants, budgets, etc. found in R-1’s.

b. Time for scholarship, vis-à-vis other obligations: This was an oft-repeated concern that appeared in a number of contexts: “What I need is more time!” Responses relating to time focus on several concerns:
   i. Perceptions that the work week or semester does not provide enough hours to complete all of the expectations for rank or promotion.
   ii. Concerns that some types of scholarship involve more time to move from inception to publication, placing faculty who do this research at a disadvantage.
   iii. Practical concerns over the time frame used to determine that a faculty maintains or lacks an active program of scholarship.
iv. Related to iii, realistic time frames for remediating a program of scholarship in faculty who are attempting to rejuvenate their program.

v. Dealing with service obligations that cut into time for scholarship.

c. **Resources:** Twenty-three respondents identified money or funding as a concern, including
   i. Personal costs of attending conferences beyond the maximum available from the College.
   ii. Inability to obtain funds to attend conferences where one is not giving a paper.
   iii. Insufficient temp service to pay undergraduate research assistants.

d. **Institutional support:** These relate to structural or personnel support.
   i. Several faculty expressed an interest in expanding CELT (or adding a CELT-like function) to provide support for research. Suggestions include:
      1. Research and writing workgroups where faculty with related interests can read and comment on each others’ projects.
      2. Mentoring systems that link successful scholars with faculty attempting to re-boot their scholarship.
      3. Walk-in statistics help to assist faculty with data analysis, software, etc.
   ii. Another focus was on structural support at the departmental level or higher to provide faculty with the means to reboot scholarship:
      1. Facilitating scholarly collaboration between faculty with common interests.
      2. Policy changes that would allow faculty who are out of the scholarship loop to attend conferences in their discipline to get “back in the loop.”
   iii. Several expressed a need to examine, at the institutional level, the impact of essential service obligations on scholarly performance.

e. **Implications:** We need to be careful before extrapolating these observations to the entire campus community. However it does appear that concerns over equity, time, resources, and institutional support factor into (1) how faculty perceive and balance their roles as teacher-scholar-servants; (2) how the institution can help active faculty maintain an active program of scholarship; and (3) how the institution can help tenured faculty who are amenable to restarting or improving their scholarly agenda. Specific recommendations coming from the survey include:
   i. Examining and addressing the impact of service on scholarship;
   ii. Examining and, if necessary, addressing perceptions of inequity across faculty and programs as these relate to workload.
   iii. Reviewing the types of support provided both for productive scholars, and those who are amenable and able to return to active scholarship.
Conclusions:

(1) Faculty who responded to the request for feedback were generally aware of the workload policy and its intent.

(2) Respondents desire expanded institutional support—structural as well as financial—to help them maintain or reinvigorate their scholarship.

(3) Perceptions of inequities across the campus are a potential morale issue and should be examined.

(4) The College should examine the effect on scholarship of: (1) the distribution of service obligations and (2) the time devoted to service.

(5) Respondents generally support proactive mechanisms to help revitalize the scholarship tenured faculty who may have fallen behind.

(6) Faculty should be made aware of their departments’ APT documents.

(7) The results of this survey, including the analysis and the original transcripts, should be made available to other committees/taskforces as relevant to their charges.
Poll of Department Chairs

An email was sent to all academic department Chairs:

The Task Force on Faculty Workload, charged with recommending the implementation of the existing workload policy in a fair and equitable manner across the campus, requests that the department Chairs respond to the question below. The Task Force is seeking information on the total of full-time, tenured faculty who are not carrying out a scholarly program of activities appropriate to their rank as defined in their department's APT document. The data collected will not be presented by department and will be reported, if reported at all, as an aggregate of full-time, tenured faculty who are not carrying out an active program of scholarship as defined by departmental APT documents. If you have any questions, please contact Betsy Balzano at bbalzano@brockport.edu

The question is: How many people in your department are tenured and not at rank in scholarship and how many of these have an increased teaching load?

Number of Chairs polled = 31  
Number of Chairs responding = 30  
Percent response = 97%

Response:
  Number of tenured faculty not at rank in scholarship = 14  
  Number of these who have an increased teaching load = 0

The total number of full-time tenured faculty is 186.  
The percent of faculty not carrying on an active program of scholarship is 7.3%

The poll of the department Chairs with a response of 97% indicates that less than 10% of the full-time, tenured faculty are not performing at rank in scholarship.
Task Force on Faculty Workload – Recommendations

Principles of premises

• All faculty members should make equitable workload contributions
• Scholarship is a major contributor to success in all areas of faculty activity
• Needs to be accepted as a clear, standardized process that is integral to campus culture
• No one should be surprised by anything. Requirements for scholarship will be clearly delineated in all departments from the time of hire, annual report letters, and feedback from Chairs and Deans throughout one’s career.
• Emphasize proactive over reactive; emphasize constructive procedure to assist faculty to establish an active program of scholarship, i.e. meetings with Chair, scholarship mentors.
• Evaluation of scholarship and service is discipline specific and should remain within Departments – ex:
  o where is the division between scholarship+teaching, scholarship+service
  o prestige/value of various products
  o amount required to be “active”
  o process/standards for evaluating how significant service obligations impact expected workload

Evaluation of Scholarship and Work Plan

• Evaluation of level of scholarship is a vital part of annual review and should be evaluated as defined in the department’s APT document.
• Chairs need to identify lagging scholarship as early as possible.
• Annual reports include detailed work plan for the next year’s scholarly activities.
• Chair should acknowledge work plan as part of that year’s review process.
• Each faculty must provide sufficient background information for the Chair to properly evaluate the scholarship (to help a Chair whose discipline is significantly different from a faculty member’s)
• Each year’s annual report should include a discussion on the success of the previous year’s plan.

Procedure

Three stages to process

• Year 1 - if faculty fails to show active program of scholarship as defined in the department APT document, the Chair will send clear signal in annual review comment
• Year 2 - if still not satisfactory after another year, a meeting with Chair and Dean will occur to create a plan for developing an active program of scholarship
• Year 3 - if still not satisfactory, Chair and Dean will develop a teaching load increase to 4/3 or 4/4
The policy and procedures for Faculty Workload are delineated in The Faculty Roles and Rewards Final Report, Guide to Academic practices and Policies at Brockport, 2009-2010. The Department Chairperson Handbook, 2009-2010 describes the process for implementing the policy.

As the committee gathered data for its report, it was apparent early on that the policy and procedures around faculty workload are in place. The implementation at the chair’s level surfaced as an issue. There are professional and collegial reasons for this occurring.

Any implementation of the policy as outlined in the Chair’s Handbook, by this committee, Faculty Roles and Rewards Report and Academic Practices and Policies needs to:

- start at the chair's level,
- support faculty in renewing a program of scholarship if needed
- clearly follow departmental APT procedures
- be consistently communicated to faculty (both untenured and tenured)
- be supported by the Dean
- be proactive

The committee was struck by the small number of faculty, as reported by Chairs, who are not carrying on an active program of scholarship. Even if this is a deflated number and doubled to 28, it is still 15.1%.

Although the response from the faculty survey was about 22%, the responses are rich as outlined in the analysis.

Faculty who responded:

- want support, financial and institutional, to reinvigorate scholarship
- identified potential inequities across the campus
- raised the issues around service creep
- pointed out that department APT documents need to be consistently shared with faculty (new and tenured)
- DSI was raised by several faculty, impact of increased teaching on DSI as spelled out in the APT documents may need to be revisited
APPENDICIES

Faculty Roles and Rewards Final Report, December 7, 1998
Excerpts from Faculty Guide to Academic Practices and Policies at Brockport, 2009-2010
Excerpts from Department Chairperson Handbook, 2009-2010
Text of Faculty Feedback Responses from ANGEL survey
FACULTY ROLES & REWARDS

FINAL REPORT

INCLUDING AMENDMENTS
AS APPROVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE
DECEMBER 7, 1998
Faculty Roles & Rewards Committee
Final Report

DECEMBER 7, 1998

Assumptions:

1. Our answers to each of the questions in the President’s charge assume that the college faculty will have teaching loads that allow them to teach effectively, maintain scholarly productivity, and meet their service responsibilities. Thus, faculty pursuing an active program of scholarship as defined by individual departments and/or with major or multiple service responsibilities would normally teach no more than a 3/3 course load or its equivalent (see Question 6, paragraph 2).

2. We seek to construct a framework within which each department develops policies and procedures. To construct such a framework we must first come to an understanding as to the nature of our common responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service so that departments and individuals will know whether or not they are contributing below, at, or above expectations.

3. We seek to empower faculty rather than to discipline, punish, or eliminate them.

4. The extraordinary diversity of our programs precludes one model of roles and rewards. We recognize that the proportion of time and energy each faculty member devotes to teaching, scholarship, and service varies from discipline to discipline, individual to individual, and changes over an individual’s career. Still, to promote equity among faculty we must have some common understanding about department and individual productivity standards. The following document represents our efforts at articulating a common framework within which departments will maintain a great deal of autonomy.

Question 1: How should we define teaching and learning, scholarship, and service?

Teaching/learning: Encompasses promoting, guiding, facilitating, and evaluating student learning. Faculty members are catalysts for creating and adapting learning environments in and outside the classroom that stimulate students to learn, to be curious, to be critical thinkers, effective writers and speakers, and creative problem solvers. Effective teaching
and learning are dependent upon faculty utilizing a variety of teaching techniques and designing and revising curriculum to produce student learning outcomes. Included within teaching/learning are the professional development processes of attending workshops and conferences and efforts necessary to maintain mastery of subject matter and teaching methodologies. Also included are the teaching-related activities of independent study and thesis supervision, field supervision, mentoring of students, and student involvement in research.

**Scholarship/Creativity:** Encompasses producing an identifiable product subject to systematic internal and external evaluation by professional peers and resulting from:

1. The creation of new knowledge or artistic expression within the discipline (Discovery). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: original research as reported in articles, books, and presentation of papers; performances; grant proposals; inventions and patents; software development.

2. The synthesizing of existing knowledge or creative work within one or more disciplines into new patterns and/or for new audiences (Integration). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: publication of interpretive studies or criticism; critical reviews or editing of scholarly work; development of public policies or of interdisciplinary programs.

3. The utilization of discipline-based knowledge to solve problems (Application). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: development and implementation of innovative clinical practice or public school programs; environmental impact analyses; consultant work in the public or private sector based on the faculty member's discipline-based knowledge and expertise.

**Service:** Encompasses governance of the department, the school, the college, the university, or the profession, as well as discipline-based or college mission oriented contributions to the community that are not included in Scholarship. Examples of governance include but are not limited to:

*Department* - department meetings and committees, advisement, registration, Saturday Information Sessions, and peer review.
School - grade appeals, Deans' committees.

College - Faculty Senate, college-wide committees, college-wide student organizations.

University - University Faculty Senate, SUNY Ad Hoc Committees.

Profession - leadership and other service in discipline-based organizations at local, state, national, or international levels.

Community - work related to faculty member's area of professional expertise or to the mission of the college.

These three areas will be referred to hereafter as teaching, scholarship and service. It is understood, however, that teaching is teaching/learning and that scholarship is scholarship/creativity.

Question 2: Should teaching and learning be regarded as the most important responsibility of SUNY Brockport's teaching faculty? And what is the place of scholarship and service?

Yes, teaching is our most important function. In our role as college professors we strive to create high quality learning opportunities for our students. Excellence in teaching is our first and foremost responsibility. This excellence is demonstrated, among other ways, by the quality of instruction and student learning outcomes.

Sustained scholarship is essential to quality teaching. It adds to the body of knowledge within the discipline, keeps us current in our fields, exemplifies for our students the intellectual skills we want them to learn, and provides them with opportunities to participate in intellectual discovery as they prepare for the world of work and advanced studies.

Service within the department, the college, the university, the community, and the profession supports the advancement of learning and the enrichment of campus culture.

Through teaching, scholarship, and service, the faculty shape and achieve the goals of the college.
Question 3: What expectations should we have of teaching faculty (with reference to reappointment, tenure, and promotion) in the areas of teaching and learning, scholarship, and service?

**Teaching:** Faculty must demonstrate continued successful teaching which includes consideration of student learning outcomes to support recommendation for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion. Departments should define the expected levels of achievement appropriate to each rank.

**Scholarship:** Faculty must demonstrate continued successful scholarship to support recommendations for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion. Departments should define the expected levels of achievement within the three modes of scholarship.

**Service:** Faculty must demonstrate continued successful service to support recommendations for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion. Service may be in one or more of the following areas: the department, the school, the college, the community or the profession. Departments should define the expected levels of achievement appropriate for each rank.

Question 4. How should faculty performance in these areas be assessed? Who should be involved in assessment of performance?

**Annual Review**

The Chair of a department is responsible for evaluating individual faculty members as part of the formal annual review and more frequently if circumstances require it.

**Term Renewal, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion**

Thorough evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service shall take place when making personnel decisions of term renewal, continuing appointment, and promotion.

Chairs and APT committees should work with their departments to develop formal procedures for evaluation of all aspects of each faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The extraordinary diversity of our programs precludes agreement on any single model, but within broad limits we recommend the following:
Teaching: In order to give teaching the stature it should have, its evaluation for term appointment, continuing appointment and promotion must be rigorous. It must involve some form of student evaluation, peer review of a teaching portfolio and may include peer observation of classroom performances. The teaching portfolio may include the following: teaching philosophy; student learning outcomes; grading practices; assignments, requirements, and assessment methods; advisement, mentoring, independent study projects, and supervision of theses; accomplishments of present and past students when directly related to the educator’s influence; quality and effectiveness of pedagogical strategies; development and use of instructional technology; innovation for the purpose of improved learning productivity; and evidence that the course content is current.

Scholarship: Each department should develop a system for evaluating the scholarship of its faculty members consistent with the principles outlined in this document.

Scholarship should be evaluated according to these six criteria*, as described by Ernest Boyer in Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., Maeroff, G. I. (1997). Scholarship Assessed. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 22-36:

1. clarity of goals
2. adequacy of preparation
3. appropriateness of methods
4. significance of results
5. effectiveness of presentation
6. reflective critique where appropriate

*(See appendix A for a brief description of the criteria. Entire text is on reserve in the Library).

Application of these six criteria will ensure uniform evaluation of scholarship across disciplines.

Service: Faculty members should play a service role commensurate with their rank and the changing needs of their various constituencies. Faculty will prepare a statement of all relevant service activities with a brief description of the individual’s responsibilities, participation, and any product developed. Where service is community-based, such activity should have a direct relationship to the faculty member’s disciplinary expertise or to the central mission of the college.

In those instances where service ranks as a major responsibility and is a key component in the evaluation and
assessment of the individual faculty member's rewards, departments should develop a set of criteria for evaluating that service which is equally as rigorous as that used in evaluating teaching and scholarship.

Question 5: What system of post-tenure review would be appropriate?

Faculty development and enrichment is an important process in any educational institution. Therefore, this committee strongly supports strengthening the current system of annual faculty review, with the goal of throughout a faculty member's career.

By policy and practice, Chairs are responsible for the annual review of all faculty members, including those with continuing and term appointments. Thus, the Academic Council should create a training system for Chairs and program directors to help them understand their responsibilities regarding faculty review, the proper procedures for meeting those responsibilities, and the types of institutional support available. Also, Deans and Chairs shall ensure that each faculty member has a clear sense of his or her responsibilities, expected standards, and methods of REVIEW, in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, under policies established by each department.

The annual review should include a thorough evaluation of the faculty member's activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and may involve a meeting between the Chair and the faculty member. At this time, the Chair should take the opportunity to point out to faculty members areas of strength, as well as any areas for possible improvement. If areas for improvement are identified, a written action plan should be developed. This action plan may include referral to an employee assistance program (EAP), if appropriate, or formulation of a professional development plan, with specific goals, expected outcomes, time frame, and monitoring of activities. The faculty member would have the option of working in consultation with the departmental Chair, both the Chair and the departmental APT committee, or the Dean, to formulate this development plan. Institutional support for implementation of the plan may be provided, when appropriate. If, after implementation of the development plan and sufficient time for remediation, improvement

1 The proposals contained in the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee's response to Question 5 are covered by Article XII of the Policies of the Board of Trustees of SUNY, Articles 19 and 49 of the current UUP agreement with SUNY, and Chapter 122 of the SUNY Brockport Faculty Handbook.
does not occur, the faculty member would become subject to appropriate actions, under procedures outlined in the Policies of the Board of Trustees of SUNY, and the current UUP agreement with SUNY.

Question 6: When actual assignments of work responsibilities are made, what framework (one which must be consistent with resource constraints) would be most appropriate?

The Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards is cognizant of the emerging educational practice of measuring work load in terms of learning outcomes rather than teaching inputs, and understands that this academic community is currently exploring the potential for increased learning productivity inherent in such a shift. Until that examination is complete, however, we recommend the following policy:

The normal expectation is a 3/3 course load or its equivalent for faculty demonstrating an active program of scholarship as defined by individual departments and/or with major or multiple service responsibilities. The Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee recognizes that variability among disciplines and teaching styles, as well as historic patterns, may lead individuals and departments to deviate from this norm. Nonetheless, we see it as the norm around which particular variation will occur.

Chairs should make individual work assignments within the department in accordance with procedures and principles adopted by the department and in such a way as to ensure that:

1. Each department meets the curricular and educational needs of its own students as well as those of other students who depend upon it as agreed upon by the Department, the Dean, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

2. Each faculty member has sufficient time:
   a. to teach well and to promote student learning
   b. to complete scholarly undertakings
   c. to meet service obligations

In addition,

1. Chairs should expect those faculty who do not demonstrate an active program of scholarship to contribute more in the areas of teaching and/or service.
2. The blend of teaching, scholarship and service may change from year to year and over a lifetime career as long as departmental responsibilities are met on an annual basis.

3. Any release time beyond the normal 3/3 course load shall be reported to the VPAA and publicized annually.

4. An important consideration in granting faculty release time should be to ensure that the total departmental effort is not compromised and that other faculty within the department are not required to take on an unfair load. Accomplishing these goals may require that the Administration provide the department with sufficient resources for support staff and replacement faculty depending upon the nature of the release.

Question 7: How should reappointment, tenure, and promotion procedures be structured so as to dovetail with the institutional stance on faculty roles?

We should re-structure reappointment, tenure, and promotion procedures to dovetail with these proposals in the following ways:

Departments/Programs

1. Each department must develop, publish** (see page 10), and obtain School-level approval for its policies and procedures to distribute the work-load and to evaluate personnel.

2. These policies and procedures must be consistent with the principles articulated in this document, as well as with the needs of the School and the College as defined in the strategic plan.

3. These policies and procedures should include at least the following:

   a. An explicit means for evaluating teaching that is rigorous and includes both peer review of a teaching portfolio and student evaluation of all faculty members.

   b. An explicit identification of the kinds of scholarship most appropriate to the discipline and the levels [quantity and quality] appropriate for each rank.

   c. An explicit system of weighting the relative importance of teaching, scholarship, and service for
the evaluation of individual faculty members. All systems developed must conform to the following formula: **Teaching > Scholarship > Service** where Teaching ≥ 50% in assessing and evaluating faculty performance.

d. Departments that give considerable recognition to Service must devise an explicit method of evaluation that is as systematic and rigorous as methods used to evaluate Teaching and Scholarship.

e. An explicit definition of total department teaching load consistent with the needs of their majors, students in other programs who depend upon that department, and the General Education program.

Schools

Each School must:

1. Develop and publish** its procedure for reviewing and validating departmental policies and procedures.

2. Develop and publish** the specific departmental policies and procedures that have been validated.

3. Develop and publish** specific policies and procedures for the annual evaluation of Chairs.

College

The President or the President's designee must:

1. Review and validate each School's proposed procedures for reviewing and approving departmental policies and procedures.

2. Review and validate the actual departmental policies and procedures that each School has approved.

3. Publish** the School policies and procedures it has validated.

4. Allocate the resources and devise the policies and procedures necessary for training Department Chairs in developing personnel policies and procedures according to the guidelines of the Board of Trustees, the College, the UUP Contract, and these proposals.
5. Bring its current "Guidelines for Faculty Renewal, Tenure, Promotion, and Performance at Rank" into line with the principles articulated in this document, with the requirements of the strategic plan, and with the School policies and procedures it has approved.

6. Replace the current IAS with a reliable and valid vehicle for measuring student evaluation of individual faculty and establish legitimate procedures for its utilization.

7. Publish** the reassignment of faculty [released time] and provide departments with appropriate replacement resources.

8. Publish** brief summaries of the teaching and scholarly accomplishments of the faculty who have been granted appointment, re-appointment, tenure, and promotion.

**Publish: "To publish" means to make public, i.e., to make available [in printed or electronic form] to members of this academic community.

Question 8: How should other kinds of recognition (both monetary and non-monetary) be structured so as to dovetail with the institutional stance on faculty roles?

Recognition of faculty on either a monetary or non-monetary basis should include faculty accomplishments in the three principal faculty roles: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. The purpose of merit pay and/or non-monetary recognition is to reward those individuals who have made particularly valuable contributions to SUNY Brockport and its mission.

DISCRETIONARY SALARY INCREASES (DSIs)

If and when negotiated by the UUP, monies made available to reward faculty for exceptional performance in one or more of the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service shall be awarded individually or to a group, and shall be added to each recipient's base salary.

1. One-Year Individual DSI

Individuals with exceptional Teaching, Scholarship, or Service, and performance at least at rank in the two other areas, may be nominated for a DSI based on a one-year period of review. The Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards urges the administration to distribute DSI awards among the three areas in accordance with the relative weight assigned to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service [see above, Question 7]. We also
encourage establishing award levels that will ensure DSIs will be greater in number for a smaller amount of money (example: $800-$1,000) rather than fewer in number for a larger amount of money.

Faculty members wishing to be considered for DSI will submit their annual reports and the supplemental documentation for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service to their department APT committee. The APT committee will review the reports and make recommendations to the department Chair. Chairs will add their own recommendations and then meet as a group with their respective Dean and recommend DSI recipients each year. Monetary compensation for Chancellor’s Awards, promotions, and salary inequity adjustments, will not come from the DSI pool. A maximum of twenty (20) percent of the DSI teaching faculty funds will be reserved for distribution by the College President. The remaining teaching faculty funds will be distributed to Schools based upon the number of full-time equivalent faculty, including those on leave, in each School. DSIs for department Chairs will be paid from the discretionary fund held by the President.

2. Multi-Year Individual DSI

Faculty members who have not received a DSI in the previous three consecutive academic years would be eligible to apply at the beginning of the 4th year for a DSI that considers work completed over the previous three-year period. The application process and the criteria would be the same as the current DSI process for the one-year review except that the money will come from the President’s share of the DSI fund, and will not exceed the amount awarded for a one-year Individual DSI.

3. Group DSI

Groups of two or more individuals whose collective achievement in Teaching, Scholarship, or Service is exceptional may be nominated for a Group DSI by the Dean(s) of the School(s) to the College President. Recipients of a Group DSI may be nominated based on collective achievement that spans one to three years. Membership in a group recognized for a Group DSI does not preclude an individual from being awarded a One-Year or Multi-Year Individual DSI based upon exceptional achievement in one or more areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, with performance at least at rank in the other roles. Faculty may not be awarded a DSI as an individual and as a member of a group for the same exceptional achievement. The application process and the criteria would be the same as the current DSI process for Individual Awards except that the money will come from the President’s share of the DSI fund.
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

In addition to existing faculty development incentives, we strongly recommend:

1. University Fellows

In order to foster faculty development and to promote excellence in Teaching, the College should establish at least six University Fellowships, with a minimum of one Fellowship from each School. The Fellowships will carry half-time teaching responsibilities for one academic year. Open to all full-time faculty, these Fellowships would be used primarily for the improvement of individual teaching, significant training, curriculum development, or for experimentation with team-teaching and/or new technology. University Fellows would be required to share the results of their work with the College community.

2. Conference/Seminar Fund

In an effort to assist faculty in keeping current with developments in their field and to encourage their professional growth, the College should establish a permanent fund to pay up to $1,000 of expenses for attendance at conferences/seminars. The grants should be rotated on a yearly basis so that no person receives a second grant from this fund before all other qualified applicants have had the opportunity to do so.

3. Team Teaching

The College should actively promote faculty development in the area of interdisciplinary teaching/learning. One way to encourage this is through interdisciplinary team-taught courses. The College should establish a fund to allow a limited number of faculty each term to receive full credit, in terms of contact hours, for full participation in an interdisciplinary team-taught course. If these courses are to be taught properly, they typically require more than a part-time commitment by participating faculty. For example, a 3-credit course being instructed by two faculty should demand three hours of classtime from each team member each week, plus full participation in grading and lesson preparation.

Faculty wishing to participate in this program would develop an interdisciplinary course proposal and submit it to their appropriate Chair(s) and Dean(s) for approval. The number of proposals that could be supported during a semester would be contingent upon available resources.
4. Document Preparation Fund

Recognizing the important role of the faculty in contributing to the creation of new knowledge through research and writing, the College should create a document preparation fund to provide individual faculty members up to $500 to be used by the faculty exclusively for the purpose of paying support personnel to prepare manuscripts for publication, or to cover the incidental expenses incurred in the publication of manuscripts. Reimbursement to faculty would require submission of a paid billing statement from the support personnel, a copy of the prepared manuscript, and the proposed transmittal letter to a publisher.
Conclusion

The members of the Committee have systematically reviewed the roles and rewards of faculty. This report provides a unifying guideline for assigning and evaluating faculty workload. At the same time, the Committee recognizes the diversity of this campus and has intentionally included parameters which allow for individual as well as departmental variations with respect to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

The Committee urges full implementation of these recommendations while recognizing that any definition of faculty roles and rewards is a dynamic process.

Finally, we want to thank all who helped us in this difficult task. Paul Yu, President of the College, Thomas Bonner, President of the Faculty Senate, Anne Parsons, Past-President of the Faculty Senate, Ed Van Duzer, President of the local UUP, Timothy Flanagan, Vice President for Academic Affairs, the earlier committee on the Redefinition of Scholarship chaired by Jeremiah Donigian on whose work we built, the 90 or so faculty and staff members who took the time to share their thinking with us in writing, the Departments that responded with written criticisms and suggestions, as well as those who attended one or more of our open meetings and shared their ideas with us.

Respectfully submitted,

The Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards
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V. Work Load Policies and Compensation – Pg 25

B. Work Load

*The Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee Final Report* recommends the following policy: “The normal expectation [for full-time faculty] is a 3/3 course load or its equivalent for faculty demonstrating an active program of scholarship as defined by individual departments and/or (emphasis added) with major or multiple service responsibilities”. However, current practice carries the expectation that activity appropriate to rank in all three areas should be the norm (i.e., no “and/or” tradeoff between Service and Scholarship). Furthermore, current practice utilizes a model in which faculty who are not performing to expectation in all three areas receive a compensatory workload adjustment in one of the two remaining areas. Historically, this has almost always happened where scholarly activity has not met expectation, and has resulted in a 4/4 course teaching load instead of the nominal 3/3 (in such cases the faculty member is still expected to perform at rank in Service).

Decisions regarding teaching load adjustments are made by the faculty member’s department chair in consultation with the appropriate school dean. In all cases, such decisions are made in the context of the *Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee Final Report* recommendation that “consideration in granting faculty release time should ensure that total departmental effort is not compromised and that other faculty within the department are not required to take on an unfair load”. In making such decisions, current practice also includes the following considerations.

For reduction from a four course teaching load to a nominal three course load:

- For faculty whose performance record would otherwise justify a four course teaching load, a lecture section enrollment of about 120 students or more (and with no adjunct or graduate student assistants in that lecture section) may be counted as two courses toward the assigned teaching load (i.e., effectively reducing the load from four courses to three). There is no comparable reduction in teaching load for faculty whose performance record normally qualifies them for three courses (i.e., they remain at three courses).

- For faculty whose performance record would otherwise justify a four course teaching load, a total overall enrollment of about 180 students across three lecture sections (and with no adjunct or graduate student assistants in any of these lecture sections) may satisfy the teaching load requirement for that semester (i.e., effectively reducing the load from four courses to three). There is no comparable reduction in teaching load for faculty whose performance record normally qualifies them for three courses (i.e., they remain at three courses).

- For faculty whose performance record would otherwise justify a four course teaching load, significant service responsibilities (those that are tantamount to an
official administrative position) may, in unusual circumstances and with the approval of the Dean, be considered in lieu of a course (i.e., effectively reducing the load from four courses to three). There is no comparable reduction in teaching load for faculty whose performance record normally qualifies them for three courses (i.e., they remain at three courses).

**For reduction below a nominal three course load:**

- For any faculty whose teaching assignments include both (a) an enrollment of at least 120 in one lecture section and (b) a total enrollment of 180 across two lecture sections (with no adjunct or graduate student assistants in those lecture sections), these two sections alone may suffice as the teaching load for that semester.

- Official administrative positions (e.g., department chair, associate dean, ad hoc administrative appointments, etc.) and extramural grants that provide for release time, may result in a teaching load below the nominal 3/3.

- Workload assignments are determined on the basis of a faculty member’s anticipated activities during the coming academic year. They are not rewards for past activity.

**Departmental versus College obligations.** Faculty appointments generally carry with them an understanding of the faculty member’s teaching responsibilities to his/her home department. However, many responsibilities (e.g., APS sections, honors courses, interdisciplinary programs with no assigned faculty lines) transcend specific departments, and represent campus-wide obligations to be shared across existing academic units. Similarly, certain advisement responsibilities (e.g., C-Step, McNair) are also outside any existing department. For this reason, faculty (and their department chairs) must be responsive to these needs as well as those uniquely associated with their own academic programs.
II. ACADEMIC PLANNING – Pg 6

The department chair must lead the department in establishing goals and objectives, and in developing a plan for accomplishing these. This involves both short-term and long-term planning consistent with the College’s mission, the directives of the Dean, the discipline itself, and the abilities of the departmental faculty. The planning process also involves periodic evaluation to ensure implementation and to make certain that its goals and objectives meet the needs of its majors, and other students it serves. In planning for the future, it is especially important that chairs have an understanding of, and take into consideration, the resources that will be needed to carry out these plans. Plans should realistically reflect current resources and/or the prospects for acquiring additional resources.

B. Short-Term Planning

Course schedules. Following consultation with teaching faculty, the chair recommends to the Dean a schedule of courses for the academic year, ensuring a slate of required and elective offerings that meet the needs of the major, service courses, and the General Education Program, and which is distributed uniformly across the day and evening. In developing each semester’s course schedule, the chair should be mindful of programmatic needs, faculty scheduling preferences (where possible), available resources, and the dictates of the department’s course distribution template.

Faculty workload. The chair recommends to the Dean an appropriate workload for each faculty member, taking into consideration the nature and number of assigned courses, the faculty member’s research commitment, and participation in departmental and College-wide governance. It is essential that the chair become familiar with College policy guiding workload assignments, and makes recommendations in accordance with this policy. The policy is described in detail in the Faculty Guide to Teaching and Learning at Brockport.

III. RECORD KEEPING – pg 7

It is the chair’s responsibility to see that the department maintains records pertinent to its daily operations, and is able to provide information to the Dean and other College administrators regarding its operations. At a minimum, each department should produce and maintain records in regard to the following.

A. Faculty teaching load determinations and assignments

Deans are responsible for determining faculty teaching-loads based on performance in teaching, service, and scholarship. Ordinarily, faculty are expected to teach three courses (9 credit hours) each semester, while performing at rank in service and scholarship (for more detail on this expectation see the Faculty Guide to Academic Practices and Policies at Brockport, and the Faculty Roles and Rewards Final Report). Documentation of this performance, and any requests for deviation from this performance pattern, must be presented to the Dean by department chairs. Accordingly, it is important to maintain records documenting each faculty member’s professional activities.
V. PERSONNEL – Pgs 10 & 11
Department chairs are responsible for the recruitment, supervision, evaluation, and development of associate and full-time faculty assigned to their departments. Because part-time faculty may not have as ready access to the routine communications common among their full-time colleagues, chairs should make a special point of ensuring that part-time faculty are kept in the information “loop”, and are familiar with departmental and institutional practices (all part-time faculty should have copies the Faculty Guide to Academic Practices and Policies at Brockport).

B. Supervision
The chair functions as supervisor to all faculty (full-time and associate) and staff assigned to his/her department. In this capacity, it is the chair’s responsibility to ensure that faculty meet contractual obligations in all areas of performance. In regard to the responsibilities associated with the supervisory role of the chair, the chair should ensure that:

- all faculty provide instruction consistent with the department’s established learning objectives, syllabus, and Course Registration Form for the courses that they teach. This is especially important for new appointees. Making certain that new faculty, PT or FT, have a copy of the Course Registration Form for any course they will teach is important.
- faculty workload assignments are consistent with College policy
- work assignments serve the needs of the department’s programs

C. Evaluation
The chair is responsible for ensuring effective evaluation of individual faculty performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. This responsibility includes:

- meaningful feedback on Faculty Annual Reports or elsewhere (Faculty Annual Report Forms can be found on Brockport’s web site), including helpful guidance regarding performance expectations
- counseling as necessary in response to problems (some guidance regarding the counseling process can be found on Brockport’s link to the Office of Human Resources (click on “Training Resources”, then “Chair Retreat Handbook”, then item #8)).
- following procedures and adhering to evaluation criteria as specified in department APT documents and College policy
Text of faculty workload survey

Q. If your scholarship/research needs invigorating, what types of incentives would help you get on track?

Responses

1. n/a

2. I believe that each School, not each department, could set CLEAR goals in terms of scientific publications or artistic contributions, whereby meeting such goals would clearly lead to a benefit for the faculty member (i.e. additional funds for equipment, or funds to hire students to engage in scholar activity, or funds to take students to conferences). This would set the bar to reward faculty who are going beyond what is minimally expected from them in scholar production.

3. Money for data (purchase/collect). It would be nice to have a walk-in statistician who can help with newer/more complex analysis techniques (LISREL, LOGIT/PROBIT, MANOVA, etc.) I would love to hand the data to someone, tell them what I want run, and come back and sit down with them and go through the results. See item two below:

4. Money for travel when I am not presenting so that I can attend conferences to get reinvigorated. I also need time...service is such a huge requirement in my department and at the college level.

5. Money for supplies, more time to perform research

6. What I need is more time! As an Assistant Professor and a new parent, my teaching, service and family obligations make it difficult to reliably schedule scholarship activity into my day at a time when I can be productive. As it stands, I have to force scholarship into my workday, making it an unpleasant activity at times and pushing me to exhaustion.

7. I think it would be helpful to have a mentoring system on campus. Perhaps regular sessions where papers/projects are reviewed and critiqued as they are in process. This could provide valuable feedback to the faculty member plus also keep them on track to produce in a timely fashion. If our expectation is one refereed product per academic year, then regular sessions would mean the faculty member would need to produce for their session.

8. Time! There are many projects that are so involved and require more time than I have available. Often I take the summer (obviously without pay) to complete research projects. I also like sharing and hearing about others’ research.

9. More time to work on it. Service activities combined with teaching don’t leave a lot of time for scholarship.

10. N/A

11. This is my 12th year at Brockport and I am tenured. I have enjoyed a successful career in scholarship as well as teaching. However, I am noting that my service obligations are now at a higher level (leadership) and that is what interferes with my scholarship most. This past academic year has been my least productive...my guess is that I am not the only middle-career (or later) faculty member experiencing this. I’m not sure of the solution, but for me it is a decrease in service responsibilities that will help me get back on track.

12. 1. Student help with administrative tasks (10 hours per week)- ability to ‘hire’/select one student to work with me. 2. Small grants ($500 - $2,000) for costs associated with research projects. 3. Course reduction for writing grants & to work on them

13. Not a problem currently or throughout a multi-decade career at Brockport. My major problem now is that I have two major service responsibilities, both of which have a one course/semester release but for pedagogical reasons in the department I have been able to take only a one course release/semester. I have eight manuscripts in various stages of preparation that need to be submitted to journals, and I have let several requests for proposals go by for which I could have written competitive proposals. But, as review DSI applications (or lack of them) each year, I realize
there are many colleagues with little or no active research, fewer service obligations than I have, and
teaching the same number of hours (often with fewer students) as I do--this long-standing situation
at Brockport is not fair and needs to be fixed. We need to look at a 3-year rolling average of
everyone’s annual reports and make decisions on teaching obligations relative to scholarship and
service at the dean’s level (they are the only one’s who see the picture for a whole school and can
compare notes across the college). Bottom line--simply implement the recommendations of the 1998
Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee, and don’t let service take the place of scholarship so as to let
people stay at 3/3 vs. going to 4/4 or 4/3. Active scholarship requires far more sustained time and
effort than any service activity I have ever been involved in. More service is no substitute for more
scholarship!

14. More money for travel would be helpful. But even more useful would be a one-time course release to
finish my book. (Which needs about 6 months serious attention.)

15. Provide scholarship workshops (in the same way that CELT presents effective teaching programs) to
assist faculty who struggle with research (from identifying topics to preparing for publication)

16. Right now, I see my research progressing well but if I were worried about incentives, I would think
that something like mini-sabbaticals, with a course or two release for one semester would be good-
but have clear guidelines and expectations for making up those courses if faculty take the time off
and don’t do anything with it. Summer pay for research projects would also be invigorating. Air
Conditioning would also be good so faculty are actually willing to come in during the summer! I also
think that making a clearer distinction for DSI purposes would be effective- increase the minimums
required to be eligible for DSI. No recent scholarship- no DSI in any category. But those faculty who
are maintaining an active program of scholarship can get even more DSI money. I also think
increasing the pay for advancement to full professor, which is dependent on a programmatic line of
scholarship, would be invigorating. Right now I think it’s only a $3000 jump and so there’s no real
difference in terms of pay whether you get promoted to full or not. But, I’d also make the
expectations for promotion to full professor more realistic. Right now I think they’re a little steep for
a college of our nature and I think a lot of faculty don’t bother because they are so steep.

17. Access to meaningful research grants. Generous travel support directly related to research purposes.

18. My scholarship is strong as is that of every single member of my department. From that perspective,
this issue does not seem to apply to us.

19. More intellectual life on campus. Deans and the Provost should take the lead in sponsoring occasional
forums and speakers. At the moment scholarship seems separated from campus life. Perhaps these
could be on Friday afternoons - or cancel late afternoon classes two or three times a semester.
Scholars Day, appropriately, has become more of a student event and does not serve that purpose.


21. The best incentives would be: (a) not going to a 4/3 or 4/4 teaching load. (b) sufficient conference
tavel funds. (c) more statistical software and support college-wide. (d) availability of faculty
mentors (who would presumably be compensated with extra travel and research funds or course
releases of their own). MORE IMPORTANT is that productive faculty whose scholarship does NOT
need invigorating should not be penalized to support those whose scholarship has fallen fallow, often
due to laziness over the years. Many of the support items indicated above should be available to
currently productive faculty too. In fact, in many schools teaching loads are REDUCED for faculty
whose scholarship far exceeds the department norms. This would be welcome at Brockport for those
of us who are productive.

22. First of all a scholar should not need an incentive to conduct their scholarship/research. It is suppose
to be intrinsic in the scholar. However, people get stuck. To get unstuck there may need to be
encouragement. Two ideas: 1) Those faculty that are identified as being stuck or in a slump should be
required in September to present to someone (chair/dean/APT committee/?) a scholarly plan for the
year. This creates a commitment on the faculty member to do something. Their annual report should
include their accomplishment of that plan. 2) Establish a weekly research series for those in a slump.
This should be interdisciplinary and required. One professor makes a brief presentation on their
work and how they would like to proceed, and the attendees comment about how they can help. This could lead to some good interdisciplinary research. The Provost and all the Deans should attend every session.

23. Maybe more conference money. Maybe encouraging “group” efforts so as to help/encourage others to get involved with scholarship. (ie. dual authorship, etc) Possibly a course release here or there with end of semester proof that shows progress on scholarship.

24. I am overall satisfied with the amount of my research productivity. However, I am very, very concerned that semesters will get longer by one week each due to the consideration of 50 minute lecture times. This will cut overall two weeks away from the non-teaching time. Off the semesters, this is where I am getting 90+ of my research efforts done.

25. My scholarship doesn’t need reinvigorating, but if someone is not interested in scholarship, I doubt that any incentives would spur any action. Only the disincentives of extra teaching or service loads would do so.

26. Have a fair and equitable policy for distribution of DSI, especially when related to scholarship. For 4 consecutive years, I had qualified for DSI based on departmental standards for scholarship, and was at least at rank for teaching and service. However, I did not receive DSI for any of those years. Therefore, I see no reason or incentive to do any more scholarship.

27. Mentoring and/or a writing group; some structure of accountability.

28. Performance pay: there should be clear rewards for productive scholarship (versus dabbling). Productive can mean external funding, publications, student success, presentations. A plan, in writing, must be submitted. Annual reports must be required.

29. Funding to help out with the costly cost of conference attending/presenting, teaching research as well as creating/performing.

30. Not applicable

31. It doesn’t need invigorating but I would like recognition for my work – reduced work load and funds and tech equipment. Those of us with records of scholarship get relatively little.

32. My research agenda is going okay, probably in part because I’m pre-tenure. But I think it would be really, really useful to have a competitive (and it could indeed be very competitive) pre-tenure leave award, open even to those who are not eligible for the UUP Drescher Diversity Leave. I would also like to see “the possibility” of occasional course releases, for those faculty who “bank” a certain amount of extra service or teaching duties (for example, after directing a certain number of grad theses, or conducting independent studies), or who have a serious but time-limited research/service project (like editing a special edition of a journal).

33. Internal research grants to support our research.

34. Work load: I’m fine with the current 3/3 course load with the option to teach (or not to teach) in the summer session. As a new untenured tenure-track faculty member, I have to spare some time for my scholarly work. Four courses per semester will be too much for me at this point. Material support, including financial support if needed: I like the way the college provides us with the scholarly incentive grant and UUP grant opportunity. In addition, the department and the dean’s financial support for conferences are vital for me. But I understand that with the budget cut, it will be more difficult to do so. I would like to see more support regarding supervision of field experiences. We are asked to have at least three e-mail communications with the school based teacher educators while do not need to make any trips to the schools. I feel that if we get more support, more college supervisors may be willing to make connections with the schools. Student teaching supervision is taken as one course and supervisors get some mileage incentives because of the trip. Field experience has no support or recognition, it is just one part in the methods course. But field experience is important and it can be used as one connection with the schools, one base to develop research as well.

35. If my scholarship needed invigorating, incentives would include remaining on a 3/3 course teaching load and DSI. Suggestions to reinvigorate non-publishing faculty could include research colloquia,
mentoring, continued support from CELT.

36. This is a super important issue. This is the "elephant in the room" in most departments. Regardless of what people do, they teach 3/3. It's very discouraging for people doing research. I have no need of invigoration at this time. However, I do not think continuing a 3/3 load for people will do anything to increase their scholarship/research activities. People need to be held accountable to the existing policy ASAP. It should be a 4/4 load until they demonstrate active research. The promise to do more research, in other words, is an insult to those who have consistently worked hard to do research. In all honesty, most people who don’t do research just don’t like doing it. I doubt any reward will help. I think this is all about just putting them at 4/4 and having somebody mentor them if they're interested. I am dead set against giving people who haven’t done any research any upfront money or time off for getting research going. If they want, they can always apply for a sabbatical.

37. I am a new faculty (recently received my PhD) for me, mentoring would be most helpful. my current teaching load should allow me to do research/scholarship, I just don’t have the experience yet to put it all together effectively.

38. NA -- plenty invigorated.

39. My opinion is that faculty who are not "invigorated" about writing, collecting data, etc...cannot be driven with incentives since this has to come from within. I think that you can be a good faculty person and not be involved in publication, but failure in all areas of scholarship indicates deeper motivational issues that cannot be "bought", negotiated, penalized etc.

40. I am mid-career and my research program is already vigorous, but it seems to me that someone who has willfully slacked off should not be rewarded for that with opportunities (for time off or for money) that are not available to colleagues who have remained active in scholarship. For someone who hits a post-tenure funk, i.e. difficulty in getting a "second-project groove" going, but who has sincerely tried, then perhaps a semester at a 2-course load plus a requirement to be fully active in a Faculty Learning Community through CELT designed to end the funk would be feasible. Or a regular course load but the FLC could be considered the major service obligation.

41. Financial support, i.e., conferences, seminars, etc. Sabbaticals should consistently be granted and used for scholarship.

42. It would be nice if there were more financial support for travel to present at conferences. The amount provided from the college usually doesn’t even cover half of the expenses in most cases. However, given the financial crisis the state is in, I recognize that more money for travel is unlikely...

43. I don’t require incentives to do what I want to do anyway--research/scholarship/writing is a large part of why I’ve chosen my career. I assume that what most faculty need is not incentives, but time. I know this is not really the task before this committee. I would only comment that the College must be vigorous in protecting faculty time for research against more immediate pressures for teaching and service.

44. A teaching reduction for one semester. I’m not saying this is a reasonable expectation, but just that it would help.

45. 1) Financial award 2) Conference and travel support 3) Preferred schedule (not reduced load)

46. I have a scholarship agenda that is at the national level and I have colleagues I work with around the country to complete my work. I feel the existing workload facilitates this.

47. A sabbatical semester. It is my understanding, however, that a sabbatical purely to pursue research is frowned upon. Faculty should return from sabbatical with something to enhance their teaching. My research is specialized and not applicable to ANY of the courses I teach. As a result of the emphasis on applications to teaching, I have not applied for a sabbatical semester in spite of having worked here for well over a decade.

48. Many thanks to members of this committee for taking on this task. A one time course reduction could
provide the needed time to explore new options and get new projects under way. Support to attend conferences— even if not presenting—would be tremendously beneficial, as it creates opportunities to enter into current conversations. The College seems to value teaching and service over scholarship—not through what gets said, but through demands placed on faculty members. As a campus we need to create a stronger scholarly culture.

49. funds for undergraduate researchers graduate assistant stipends/assistantships internal grant programs course release a better economy

50. More opportunities to initiate collaboration, not just within a department, but also across departments. 2. More funding opportunities to attend conferences, especially ones that take place in a foreign country.

51. allow an option for the full time "academic year" to be a summer/fall or spring/summer, allowing a fall or spring semester “off” to do scholarship/research—wouldn’t have to be an option every year, but once every three, maybe five, years would be awesome, allowing faculty and departments to plan ahead

52. The most important thing to me is flexibility in scheduling. I’m not asking for a course release or a semester off; I just want to arrange my teaching schedule so that I can write every day.

53. If the College wishes to assist professors to re-start a stalled research agenda, then it must help professors re-enter the research community. A major step to accomplish this is by attending conferences. The College should support attendance at conferences, as well as presentation at conferences. Also, the current level of support for presenting at conferences ($500 or $600) pays only a small portion of the costs.

54. There are many of us who do scholarship and creative work in different FORMS. Not all of us go the traditional route of journal publication. Our creative efforts take many different forms - many of which can come under the umbrella of ‘Service Learning’, performances, film productions, software, etc. The campus as a whole must UNEQUIVOCALLY RECOGNIZE the various different forms of creative activities that people from across the various departments on campus engage in. On the one hand, we see that the campus states that its primary objective is ‘student success’. On the other hand, what seems to be rewarded most - say during the DSI process - is publication in a journal. It has been well-known in our department at least that a journal publication is a guarantee of a DSI, even though that year you may have done a very indifferent job in teaching all your classes - this still rates as ‘adequate’ and your journal publication gets you a $1200 DSI. How does a journal publication - dealing with abstruse stuff that does not give any undergraduates even a chance to participate in due to its level (we have no grad program) - help the students, and does the indifferent teaching done to focus on the publication not hurt them, and diminish their chance for success? Even grants -- getting a highly competitive grant that provides scholarships to students is considered not to be scholarship, but just ‘service’ - the most maligned of the three obligations of a typical faculty member. Why would anyone feel the motivation to go and get such a grant? Given this background, what would invigorate me the most is a clear recognition of any kind of creative activity that enhances student success should be recognized as scholarship campus wide. Different departments could enumerate specific kinds of creative activities appropriate for them, but the campus a whole should set the framework for it. It should be stated that any creative activity that demonstrably helps students, impacts the curriculum positively and helps bring it up to date and in line with current practice at institutions comparable to us, should be recognized as scholarship. To reiterate the key points: demonstrably helps students and impacts your teaching positively -- that should be the yardstick to measure creative activity. NOT JUST JOURNAL PUBLICATION IN TOP JOURNALS -- achieving this is impossible for some of us in this predominantly teaching-oriented undergraduate college.

55. I am tenure track, so I run around a lot to try to meet expectations. I do not need invigorating, but the funding we have is inadequate. More money would help a lot.
56. Writing Groups both within schools and across schools would be helpful, and should be encouraged. This helps keep traditional scholars on task, much like a weight watchers meeting where you have to weigh in. Funding for research expenses for a specific project that perhaps can be shown to have already been underway, and some accomplishments may help get someone over the finish line. I also think it is important that faculty are asked to actually document to their chair their “in progress” scholarship. So if I say I am working on a book or journal article, I should be able to provide drafts of my work as a way to document the progress. In the event that a particular project is large, and spans several years as a faculty members primary scholarship, again drafts (with year to year progress indicated) should be required. A faculty member should not be able to say, “Oh I’m working on a book” and leave it at that. This may put more of a burden on the chair, so perhaps another method of verification can be established, but it is important that faculty are asked to verify in some tangible way, their on-going scholarship.

57. Time and Money. Funds to pay for data sets, research assistants, course reductions, travel to conferences, books, and other materials. Also, more investment in access to current issues of journals through the library. Interlibrary Loan is phenomenal here, but it does require an extra, time-sucking step to make the request and wait for the material to come in.

58. All faculty should get $500 to attend one conference per year and a subscription to the journal of their field.

59. Reduced teaching and service loads. Also, if you publish a book, you should receive more than a $1,200 DSI--which is the same you receive for a single article. And DSI awards for publishing should be automatic. The evaluation process is ridiculous and riddled with personal bias, politics, and sentiment as it proceeds through the APT committee and department chair.

60. Brockport is a “teaching” college, has research I expectations, and little to no funding to support faculty. Each year I spend at least $4000 out of pocket traveling to conference/festivals for creative research and almost always include student participants. Dance/Creative Research is different from other disciplines. We cannot mail (or email) a manuscript or article. Choreographers and dancers must be present for live performances which are expensive. (travel, hotels, food, etc) UUP offers limited help as has Rochester Arts and Cultural Council but for larger state grants, dance artists are competing with NYC based artists who are regularly given preference over upstate choreographers. (commonly accepted understanding in the field) Without additional travel funds, it will be increasingly difficult for Brockport to recruit or maintain national level artists. Also necessary are additional student travel funds for participation in faculty research. Finally, release time for research is essential. (Course release? Service release?) At least 65% of my time is taken with service related activities.

61. Monetary issues are always a concern. I have needed to decline scholarship presentation opportunities due to the lack of funds. This is quite discouraging and sends faculty a mixed message; scholarship is crucial to your employment with Brockport but it must be funded largely out of your own pocket. And as we all know travel can become quite expensive.
Q. What issues do you think the Task Force on Faculty Workload should consider in designing procedures to implement the current policy on workload?

Responses

1. 1. What are the intentions of the faculty member? 2. If the intention is to re-start scholarship / workload, what is a reasonable timeline? 3. Give faculty up to a year (maybe two) to show real evidence of sustained scholarly activity. 4. If the intention is to not restart, then implement the 4/4 policy immediately.

2. After reading the current policy my only issue has to do with implementation of reduced workloads for faculty that have large classrooms (and no Teaching Assistant). I am not convinced that this situation, by itself, implies that the faculty is overloaded and warrants a teaching workload reduction. The number of students in one course, alone, does not imply that an instructor is necessarily devoting a larger amount of time to teaching duties. In my opinion, the task of teaching 3 different courses in one semester, is much more difficult than teaching the same course to 3 separate audiences (regardless of their size). For instance, a faculty member who teaches a large Gen Ed course 2 or 3 times, only needs to prepare for a lecture once, and he/she will be prepared for all of his lectures. Any material to be distributed in class, also would only need to be prepared a single time. On the other hand, instructors teaching 3 separate courses must engage in 3 distinct preps. This is particularly draining on newer faculty who have never taught those 3 courses before. In essence, I believe that this task force needs to re-evaluate the other dimensions of teaching workload that are not simply tied to the actual number of students registered in one course.

3. I think that sometimes the administrators at this institution are naive about the impact of service and advisement load on the scholarly output of senior faculty. There are individuals that are true "stewards and workhorses" of their programs - they provide the initiative, the leadership, the creativity, and - here is the important piece - the implementation effort required to move programs forward. Not unexpectedly, these people are often the same folks that go above and beyond in the classroom - constantly reinventing their courses, assigning numerous projects and papers that take much effort to review and constructively critique. They do this year in and year out. I have been here 20 years and, with one exception, I am unaware of any effort at the Dean's level or above (outside of sabbatical) to purposefully and systematically identify these individuals and reduce either their service or teaching workload in recognition of their leadership/stewardship. I realize that some folks get release, (e.g. for serving on the budget and resource committee) but the distribution of that release can not be argued to be equitable as it is not based on complete data – how do you know folks on the budget and resource committee (for example) have a heavier service load than someone shouldering the grunt work back at the Department level? In summary, equitable service loads are required for equitable scholarship loads to be achieved. As enrollments grow and personnel budgets shrink, and as we try to shelter junior faculty from excessive service loads (for pragmatic and competitive reasons), the service load issue is likely to become more important to the scholarship issue.

4. There needs to be some way to find a consensus about what constitutes increasing someone’s workload to a 4/4 - so that chairs/deans and above all agree in general as to what that is. I also think graduate teaching needs to be considered in this. I think the 4/4 workload policy is really based on undergraduate course load. Is this 4/4 expectation truly applicable to graduate teaching? I don’t believe it is. Is there a difference in teaching responsibilities in all graduate department versus an undergraduate department that has a graduate program versus an undergraduate department that just offers graduate courses? I would also like the committee to consider thesis supervision - right now there is really no recognition in teaching in terms of the amount of time it takes to help students complete their theses. Students sign up for TCC but the faculty member doesn’t get "credit".

5. An active scholarship program by the individual, current teaching and service (college and dept.) load
6. “Service Creep”? The amount of service required for DSI, promotion, and tenure and the number of service requests faculty are receiving is on the rise and there seems to be no end in sight. “Service Creep” is stealing hours from faculty that they might use to develop/maintain a strong program of scholarship. This is the issue no one seems to be discussing regarding faculty workload, and it is one that needs to be addressed!

7. Understand that not every year will mirror a certain level of activity. Some projects take longer to reach completion (video documentaries, books) than others. The Workload expectation should spread over a multi-year timespan. Perhaps a 3 year period. If production does not keep pace with a 3-year time frame, then the faculty member is not keeping up with the expected workload.

8. I think it varies tremendously depending on the individual faculty member (willingness to take on things, seniority, etc), the department, and then the commitments to service, research, and teaching. For example, I took on an overload in a time of great need for my dept. However, I got no assistance of any kind or any “breaks” from other commitments. That was a real killer! I won’t do that again. So, I think the committee should look at individuals rather than depts or programs.

9. Look at balance of work. Service takes far more time than anyone is given credit for. What are realistic expectations from people. May have to consider a case by case basis since each department is different.

10. It is important to have a reasonable period of review for assessing scholarship. I feel that a ‘look-back’ policy that covers the past five years is a reasonable approach. I think that only the past history of successful scholarship should be used. Statements of work in progress should not enter into the workload decision at all.

11. This is so hard. There are so many . . . first, I would consider the reason/s why a persons scholarship is waning. Is is a time limited issue or more chronic? I would hate to see someones teaching load increase if they were dealing with a major illness, taking care of a family member, etc. and trying not to take a leave of absence from teaching. However, if it seems to be a lack of interest in scholarly endeavors then implementing the increased course load seems reasonable. Also, many people take on time intensive service obligations that do not result in a course reduction . . . I would hope these are given consideration as well.

12. Tenure track faculty must be exempted from this policy, or non-tenure track faculty working on their dissertations (QAR lines). Family or personal crisis should be taken into consideration as well (divorce or similar upsets; chronic illness of a family member, etc.). This should be considered a gender equity issue as women typically are far more affected by such issues.

13. There are two key issues: equitability and finances. 1. The procedures should ensure equitable workloads among individual faculty members across departments, schools and disciplines. I am not advocating my work schedule for everyone, 8-14 h/d, 7 d/week (the only way I can maintain scholarship while chairing a dept. and teaching its largest course each semester); however, we are professionals—everyone should be able to document beyond reasonable doubt a workload that requires 40-50 hours of effort per week. 2. Finances: The more tenured faculty we can move into the classroom, the fewer adjuncts we have to hire ($2.5M/year budget for adjuncts currently and a $2-3M annual structural deficit as far into the future as the college can see). Given the permanent decline of NYS finances, in not too many years, saving money on adjuncts and putting tenured faculty without demonstrably active programs of scholarship into more classrooms will save the jobs of those same tenured faculty.

14. Anyone who is doing active research cannot possibly teach more than a 3/3 load. (I know - I’ve tried it in the past.) I think that the committee should be sure to remember than in some disciplines (history, for example), the time between a project’s conception and its completion can literally be years.

15. Create a positive vs. a punitive climate: design and present procedures as preferred alternatives vs. suggesting that those who do not have strong research agendas are “less than”

16. I think that a college-wide implementation will be difficult. I think that department or perhaps even
schools (or how the schools are broken down into DSI-units or something) would be the best place to establish the criteria. Maybe something akin to the way APT was done a couple of years ago, where departments made them up and then they were approved all the way up the administrative chain. Then make chairs provide support in the annual reports for the way that faculty are either meeting or not meeting those guidelines. Right now, I think that many chairs don’t want to pick that fight with faculty and make them teach more so diffusing that process would be key to implementation.

17. Relate workload discussions to providing strong support for faculty development in instruction & curriculum design, basic department management, faculty governance.

18. Where applicable, each department needs course releases for faculty who take on important jobs like graduate director and undergraduate advisement coordinator. This should not change.

19. The varieties of what constitute service and scholarship and especially the overlap between the two need to be factored in. Scholarship should not be seen solely as publishing and performing to contribute to our niche guild, rather activities that convey scholarly knowledge to broader audiences and those that contribute to the field in general (e.g., editing, building resources) should be included. The tripartite teaching/service/scholarship is an appropriate overall framework, but simplistic and harmful if treated too rigidly.

20. TOMORROW’S PROFESSOR(sm) eMAIL NEWSLETTER http://cgi.stanford.edu/~dept-ctl/cgi-bin/tomprof/postings.php Sponsored by Stanford Center for Teaching and Learning http://ctl.stanford.edu Posting comments http://tomprofblog.mit.edu/ Folks: The posting below by Scott Jaschik looks at some ideas coming out of Ohio State University on offering more than one criteria for faculty promotion, particularly to the full professor level. It is from the March 5, 2010 issue of INSIDE HIGHER ED, an excellent - and free - online source for news, opinion and jobs for all of higher education. You can subscribe by going to: http://insidehighered.com/. Also for a free daily update from Inside Higher Ed, e-mail [scott.jaschik@insidehighered.com]. Copyright © 2010 Inside Higher Ed Reprinted with permission. Regards, Rick Reis reis@stanford.edu UP NEXT: Displaying a Personal interest in Students and Their Learning” Tomorrow’s Academic Careers ------------------------ Different Paths to Full Professor Last month, E. Gordon Gee mentioned to the Associated Press that he thought it was time to reconsider the way tenure is awarded. The wire story got a lot of attention, especially given that Gee, president of Ohio State University, wasn’t suggesting abandoning tenure at all, but rethinking the criteria on which it is awarded. Ohio State officials were quick to caution at the time that Gee wasn’t making specific proposals, but was trying to get people thinking about an important topic. In fact, though, Ohio State is embarking on discussions on how to change the way professors are evaluated for promotion to full professor. University officials argue that, as in tenure reviews, research appears to be the dominant factor at that stage, despite official policies to weigh teaching and service as well. Not only does Ohio State want to end the all-out dominance of research considerations in reviews for full professor, but the university wants to explore options where some academics might earn promotions based largely on research (and have their subsequent careers reshaped with that focus) while others might earn promotions based largely on teaching (and similarly have career expectations adjusted). Both could earn the title of full professor. Further, the university wants to pay attention to questions of impact -- for both teaching and research. The concept in play would end the myth that candidates for full professor (and maybe, someday, candidates for tenure) should be great in everything. Why? Because most professors aren’t great at everything. Using a religious analogy in an interview, Gee said that there should be ”multiple ways to salvation.” Associate professors should be able to find ”their real callings” and to focus on them, not fearing that following those passions will doom their chances of promotion for deviating from an equal balance between research, teaching and service. Ohio State’s provost, Joseph A. Alutto, has started working with faculty members on redefining promotion guidelines, and faculty leaders are backing the effort. And while many college leaders talk about a desire to reward faculty members on factors beyond traditional measures of research excellence, actually shifting promotion criteria is rare at research universities. “It could be revolutionary if we do this, and then others do it. We could really escape from some of the limitations of the system” in place now, said Sebastian D.G. Knowles, a professor of English and associate dean for faculty and research in the arts and humanities. In a recent speech to the University Senate, Alutto outlined a path to a
different approach for the promotion to full professor. He started by noting the traditional teaching/research/service demands for tenure, and stressed that he favored continuation of tenure. “Without the assurances provided by tenure, all of us in the academy would be constantly in danger of speaking only the current orthodoxy, for seeing the world in limited ways,” he said. When it comes time to promote to full professor, he said that it seems that Ohio State just wants “more of the same” in more high quality research, more great teaching and more service. But if that’s the official policy, the de facto situation, he said, is that the focus is on research. Once research eminence is verified, teaching and service must be found only to be “adequate.” “This approach is insidiously harmful,” Alutto said. “First, it generates cynicism among productive faculty, as they realize the ‘game’ being played. Second, it frustrates productive faculty who contribute to their disciplines and the university in unique and powerful ways other than -- or in addition to -- traditional research. Third, it flies in the face of everything we know about the need for a balanced portfolio of skills to achieve institutional success.” Gee said that his view is that the university needs outstanding work in research, teaching and service, and that divisions or areas of study within the university need outstanding work in those areas, but that the current system presumes that every individual can provide all of them in equal measure. Alutto said that the key missing element to giving teaching and service a fair shot at equal consideration in promotions to full professor is measurement of impact, which is easier for research. He said that if good criteria could be developed, not only would teaching-related activities be rewarded, but so would research that has practical use. “Measuring impact is always difficult, particularly when it comes to teaching and service,” he said. “But it can be done if we focus on the significance of these activities as it extends beyond our own institution -- just as we expect such broad effects with traditional scholarship. Thus, indicators of impact on other institutions, recognition by professional associations, broad adoption of teaching materials (textbooks, software, etc.) by other institutions, evidence of effects on policy formulation and so on -- all these are appropriate independent indicators of effectiveness.” Gee stressed that once such measures are established, it will be clear that promoting a faculty member to full professor based primarily on teaching would not mean any lessening of the rigor required for advancement; that it was simply a matter of having a way to apply that rigor to teaching and not research alone. Alutto said that this broader focus would make it easier for departments to agree with various tenured faculty members on stages in their careers, such that someone might focus more on creating a new curricular offering for a period of a few years, and someone else might be at a critical juncture of research and want to focus on the lab. Faculty jobs could be restructured accordingly, but not universally, so that different professors would have more widely varying divisions of their duties (in the way Ohio State already has such options in its medical school and some other programs). “This gives an opportunity for individuals to say: What’s the passion I have and what can I do at this point in my career?” Alutto said. Alutto said that some of the same principles might also be used to reform tenure criteria But one caution he had was that -- because tenure is a “30 or 40 year commitment” by the university -- there may be a need to be sure of more of a mix of talents in the candidate, since the university’s needs may be hard to predict so far into the future. Timothy Gerber, a professor of music education at Ohio State, and chair of the Faculty Council, said that he is generally hearing enthusiasm about considering alternate paths to full professor status. Comments by Gee “certainly got everyone’s attention and people are saying that it’s time we take a look at this.” Gerber said he agrees that contributions to a discipline may extend beyond traditional publications. For example, he is the co-author of a music textbook used in high school. “I think we have had an impact,” he said. “Thousands of teachers are teaching differently, and hundreds of thousands of students are having contact with content they would not have had,” he said. In many ways, Gerber said, the idea of “counting” such contributions in faculty evaluations is an embrace of Ernest Boyer’s ideas about “the scholarship of teaching,” ideas that have had much more influence outside research universities than within them. Knowles said that the only “pitfall” he saw was concern that teaching might be too easy for someone to use to justify promotion. “There is always some group of students for whom you are a magical teacher,” he said. But if university leaders follow through on their goal of creating mechanisms for measuring the impact of teaching contributions, Knowles said he was “fully supportive.” “I think the worst thing we can do right now is stay where we are,” he said. “We need to shake up the way we promote associate professors.” * * * * * * * NOTE: Anyone can SUBSCRIBE to the Tomorrows-Professor Mailing List by going to: https://mailman.stanford.edu/mailman/listinfo/tomorrows-
21. Workload must not undermine ability of faculty to engage meaningfully with students inside and outside the classroom, in a manner that improves student learning outcomes. A heavy workload invites sloppy preparation and shortcuts in creating and grading assignments, both of which are detrimental to the students. A reasonable workload makes it possible for faculty to devote an appropriate amount of time to course prep, and to the making and grading of assignments, so as to achieve the best possible student outcomes.

22. Make the performance at rank standards meaningful across departments. Have some sort of quality control over department tenure and performance at rank expectations (too many departments are lax in these respects). Make sure the process is transparent and fairly implemented.

23. Having done interdisciplinary research with a number of vastly different disciplines, it is clear that each operates in different ways. These different ways need to be investigated and reduced to their greatest commonness. This greatest commonness then sets the base for the procedures.

24. Within each discipline, you must consider how long it takes to get things published. For example, my most recent article has been under review for 7 months and while I have contact with the editor who assures me I will have word soon, it has yet to come. This is very typical in some disciplines and must be taken into consideration when calculating how productive one is at getting things in to print. Also, if a person teaches a four course load, how easy would it be for them to return to a more traditional scholarship track? They get into a 4 course load because they don’t publish and yet, by teaching four courses, you make it more difficult for them to publish! It seems like a catch 22. Also, if a person is teaching a heavier load, should there be some guaranteed reward? (maybe a DSI every year, or other year?)

25. Teaching Class size, lecture versus lab, first-time teaching the course or not, new course development or major redesign, preparation for course (which can be very substantial for labs) Service Overall service load of faculty member (This may include thing people don’t think about such as maintenance of research and teaching instruments and equipment) Scholarship How many students does the faculty member mentor/supervise? Student generated products such as talks, posters, performances etc. Grants and contracts and keeping up with report writing Publication record Any active collaborations with other peers. (It takes time to communicate.)

26. Should the extra teaching load or service equivalent be 4/3 or 4/4, or perhaps summer service or teaching if the faculty member desires? How many years of scholarship at rank would it be required to demonstrate before returning to a 3/3 load? How far up the administrative chain would these decisions be made? How does one respond to faculty that claim that an extra teaching or service load would prevent them from ever performing scholarship at rank? (Hint---the following is the correct response: Too bad. You reap what you sow.)

27. One of the most important issues is gender parity. In general, men are more likely to be aggressive about limiting their obligations than women. I hope this effort can help redress that.

28. Decisions regarding current policy MUST keep in mind that there should be equity among faculty in a single department. When 1 faculty member has few students, another has many, that isn’t fair and this imbalance can lead to resentment and sub-optimal performance. See this sentence in the written policy: “other faculty within the department are not required to take on an unfair load” Once a person has tenure expectations should INCREASE, not decrease. All faculty should perform full time work for full time pay! We need checks and balances.

29. Equitable distribution of workload in relation to faculty output.

30. those who don’t/have not done real scholarship should teach 4-5 3-hour courses. They are living the good life-off of our backs.

31. I presume the annual faculty report is the obvious document for assessing whether a faculty member has an active research agenda. And since there might be good reasons to have a thin research agenda
in a particular year (the birth of a child or the death of a parent, say), I would consider the department chair the best person to assess whether the faculty member has truly withdrawn from scholarly work more than just temporarily. I imagine that the department chair (based on her knowledge of the faculty member’s circumstances, and the comparison of that person’s past annual reports) might first issue some kind of warning, or institute a probationary period; it may be that some faculty would rather teach an extra class (or do more service) than conduct their own research, but if they “do want” to be an active scholar, I’d hope that they’d be given the chance to work back to a 3/3 load if they showed clear signs of a (re)new(ed) commitment to research.

32. create a point system (i.e. 3pts for a book, 2pts for research pub, 1 pt for national presentation, etc) faculty will be required to maintain a minimum number of points over a 3 year (sometimes pubs take a long time to be published) span to show that they are actively engaged in scholarly work. THOse who do not maintain the minimum points, will be required to take on additional teaching responsibilities. It also could work in the other direction, those who reach a certain number of points can earn a course release.

33. The requirements and expectations for faculty members at different stages of their career. Tenured senior faculty members who have already established their scholarly work will have a different time schedule compared to new untenured ones regarding how much time for teaching (preparation), research, and service. And my understanding is we have different expectations across the departments even towards untenured faculty members at the same level. So how to make it generalizable? Or there is no need to generalize it at all?

34. Most department APT requirements don’t specifically define an active program of scholarship. That is critical. Once that is in place, faculty who don’t meet published departmental criteria would have their teaching workload increased.

35. The issues are mostly cultural. Lots of tenured faculty who currently do not do research simply feel entitled to a 3/3 load. Also, they do not seem to think the administration is serious about making them teach a 4/4. The most common excuse is the service they do. It needs to be made clear that research/scholarship is the required justification for a 3/3 load, not service. Another issue is that any chair who talks about 4/4 is labeled as the bad guy who won’t be reelected. The chairs need to be able to say, ”This is not my decision. This comes directly from the dean” (or something like it).

36. it’s not easy to implement across the board policy, especially with such diversity in areas of study.you have taken on a considerable task. I think that one issue that should be considered is what kinds of work practices make up faculty workload (and how are they compared to the norm, and valued?) In my department, part of the faculty workload involves 10-12 hour days, twice a week, in the field, hand to hand with groups of students. This work is done day and evening shift. There is also a written/academic component to this coursework. How does this compare to a 3 or 4 credit class conducted on campus, which meets for an hour 3 times a week or 1 1/2 hours twice a week? I do not mean to imply that it should be valued more, just that the time commitment should be considered. What would happen if each department had coursework like this? Also, in areas where continuous study and maintenance of credentials requires considerable cost or time commitments this should be equalized as well. isn’t this type of study also considered scholarship? it is evidence based, results in advancement in the field, and helps our program to continue to be highly regarded.

37. Currently too dependent on chairs’ judgment. Could use a multi-step adjudication to make it less “personal.”

38. Some faculty lack the training to be productive in scholarship.....many PhD programs fail to provide the necessary opportunities with productive faculty mentors to create productive scholars. This has to be addressed at the hiring stage....it may be that some faculty are hired who are “risks” for scholarship but perhaps needed for teaching...not sure this is always evident in background info, recommendations etc. Also, some faculty choose to stop writing and doing scholarship...maybe they run out of things to say or interests, these folks may be great teachers who can help by teaching more while others who are doing the scholarship that we need teach less.

39. Two comments: 1) Should individual departments really be allowed to define what “active workload”
means? What if there are departments with a department culture that just doesn’t emphasize active research very much? Such departments need to be held to a common standard. Do they even know what colleagues in other departments are doing in terms of scholarship? Do they know how far behind the curve they are? 2) Advisement is a hugely important but all too often overlooked aspect of faculty workload, and one that I feel very passionate about. In my department there is a strong culture of excellent advising which results in faculty spending long hours with advisees, especially in the second half of each fall and spring semester, once majors reservations begins. Nobody simply gives out key code numbers as I understand happens with some faculty in some other departments. And nobody in my department simply advises to the major requirements, ignoring gen. ed., etc. - something that results in students thinking they’re ready to graduate when in fact they are not. There need to be rewards for doing advisement properly and there need to be penalties for shirking that core responsibility. At the moment, bad/slack advisors simply get assigned fewer and fewer advisees, as Advisement Coordinators don’t want to punish students in the name of equity in faculty workload. The end result is that good advisors end up carrying workload for bad advisors. This is an issue that I hope the Provost will pay a lot of attention to, including a College wide clarification on whether advisement is a teaching or service activity. There also needs to be scrutiny of numbers of advisees/faculty member across departments. If some regularly advise 30 and others regularly advise 70 that’s a huge disparity in faculty workload, and it needs to be made visible. In terms of making all faculty carry out the core responsibility of advising majors properly, completely, and responsibly, what about mandatory training? In terms of penalties, what about an IAS system in which advisees rate their advisors every semester? What about making chairs pay attention to who’s advising well or badly? What about having new faculty be acculturated to advisement not through their home departments--where attitudes toward advising may vary--but through Academic Advisement working with a panel of experienced and successful Advisement Coordinators from a variety of departments?

40. No change in policy is necessary. The policy exists. If its not being implemented by the chairs, simply require chairs to implement it. Keep in mind, though, one size definitely does not fit all. Respect to differences in disciplines must always be recognized.

41. Advisement load; class sizes

42. 1) The differences between disciplines. 2) Who controls the mechanism for implementing current policy--department/faculty vs. administration.

43. It’s important to allow for scholarship programs that don’t produce the same results every single year. If a faculty member receives an increased teaching load, a faltering program of scholarship that had a reasonable chance of success could be permanently lost.

44. 1) Focus should be quality 2) Single-authored research output should be rewarded more

45. The onerous amount of external accreditation requirements that some departments have to contend with while others do not. For example, EHD must answer to the Ny State department of Education, NCATE, and college necessities among others.

46. A broad definition of scholarship. Research with students, even if it does not produce a ‘product’ (book or peer reviewed article) should be considered valuable and evidence of a program in scholarship.

47. Please consider issues of equity across programs, departments and schools. For instance, programs/departments that must deal with accreditation demands and/or field-based programs require far more in terms of service of their faculty members than do programs/departments that do not face these demands. As a result, faculty members have unequal and inequitable opportunities to devote their time to scholarship. Please consider the differences inherent in teaching and advising graduate students as opposed to teaching and advising undergraduate students. SCH is a poor indication of the amount of work that teaching a given course requires. Please consider a range of factors, such as field supervision, the nature of the course, graduate/undergraduate... The procedures need to be implemented across campus in equitable ways. All Schools and departments must be held to the same procedures. It is not
clear that this is currently the case.

48. graduate student advising independent project/honors project advising submitted publications/accepted presentations grant proposals submitted/awarded participating in peer-review of papers and grant proposals Also must consider lag time between working on manuscript/proposal to submission and award

49. please consider this issue: “current practice utilizes a model in which faculty who are not performing to expectation in all three areas receive a compensatory workload adjustment in one of the two remaining areas” This regressive model simply guarantees, for example, the “failing scholar” now teaches 4/4 and will never publish! try the opposite---failing scholar is given a 1/1 for a year, encouragement (a positive, caring “investment”---what successful organizations do for their people), and then, if unsuccessful, have a counseling session :)

50. They should consider contributions made by the faculty member in BOTH scholarship AND service over the past several years (say, three). Note that many departments that have had to seek Accreditation in recent years have had their service workloads dramatically increased in order to (mainly) fulfill the assessment needs of the accrediting agency. Service should be recognized better than it is now. Also, in the case of many departments it is critical to stay current in the discipline. For such departments, teaching the same material you did 5 years ago is a big harm to the students. In such disciplines, a faculty member must be asked to describe how he/she has stayed current. If they have made, and plan to make in the next year, efforts in this direction, this should be considered a contribution and recognized as part of the workload.

51. Are faculty active in scholarship? That’s not complex to determine. If they are not, teaching loads should be increased. I think many faculty would welcome teaching 4 classes with little or no pressure to do scholarship.

52. Volume of service responsibilities in smaller departments where the service load has to be distributed among a small number of tenure track instructors should be taken into account when assessing equitable workload. It is not uncommon for many hours of service responsibilities to encroach upon time needed to conduct scholarship. Thank you

53. I have several suggestions here: First of all in terms of numbers of students in classes, and the relation to workload. (And this assumes that there is no Graduate Assistant or any other kind of help for the class) I believe it is important to make a distinction between high enrollment classes that include graded assignments beyond scantron exams, and high enrollment classes that primarily rely on scantron exams. For example, teaching a high enrollment Gen Ed classes, in which 2,000 words of written work must be graded, is a far more daunting task than teaching a high enrollment class in which scantron exams are the primary method of grading. While I do understand that the simple act of having to respond to e-mails when you have a high enrollment class, even if you just give scantron exams, is time consuming, I still think the way in which classes factor into workload should take into consideration the kinds of graded assignments in high enrollment classes. The current policy seems to base the way in which numbers of students affects faculty workload simply on the numbers of students. And, additionally (or as another method to acknowledge the challenges of high enrollment classes) in terms of the percentage of workload and the triad of teaching, service, and scholarship, that faculty members who have an extraordinarily high number of students in their three classes should have a higher % of their workload attributed to teaching, and lesser % attributed to service and scholarship. Second, still in terms of numbers of students and teaching workload, I totally know and understand that small UNDERGRADUATE classes, by this I mean say 3 - 7 students, depending on the class and discipline, may take as much energy and faculty attention/input as a larger class, but I’d like to see some indication that a faculty member who may only have say 15 - 25 students across the three classes that they teach, that this may not count as a 50% teaching load. This doesn’t mean that they are asked to teach 4 classes, but perhaps that the expectation in terms of service and scholarship is raised due to the small number of
students in their teaching load. Third, in terms of teaching and workload, I’d suggest some language in the policy that is clear that in terms of a 3/3 workload - if you are teaching a three credit class, that you should actually meet with your students for 3 hours a week. I have heard of several instances where a faculty member is teaching a 3 credit class, and they only actually hold class once or twice a month. Obviously, in consultation with the chair a faculty member may be able to explain the pedagogy and verify that their efforts in teaching the class are actually equal to meeting with the class for 3 hours a week, but there should be some general required relation to the credits of the class and amount of contact time the faculty member has with students for that class. So, for example if a faculty member teaches a 3 credit class, in which the faculty member has far fewer contact hours with the students, that, even if the class might count for 3 credit hours for the student, that it won’t count as 3 credit hours for the faculty member and their workload, unless they can justify the situation in consultation with the Chair. Again, I understand that there may be situations where fewer contact hours with students can be justified, and Chairs should have the authority to grant the faculty member 3 credit hours in their workload for a 3 credit class with far fewer contact hours with the student, but I’d like to see something explicit about the definition of workload, in regard to teaching, between contact hours with students and credit hours.

Fourth, in terms of workload in relation to rank, and I am now more concerned with the areas of service and scholarship, we need much clearer guidelines about the relationship of rank to these areas, in terms of a year by year evaluation as opposed to an evaluation that looks at multiple years. So, for example what are the expectations for “performance at rank” in the areas of service and scholarship for assistant, associate, and full professor on an annual basis. How should the service responsibilities of an assistant professor who may have a 15% allocation for service differ from the service responsibilities of a full professor also with a 15% allocation for service. This is really important because I have found the lack of clarity of “performance at rank” on an annual basis in our college documents has made it very difficult to objectively evaluate faculty members “performance at rank” in terms of DSI applications. While this may not be the issue you are addressing in your committee, it does fall under the umbrella of workload, since service, scholarship, and teaching are all part of workload, and ultimately faculty members should be performing at their designated rank every year. Finally, While I totally understand the expression “if it ain’t broke why fix it” In terms of the % allocation for teaching in a faculty members overall workload, I think that a faculty member who year after year after year teaches the same classes, with no course revisions or serious self-reflection of their teaching, should receive less than 50% of their workload for teaching - and therefore have more expectations in the areas of service and scholarship than the faculty member who has regular new course prep, or who teaches a wide variety of classes, and who actively evaluates their teaching and shows a passion for improvement in that area. Again, sometimes due to the nature of a program, a faculty member may end up teaching the same classes year after year after year, and I don’t mean to say they should be “punished” for that, but let’s face it, it is much more difficult to teach new classes - so the standard 50% in teaching should not automatically apply to faculty who teach the same classes year after year without documented improvement in their teaching.


56. Brockport expects faculty to teach and do service as if we were a community college or teaching oriented private liberal arts college, yet also publish at a level as if we were a research institution. In trying to be successful at both, we end up being successful at neither. This requires a fundamental reorientation of school philosophy/mission. Are we primarily teachers or scholars? It’s a wonderful ideal to simply state that the two are complementary; but the reality is that they are not. Focusing time and energy on one necessitates draining it from the other one. And trying to excel at both simultaneously leads to excessive anxiety and stress and reduced family time and reduces overall quality of life.

57. I think consideration should also be given to the amount of service faculty members are performing. In my department, the high level achievers in research are also pulling most of the service weight. That being said, if policies are not enforced at the department level (as the current one is not) any change will be irrelevant.

58. I believe college has current policy of 4/4 for not having active scholarly outcomes to increase/encourage scholarly works. However, this would have the opposite effect. Many faculty do not
have much scholarly outcomes due to heavy teaching load (3/3). If they are forced to teach 4/4, then it will be the way more difficult to find time for scholarly work, so less outcomes will be produced. So, I think if a faculty member does not have active research work, then should be given at least one year of probational period to catch up the scholarly work instead of be forced to teach 4/4 right after being labeled as 'no-scholarly-outcome' faculty. Also, the 'active' scholarly outcome guideline is, I believe, very unclear. Has to be very explicit so that all faculty members know what they are expected to do to be labeled as 'active'.

59. I believe that Service needs to be further examined. Many times individuals go above and beyond in their service opportunities to the college and community and I feel these are often overlooked. Many of these service opportunities involve large time commitments and as a result elicit future partnerships with the community and local schools which directly benefit the college but are viewed as minute tasks.