

Appendix B

**Discussion Questions and Feedback from Departments/Colleges (Library,
Education, Engineering, Business, Fine Arts, Psychology, Criminology, Sociology)
Represented by Roles Subcommittee Members**

First Draft Definition of Faculty Roles

Discussion Questions and Feedback from Departments/Colleges (Library, Education, Engineering, Business, Fine Arts, Psychology, Criminology, Sociology) Represented by Roles Subcommittee Members

Purpose

As one approach to addressing its charge, the Roles Subcommittee of the Faculty Roles, Responsibilities, and Rewards Task Force drafted a definition or values statement regarding the nature of faculty roles at a research university. After subcommittee members reached consensus on the statement, each member engaged faculty from his/her respective unit to provide feedback regarding the definition. The following includes:

1. The first draft definition/values statement regarding the meaning of *faculty* at a research university. **Readers should note that this definition was modified to reflect feedback from the departments represented. The resulting definition is included in the Final Roles Subcommittee Report.**
2. The standard set of questions to elicit faculty feedback about the definition.
3. Responses to the definition. Each member of the subcommittee provided a summary of, and in some cases individual responses to, the definition. Feedback from the departments/colleges represented by each member of the subcommittee is presented in full.
4. An overall summary of faculty responses was developed, and recommendations (see final Roles Subcommittee Report) were drafted.

1. First Draft: Definition of Faculty at a Research-Intensive University

A top-tier research university is devoted to the disciplined creation, cultivation and dissemination of knowledge. Faculty members of such an institution are the agents of this process. The stature of a university faculty derives from the extent to which the knowledge created at that institution is recognized by the larger community of scholars and interested consumers of new knowledge (in academe, government, and other societal organizations) as central and critical to ongoing effort to further the intellectual reach of humanity. Consistent with this core mission, faculty members often are engaged in addressing issues of importance to the local, state, national, and international communities, but the creation of new knowledge that may not have immediate applicability is valued in its own right.

The stature of individual faculty members within a top-tier research university is based upon the extent to which their individual contributions are seen as central and critical to furthering knowledge within and beyond their disciplines, and the extent to which their individual prominence within their discipline contributes to the prominence of the institution as a whole. At such an institution, faculty roles and rewards are tailored to be consistent with this central value.

At a successful top-tier university, this fundamental value also is understood to infuse all the activities of a faculty member, including the traditional categories of research

(scholarship), teaching, and service. Research represents, of course, the knowledge creation process itself, teaching represents one part of the cultivation and dissemination of knowledge (publishing and other mechanisms of placing the new knowledge within the public domain represents another part of knowledge cultivation and dissemination), and service represents the creation of mechanisms to support the knowledge creation process.

The difference between the teaching roles within a top-tier research university and other institutions of higher education is that, at a top-tier institution, the most valued teaching activities are infused with the knowledge creation process, that is, they convey newly created information along with the disciplined ways of thinking that are used to generate new knowledge. At other educational institutions, including other institutions of higher education, teaching emphasizes consumption of knowledge created in other venues, including research institutions. These differences are, of course, not absolute; teaching of both kinds can be found at either kind of institution. A top-tier research university, however, places the most value and emphasis on the knowledge creation process, and faculty roles and rewards pertaining to teaching should more directly represent this value system. Similarly, service at a top-tier institution is valued in proportion to the extent to which it contributes to the knowledge creation process. Once again, roles and rewards pertaining to service should be tailored to accommodate this central value.

2. Engagement of colleagues to solicit feedback on the definition of faculty roles

Members of the Faculty Roles Task Force committed to engaging colleagues in their respective Colleges in informal discussions of the definition provided above. The Task Force sought feedback in response to the following questions:

1. To what extent does the above statement appropriately describe faculty roles in a top tier research university? Please discuss how specific elements of this statement reflect the roles of faculty.
2. Do you envision USF as having the potential to be a top tier research university? Why or why not?
3. To what extent does this statement accurately describe your role at USF?
4. In the absence of a similar definition of faculty roles at USF, would you support adoption of this statement? To what extent would you expect others in your department/college to support it?
5. Do you agree that USF should aspire to be a top tier research university?

3. Full text of faculty responses

Library Faculty Response

Librarians agreed that the document reflected a good definition of faculty for a top-tier research institution. The question arose whether there should be some differentiation in the definition between teaching and non-teaching faculty. While librarians are non-

teaching faculty, much of what the library faculty do fits into this definition. Librarians teach, though not for credit. Librarians bring in grant money to do innovative projects that later result in published research. We incorporate technology into current practices and help set current research practices. In the library profession, a lot of research and publications are related to best practices in libraries. Reports from other university librarians through professional conferences indicates that USF Libraries are innovative, and it is important to distribute that information via presentations or peer-reviewed articles. The librarians believe that USF should aspire to be a top-tier research institution during good and bad fiscal times. One librarian worried that the university has been reduced to basic services and functions because of the current fiscal crisis. However, another observed that nothing in the question about USF having the potential to be a research intensive research university involved a timeline. Yes, USF does have that potential, especially noting how far USF has come given Florida's low ranking in state funding and its weak support of academia.

College of Education Response

The Faculty Roles definition was disseminated to the COE Faculty Council, a governance committee consisting of a cross-section of faculty who represent all departments and all other curriculum committees. At the February 27th meeting of the Faculty Council, members were asked to respond to the Roles TF's questions about the roles definition. Responses were as followed:

- Members almost unanimously objected to what they perceived as an unbalanced emphasis on research as opposed to teaching as a reflection of faculty roles. For the COE, teaching, teacher preparation, and the study of teaching are central to our core and must remain there. The group understood the definitional attempt to convey the interrelatedness of teaching and research but felt that the definition should convey the equality of these activities and, at least in the COE, the centrality of teaching.
- Members felt that the definition implied a particular, empiricist view of research that does not necessarily reflect the multiple approaches to research that all faculty in the COE and university espouse.
- Members felt that the definition does not take into account USF's moral and political imperative for community engagement nor account for USF's historical roots in the community.
- Most members feel that they do aspire to AAU membership and Research Extensive status but that USF faculty should not have to compromise their core values to attain this status.
- A first-year faculty member commented that the definition was consistent with what she had been told about the university's goals and trajectory during her interviews and orientation.
- One faculty member commented that we should be examining the change processes universities undergo in becoming Research Extensive or AAU-like rather than develop a definition that may not fit us now.

Fine Arts Response

The draft document produced by the faculty roles task force committee offers a definition that emphasizes “knowledge creation” and “information” as core principles characterizing faculty. While it is generally assumed that that artistic and creative work results in the creation of knowledge, faculty in the College of the Arts urge that the definition include explicit language acknowledging creative and artistic productivity.

The creative artistic process explores and expands our understanding of the world and what it means to be human, expressing ideas through design, performance and exhibition that represent a unique way of producing knowledge. These values should be central to the mission of a research university. A recent Harvard study ranked the arts along with the sciences and humanities as “irreplaceable instruments of knowledge” and concluded that the experience and practice of art is central to the mission of a research-intensive university.

The forms of thinking inculcated in art training are valuable both in themselves and in what they help to enhance elsewhere in the curriculum. These include the development of craft, the sharpening of focus and concentration, and the empowerment of the imagination. Art-making is an expressive practice: it nurtures intense alertness to the intellectual and emotional resources of the human means of communication, in all their complexity. It requires both acute observation and critical self-reflection. This self-reflection—this drive to interrogate conventions, displace genres, challenge inherited codes of meaning—encourages risk-taking and an ability to endure repeated failures. It fosters both intelligent imitation and a desire to conceive and bring forth what has hitherto been unimaginable. Most notably, art-making requires empathy not only of its audience, but of the maker as well, who must consider personal expression—imaginatively—in light of public reception. Far from being a thing of the private sphere, the arts, if taken seriously, teach lessons in the public nature of all expression. Insofar as the project of contemporary art is to imagine the possibilities of the present through the double lens of both past and future, the mode of practice offered by the visual arts **is entirely commensurate with the aims of a research institution**. Comparable claims can be made for contemporary music, dance, and theater. Through a combination of research, critical examination, problem solving, and imagination, the arts present counter-models, problematize structures, and explore the affective and ethical dimension of human existence. It is these modalities of art that are in keeping with the fundamental core values of critical thinking, self-awareness, and compassion that are central to a liberal arts education. (*Report of the Task Force on the Arts*, Harvard University, December 2008)

These are values that we ought to keep in mind as we define faculty roles and responsibilities that are inclusive of arts and artists. Creative art is truly the most original research anyone can do, and it is an extraordinary challenge to teach it and to transmit that process to others. Poets and writers share the same territory as our painters, sculptors, choreographers, musicians, actors, designers and architects. It is vital for us to develop language that expresses these concepts in order to establish our true value to the university at a time when the arts and humanities are under siege.

Individual responses:

- In the Arts, creation of new knowledge, cultivation and dissemination of knowledge are often infused in a production of dance, theatre, exhibition, and music performance. This unique nature of arts disciplines' contribution needs to be defined and articulated clearly so that the larger academic community can easily comprehend the impact and significance of the artistic contributions within and beyond the arts disciplines, university's recognition, and in the betterment of society.
- A better descriptor is needed, or an extended description should be added that includes "artistic" creation, cultivation and dissemination for those faculty whose discipline is in the arts, (Music, Art, Theatre, Dance, Architecture) and would also include poets and creative writers. Research in the arts includes not only factual, historical studies, but the study and creation of works of art, which do not fall under the descriptors "knowledge" or "information." It may be that the first paragraph (and subsequent entries which make sense could be adjusted to read): "The fundamental value of a top-tier research university is the disciplined creation, cultivation and dissemination of knowledge *and art*."
- The problem is that in the arts, while we ourselves may see our activities as "creating knowledge," persons outside of our disciplines have a difficult time understanding that the creation of a painting, or the design of a building, or the staging of a performance could be understood in such terms. As an architect and designer, it is important to express to those outside of architecture that design activities which contribute to critical architectural discourse are an important part of the creation of knowledge within the realm of design. We design, make, and talk about objects; this is how we contribute to the making of knowledge in our field.
- Artistic and creative work results in "knowledge creation" and "information" just as much as any other activity. Cognitive Science has been very helpful over the past several decades demonstrating that there are multiple ways to know, with the arts being a distinct method of producing knowledge and information. There is concern that singling out the arts as being some how different will only cause more problems than it will solve.

- If the faculty is able to work in an environment where their research activities are supported, rewarded, and acknowledged by the University, then we can continue to produce good work, improve our reputation, and attract top quality researchers and students, as well as acquire new sources of funding.
- Arts faculty roles and contributions should be clearly articulated as “central and critical to furthering the knowledge” and “contributes to the prominence of the institution as a whole,” which must be spelled out well in faculty reward and evaluation systems. We must have a leadership that comprehends the new concept; otherwise, the current punitive and selective style will promote more resentment and further erosion of faculty morale.

Engineering Faculty Response

In general the COE faculty agreed that the statement describes faculty roles at a research-intensive university, however it was felt that undergraduate teaching should focus on the development of critical thinking skills as opposed to knowledge generation. The engineering faculty also feels that USF has the potential to become a research-intensive university but improvements in the quality of the undergraduate students are needed. The engineering faculty also agreed that the definition accurately reflects their role at USF. The engineering faculty would accept this definition, with the exception of how the undergraduate teaching mission is described. They are in favor of USF setting its sights on becoming a research-intensive university.

Individual Responses from the College of Engineering:

To what extent does the statement appropriately describe faculty roles in a top tier research university? Please discuss how specific elements of this statement reflect the roles of faculty.

1. I agreed strongly with the statement as it pertains to the research role of faculty at a top-tier research university. I agreed less with the statements on teaching and service. In my opinion, teaching of undergraduates, even at a top-tier research university, should probably focus more on *critical thinking* than on the knowledge creation process. I think this is particularly true at a large state-sponsored university such as USF. In the CEE department, we turn out 100+ bachelors degrees per year. I think the important thing, both to them and to the state of Florida, is that we turn these students into critical thinkers, who are able to draw on their education to solve new problems they encounter. I think it is *less* important that we infuse our teaching with the knowledge creation process. At the doctoral level, certainly knowledge creation is *the central* educational goal; a PhD should be awarded when the candidate makes a significant new contribution to knowledge, and that contribution must be judged sufficient in both scope and quality by a committee of experts in the field. But at the undergraduate level, I think critical thinking is more important than infusion of knowledge generation.

2. Potential, if we get enough funding. There are a number of research active and well-known faculty who would like to move forward. We need baseline funding which is sufficient to have a good grants infrastructure. Currently, we cannot determine how much funding is in our accounts at any given time without going through a very laborious and inexact process. We also need to hire more faculty for critical mass (the ability to run large research grant programs and get the necessary recognition to both get those programs and get the desired ranking). This may force us to grow our student body on the Tampa campus to obtain the funding. Certainly, we must grow the graduate enrollment. It is important to have excellent faculty and there are positive aspects about the weather in this area, the lifestyle one can live, etc. They can attract people besides the university environment. We must capitalize on that as we currently do.
3. The parts on research and service look good. I think the teaching paragraph applies to the graduate level but doesn't accurately characterize undergrad teaching. I think undergrad classes at research universities aren't about disseminating new results; they're about covering the foundations of topics such that at the end students can understand the basic concepts in new results. (Ideally, a couple new results are included in an undergrad class, but those shouldn't be the focus.)

Do you envision USF as having the potential to be a top tier research university? Why or why not?

1. The statement did not define "top-tier research university." Therefore it is slightly hard to answer this question. However, if we infer that a top-tier research university is one at which the faculty are actively engaged in the activities described -- then I think yes, USF has the potential to be a top-tier research university.
2. It covers it to a reasonable extent.
3. Sure; if UC-Irvine, -Davis, and -Santa Barbara can do it, we should be able to too.
4. The challenge is to create a culture where professional recognition, as measured externally (Fellows, etc.), besides funding, is a top goal of faculty. Another big challenge is to "somehow" raise the quality of our students. This is one of the major complaints that I hear.

To what extent does this statement accurately describe your role at USF?

1. It is quite an accurate description of how I have interpreted my responsibilities at USF, and it is consistent with the feedback on my performance that I receive from my chairperson, T&P committee, etc. However, consistent with my comments above, I have geared my (undergraduate) teaching activities towards the creation

of a graduating body of critical thinkers, rather than infusing my teaching with the knowledge creation process.

2. I think people in our department would support this, as I would.
3. Well, except for the undergrad teaching component discussed above.

4. In the absence of a similar definition of faculty roles at USF, would you support adoption of this statement? To what extent would you expect others in your department/college to support it?

1. I would support it, but consistent with my comments above, I do have some concerns over the sections on teaching & service. For example...are student chapters of national professional organizations less valuable, because they are not focused on the generation of new knowledge? In my opinion, these student chapters are of great value to our students, and faculty that participate in these are doing important service, even though it does not result in the creation of new knowledge. In my opinion, with respect to (undergraduate) teaching and service, activities that are designed to help our students master existing knowledge and (especially) to become *critical thinkers* should be considered high-value activities, even if they do not directly support the knowledge creation process.
2. I wouldn't support it because of the undergrad-teaching issue described above. I think it's important for faculty even at top-tier universities to carefully prepare good courses that introduce undergrads to areas without covering many new results. Besides this teaching issue, I'd support the statement.

Do you agree that USF should aspire to be a top tier research university?

1. Yes. But I think we should better define what is meant by "top-tier research university" because that does not appear to be defined.
2. I have always been very interested in discovering new knowledge, research. The best way to accomplish that is to be at a top-tier research university. So, let's build one here in Tampa.
3. Yes, mostly. It'd be great, but I don't see it happening anytime soon, and I'd hate for us to misallocate resources (e.g., by downplaying undergrad teaching) in an unrealistic endeavor (e.g., achieving top-tier status within, say, 6 years). As long as we're realistic about it, I'm definitely in favor of working to improve our research standing.
4. That is why I am here!

Sociology Faculty Response

The point about the necessary differentiation of faculty roles is a good one. The readings we did on AAU and current literature all suggest that even top tier universities are now faced with the challenge of defining and valuing a diversity of faculty roles. This might reflect the realities of reducing instructional costs through increasing the numbers of instructors or nonpermanent appointments. However, all universities rely heavily on instructors, one function of which is to free up other faculty to focus on research. A definition embracing differentiation is the key, but I don't see that really reflected here, although it was talked about in our early meetings. I would expect that an instructor would respond to question 3 with the answer "no, not really," but then, what do we do? I'm pretty sure my faculty would think that this language and intent is elitist and not really based on the realities of contemporary university life. I also think they would be very suspicious of something that wasn't as inclusive as it could be, particularly now. They are also very process oriented and would want to know or be assured that this would be thoroughly vetted through the Faculty Senate. All faculty, including instructors, are evaluated annually on assignments distributed differentially in research, teaching, and service activities. Tenure track or tenured faculty have assignments weighted differently (perhaps) than instructors, but I would think that anyone subject to the departmental annual evaluation based on assigned duties is "faculty." Many faculty might value research as their core mission, but rarely, for tenure track people, does it comprise the majority of their assignment. So, if what we have here is a values statement, we then need to ask, who is in and who gets left out. If we're left with a self-defined community that is smaller than the larger group recognized departmentally as faculty then we need to recognize this incongruence.

A statement also needs to be clear about who is doing the defining and why. For example, in my experience, students don't know or care what title the person standing in front of the room has. They respond positively to good teaching, negatively to bad teaching, and, if so inclined at the upper undergraduate or graduate levels, expect someone to open opportunities for research but don't really care what that person is called by the institution. They are often unhappy to learn that instructors can't chair their committees, and can be very unhappy with the quality of teaching offered by a full professor. It's how it all fits together that matters. A student-centered or departmentally based definition would certainly emphasize differentiation, and an individually based values statement would have to, I think, value the complementary contributions of other faculty.

It also strikes me that somewhere along the line (over the years) we lost a meaningful definition of "graduate faculty." Some of the issues we're now grappling with might not have existed had we had clear criteria for achieving graduate faculty status.

Psychology Faculty Response

The psychology department was in strong overall agreement with the position statement, which was judged by department members to accurately reflect their understanding of what a top-tier university should be and their own values. A small number of people were worried that funding limitations would be an impediment to the advancement of the state university system as a whole, but in particular to USF relative to other leading state universities.

The university should “forge ahead and assert that in order to protect the concept of ‘faculty’ and in order to be within our aspirational goals, we need to limit the term faculty to faculty, regardless of the union” (which this person thought should be limited to tenured and tenure earning positions). Perhaps the track of Academic Professional could be reserved for other types of appointment.

Another faculty member thought that metrics of faculty productivity should be addressed; that is, “refereed publications or recognition by peers in the form of awards, grants and the like.”

Criminology Faculty Response

Generally, the criminology faculty supported the statement. While there was general agreement, respondents also pointed out several limitations that they thought restricted the usefulness of the statement. These observations included the following comments:

- The discussion of faculty service roles is limited, it seems, only to University and disciplinary service, and seems to overlook the ways in which community service promoted the dissemination of knowledge in important ways. It would be useful to extent this statement to include community service and acknowledge the ways in which community service also fulfills the role of knowledge dissemination.
- There was some concern that the statement was abstract on some points, especially with respect to key terms (e.g., the cultivation of knowledge).
- The statement seems to imply that some forms of teaching (e.g. graduate) are more valuable than others (e.g., undergraduate teaching), but there is some lack of clarity on this point. If this assumption is true or what was intended by the committee, then there needs to be a mechanism to allow faculty to have access to opportunities to teach at the graduate level.
- Some faculty may be “on the fence” concerning this type of statement because they fail to see a commitment to top tier status by the state or some university administrators.

- Among all of the questions, the issue of whether USF should be a top-tier university generated the broadest set of responses. Many believed this was possible, but that resources limited the effort to do so. Some, however, also noted that they believed that resources were so limited at the University that while they would endorse becoming top tier, they fear deficient resources would limited the University's ability to achieve top tier status. Others noted that there needed to be a better specified plan in place if this were the goal. What departments would receive resources? And why? Some departments that are not highly productive in terms of scholarship need to be treated differently (e.g., English) because they contribute to the University's educational mission, but not its top tier mission. Remediating these problems requires foresight. While the criminology faculty agreed this was an appropriate goal, they raised some concerns about alienating faculty in some departments, and how best to deal with that situation.
- Criminology faculty respondents generally agreed that the statement provided by the committee was consistent with their roles in the University. Some noted, however, that they are frustrated in their efforts to produce at a higher level given the large undergraduate course loads in criminology (from reports, I'd estimate that we have between 1700-1900 undergraduate majors). However, it was also noted that the chair makes an effort to accommodate productive faculty.
- Respondents also noted that there are trade-offs made within the department to attain top tier ranking. In three recent criminology Ph.D. program surveys, the department has ranked in the top 10 nationally and within North America on productivity indicators. The small size of the faculty has been a consistent difficulty, and internal mechanisms for differential teaching have been instituted to meet competing University missions, specifically the trade off between teaching undergraduates and faculty research productivity. Thus, the criminology faculty believe that, as a unit, it has successfully accomplished a top tier status – the problem is whether further gains can be made, and whether it is possible to maintain that status given resource restrictions.
- Overall, the criminology faculty agreed that they could endorse the committee statement. Here, too, however, some noted that they would like the statement simplified and clarified so that it was less abstract.
- The criminology faculty over-whelming agreed that USF should become a top-tier research university. Some noted, however, that they were unsure if there was the required level of resources committed to the University to make this outcome a reality.

College of Business Response

The Faculty Definition statement was sent to the Faculty Executive Committee of the College of Business for input. The following is a summary of responses for the five questions.

To what extent does the above statement appropriately describe faculty roles in a top tier research university? Please discuss how specific elements of this statement reflect the roles of faculty.

- There is agreement this meets the spirit of what it means to be a top tier faculty member. Creation is tops, teaching is part of the dissemination and service is important in that it helps set the stage for creation and dissemination. The most telling sentence starts with “A Top Tier.....system.” However, how can some of this be stated from a more meaningful output related definitional perspective? All of the accreditation agencies are really into outputs, not philosophy. So while this is useful how will it be interpreted in terms of outputs? For example does a \$10 million grant which examines a cross disciplinary issue and does not neatly fit into one of the top journals in any field have no or little value?

Do you envision USF as having the potential to be a top tier research university? Why or why not?

- Certainly not in the short term, maybe in 10-20 years. Having very limited financial resources is problematic and may lead to a waste of time and of the precious financial resources that we do have.

To what extent does this statement accurately describe your role at USF?

- Not much for faculty at Poly, Lakeland, if the plan for Poly becomes a reality. However, if for some reason Poly, Lakeland does not become independent then statement has to become the role of faculty.
- In the absence of a similar definition of faculty roles at USF, would you support adoption of this statement? To what extent would you expect others in your department/college to support it?
- Most will certainly support this, but some colleagues will not.

Do you agree that USF should aspire to be a top tier research university?

- There is room for another AAU school in Florida and USF is better situated than any other state university in Florida. However, understanding the politics of AAU invitation, it will be very difficult.

4. Summary of responses to the definition

- Faculty across units generally agree that USF should aspire to being a top-tier research university.
- Faculty across all units expressed concern that, to reach this goal, resources must be allocated to support research, to recruit outstanding students, and to hire new faculty. If the faculty's research activities are supported, rewarded, and acknowledged by the University, then we can continue to produce good work, improve our reputation, and attract top quality researchers and students, as well as acquire external funding.
- Several units suggested the need for some differentiation of faculty roles. As one example, the university might consider a designation such as *Academic Professional* or *Fellow* to create a culture that provides recognition, as measured externally.
- Faculty across several departments and colleges took issue with the description of research. Some expressed concern that the definition presupposes a particular approach to research and fails to recognize multiple forms of research and scholarship. Other forms of creative activity such as that of the arts must be explicitly recognized. Arts faculty roles and contributions should be clearly articulated as “central and critical to furthering the knowledge” and “contributes to the prominence of the institution as a whole,” which must be spelled out well in faculty reward and evaluation systems.
- Faculty across several colleges objected to what they perceived as an unbalanced emphasis on research as opposed to teaching as a reflection of faculty roles. One engineering faculty member stated, “I have geared my undergraduate teaching activities towards the creation of a graduating body of critical thinkers, rather than infusing my teaching with the knowledge creation process.”
- Faculty across several departments and colleges expressed concern with the definition of service. As one example, faculty engagement with student professional organizations should be valued regardless of the potential for creation of new knowledge.
- Faculty across several units expressed concern that the definition does not include explicit reference to community engagement. USF is ranked by the Carnegie Foundation as having a high level of community engagement, and this is a fundamental part of our mission.

–