

Taskforce on Faculty Roles, Responsibilities, and Rewards Responsibilities Workgroup

APPENDIX B: Summary of responses to survey of Chairs, by question.

Individual chair's responses are listed in each section below. In some cases, a short summary of responses is also provided (in italics preceding the individual responses). Portions of responses that could be used to identify specific departments have been deleted and replaced by brackets ([]).

1. Goal: Increase Research Funding

1.A What strategies are currently used to achieve this goal in your department?

Summary: Evaluative recognition and encouragement, mentoring by funded faculty, reduced teaching loads, use of RO money for bridge support, encourage teaming with funded faculty, encouraging interdisciplinary research, strategic research goals and making available information about RFPs, research time (and proposal development time) through assigned duties, private sector funding in addition to pursuing Federal grants, new outstanding faculty hires to increase critical mass in strategic areas, increasing proposal submission in targeted areas of national significance, support for grant writing, increased technological sophistication, facilitate attendance at workshops on sponsored research.

1. Grant submission considered in annual evaluation. Consider competitiveness for grants in hiring decisions.
2. Mentoring of junior faculty by those who already have NIH funding; NIH funding is extremely important part of annual evaluation; additional resources, when available, (e.g. extra travel money, TA's, etc. are directed toward faculty who are submitting NIH proposals or who have NIH funding; opportunities to meet potential collaborators are always being sought.
3. We reward faculty who pursue grants by reduced teaching loads and utilizing RO money to support their activity.
4. Developed "Principles and Goals for [dept] Faculty" document, which provides strategic goals for faculty re research and teaching. Sponsored faculty members to participate in advanced research skills workshops, and encouraged application to competitive NIH summer research institute programs for junior faculty.
5. Providing information on relevant rfps to all faculty. Modest financial support for tenure earning faculty. Encourage interdisciplinary research proposals with faculty who have a record of federal funding.
6. We have adopted a department Strategic Plan that incorporates "principles and goals" (describing what our department values with respect to research grants, publications, teaching, etc.). These emphasize NIH grant funding. We have incorporated these into faculty assignments and faculty evaluation process. Within these principles: Faculty are asked to build sustainable "lines of inquiry" that are compatible with our mission; NIH and other federal funding are most valued; all faculty are expected to be applying for research funding with a minimum goal of offsetting 25% of their salary plus paying for labor to conduct the research; and multi-year funding is emphasized. Collegiality and teamwork is emphasized.

7. Faculty applying for grants to support individual projects.
8. Internal funds and assigned duties (research time).
9. Stabilization of faculty strength with new faculty hires. The college of [college] Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require excellence in the trilogy of (1) research, (2) teaching, and (3) service. So by extension, faculty are required to obtain as much extramural funding as possible. The amount and type of funding is also documented in each faculty member's annual evaluation. Collaborative proposals among faculty and with local State and Federal partners increase likelihood of success. Additionally, the evolving relationship with major private sector partner [company] and other companies will yield research funds. Yet an additional way to increase research funding is to expand the number of private gifts from individuals, corporations or foundations that support basic non-proprietary research having broad application and use.
10. Keep course load to 2 courses/semester. Provide low teaching loads to new faculty together with large startup packages.
11. We will provide release time for large, high impact proposal development where feasible.
12. Encourage research activities by faculty. Try to provide reduced teaching assignments as incentives. We do not offer a large summer program so faculty have incentives to increase income by doing research during summer.
13. Give credit for research funding in annual evaluations.
14. Writing more targeted grants, looking for more collaboration, seeking to increase technological sophistication to attract funding.
15. Faculty is encouraged to attend the seminars on funding held by CAS. Faculty is encouraged to investigate collaborative options with faculty in other departments.
16. Hire outstanding research faculty in targeted areas based on a careful analysis of current and projected national trends in [research area]. Encourage interdisciplinary research in targeted areas of national significance. Actively promote increased submission of (e.g., health communications) to pursue funding; making clear the importance attached to competitive proposals. Focus on research funding as a measure of productivity in annual evaluations.
17. Encouragement, recognition, some course releases to give faculty time to prepare proposals.
18. Encouraging all faculty and especially younger faculty and those working in more fundable areas this by USF and hence to future of department.
19. Selectively reduce teaching load to 2-2.
20. Encouraging faculty to identify and seek out research grants.
21. Providing support (time and financial) for writing external grant proposals.
22. Faculty in [dept] have recently decided to seriously collaborate in grant writing and application, especially since [dept] now has a PhD program.
23. We are working within and across the USF finding partners and seeking internal support for interdisciplinary research projects at NSF.
24. Pairing successful grant recipients with new and/or junior faculty members. Encouraging interdisciplinary projects. Having new faculty attend workshops on sponsored research.
25. Faculty are seeking out funding sources and searching databases for federal funding opportunities and preparing proposals for submission to funding agencies.
26. Identification of opportunities and encouragement to pursue opportunities as appropriate.

27. We strongly encourage grant applications.
28. Making faculty aware of grant opportunities and encouraging them to apply.
29. N/A.
30. No departmental policy as such, but encouragement of applications for available grant opportunities by the chair and faculty mentors.
31. Three faculty members currently identify and submit/have submitted /will submit grants for external funding. A new hire will have a 25% assignment to identify and submit grant proposals.

1.B What barriers impede your department's progress toward this goal?

Summary: Teaching loads, lack of technical and staff support, lack of collaborative atmosphere at USF, lack of tangible rewards and credit, poor post-award service from DSR, decrease of Federal and State dollars and poor fiscal climate for social sciences research, lack of external funds in MIS/Business and Humanities, grants limited in performing arts, lack of internal funds, limitations in salary and start-up for new hires, poor economic outlook in near future, lack of tools to address the problem of underperforming tenured faculty, lack of critical mass in faculty, inadequate graduate student support (especially in first year), multiple distracting demands on faculty time, lack of adequate research space, productivity in some disciplines does not require research funding, holdback of RO money to Department and PI, lack of doctoral program, non-competitiveness with external peers.

1. Teaching loads. Access to technical support, statistics support.
2. Lack of collaborative atmosphere at USF Health; lack of infrastructure (programmers, health economists, etc.); lack of truly tangible rewards after faculty has brought in sufficient funding to cover summer salary and buy out of as much teaching as is allowed.
3. The current fiscal climate for social science research is poor. Faculty with funding are poorly serviced by sponsored research post awards.
4. Federal research dollars have not increased, and in some areas have decreased in the past three years. State contract and grant resources have also declined significantly in the past several years.
5. Only a few have ever received federal funding and even those have been extremely modest. Very few RFPs at the federal level are social work specific.
6. No real barriers. It is just a matter of time before all faculty have some grant support.
7. Grants in the performing arts are extremely limited.
8. Lack of staff; lack of internal funds – limitations of what constitutes research achievement in one of our disciplines.
9. Availability of funding for salaries and startup packages for additional faculty will be a major obstacle to achievement of this objective. Recognizing that [dept]'s success in the allocation of budgets for the next academic year will be based on how well our planning priorities align with the strategic goals of the University, we are still concerned that the state of the general economy will take precedent and is a factor over which we have no control. Tools to motivate underperforming tenured faculty are needed. [Dept] has a few members who could be more productive. Their lack of productivity hurts [dept]. General lack of knowledge, training, benefits and faculty credit regarding the procurement of private funds to support research initiative.

10. Nothing.
11. We must account for time reasonably on the faculty assigned duties. We must cover classes.
12. Not having enough critical mass in research areas. Not having enough resources to support graduate students especially in the first year.
13. Limited funding available for [dept/area] discipline for research from external sources.
14. Little support from USF for buying or maintaining technology, too many demands on faculty time detracting from ability to write grants and papers.
15. Decrease in [dept] funding from [academic area].
16. Lack of adequate research space. Lack of adequate infrastructure. Lack of adequate rewards for faculty members who are truly meritorious.
17. Time, time, time. Faculty simply don't have enough time, given heavy load of teaching, especially graduate advisees. Also research office's bureaucratic procedures can be very burdensome. And there seems very little reward; my department is one of the most productive in the college, and yet we do not get faculty lines, increase in GA support, or anything else. We bring in more money than many of the natural sciences – they get the rewards, we don't. Latest policy in CAS is a great disincentive – the reduction in RO money to dept and PI. I do not appreciate the fact that my RO money seems to be going to pay start up for multiple new lines in the Natural Sciences, while we get nothing.
18. Our faculty are highly productive but do work that requires very little funding
19. School short-staffed.
20. Our field is not very well-funded, but we have been receiving sizeable training grants.
21. Funding for qualitative sociological research is limited at the national level. Lack of Ph.D. program and high teaching loads is limiting.
22. The usual difficulty of attracting substantial external grants in the social sciences, compared to the natural/hard sciences.
23. Faculty time in depts.. That our understaffed – [displines within college].
24. Low priorities for research in department specialties. Competition from other colleges and universities with better track records.
25. Faculty have very heavy teaching loads, particularly due to the specialized courses that we need to teach at the doctoral level. In addition, they have heavy loads with supervising/advising on doctoral committees, not only for students in the department but across the College of [college] as well. Due to the nature of the specialized advanced level courses that we need to teach in the areas of [teaching areas] the option of using adjuncts on buyout from grants for these courses is not feasible.
26. The greatest funding opportunities are in the specialties of a relatively small number of the faculty.
27. The amount of grants funding in the Humanities is miniscule.
28. Humanities grants are so small as to be almost negligible in relation to large grants in applied science, when talking about dollar amounts.
29. Barriers exist due to so few opportunities for research grants in the Humanities and far too many applicants for those.
30. We don't believe in barriers.

1.C What institutional policies or resources would help your department to achieve this goal?

Summary: Grant-writing workshops at USF, summer funding for faculty grant-writing, summer research assignments, summer GA support for research, more USF support for graduate students and postdocs, appropriate University policies regarding support of interdisciplinary collaborative research (such as indirect cost-sharing among units, credit for multi-PI projects, etc.), possibility for extra compensation in excess of summer salary for faculty who bring in grant funding, reorganization of post-award at USF, funding for faculty to attend national research conferences and workshops (particularly for junior faculty), reduce committee work, strategic planning between Dean and Provost (perhaps through Compact Plan) to allocate resources for investment in hiring, required training in grantsmanship with invited trainers from Federal agencies, more faculty to reduce teaching load, facilitate inter-unit connections for collaborative research such as combined sciences/humanities grants, increase staff support for grant writing and grant management within Colleges to reduce oppressive burdens on faculty, provide resources for shared infrastructure, more seed grants at USF to encourage grant-writing, identification and communication of grant opportunities to relevant faculty.

1. Summer Institutes to support grant writing in CAS helpful. Funding for initial summers to support faculty in grant writing. Better central support for budgets, etc.
2. University-wide policy on inter-departmental and cross-VP research (re-indirects, credit, etc.) is essential to support collaborative research; University policy on faculty receiving extra compensation from their grant, if they bring in enough grants to cover their summer and want to have extra comp.
3. A re-organization of sponsored research post-award.
4. Internal grant programs to fund pilot research. Research mentorship opportunities for junior faculty. Awards for promising junior faculty to support involvement in advanced research skill training workshops.
5. Additional ways to facilitate experienced researchers connecting up with those who have a track record of federal funding.
6. Continue funding for junior faculty to attend research conferences and NIH research workshops. Reduce committee work related to university governance and processes, and spend more time to do the grant writing.
7. Unknown.
8. Money, summer research assignments, summer grad student research assistant funds; change the definition of research so that prestigious achievements in one of our disciplines "counts".
9. Agreement between Dean and Provost on priorities, investments, and actions in support of the USF and [dept] Strategic Plans, i.e. Compact Plan, would focus efforts and planning. Reallocation of funds to [dept] for salaries and startup packages would increase our competitiveness in attracting faculty with proven track records in attracting research dollars. Expansion of the role of Unit Development Officers to include this critical component of support. Required training in grantsmanship with annual recertification. Invite trainers from major funding organizations, e.g., NSF, NOAA, DOD, DHS to share organizational priorities and suggest strategies for success.
10. More faculty to reduce course load.
11. Set policies that facilitate this.
12. Provide more resources for support of doctoral students and post-docs.

13. Facilitate connections with other disciplines and research areas where funding is readily available. Fix the grant reporting system at USF, by giving credit to Co-PIs and subcontractors for a grant.
14. Decrease the administrative burden on faculty-increase the staff support so faculty are not writing their own letters, doing their own accounting, working with an oppressive set of business practices.
15. No.
16. Provide adequate numbers of competent research staff support in aiding the mechanics of grant-writing and submission, as well as post-awards' supports. Provide resources for shared infrastructure. Develop a coherent plan to allow research-active faculty members to earn rewards, specifically by providing mechanisms for them to earn salary overload (beyond the 9-month plus 3 salary) through increased grant productivity.
17. New hires.
18. Acknowledgment of this fact.
19. With implementation of new Ph.D. program we should move forward in this area. Teaching release time for those obtaining external funding would be helpful.
20. The regular workshops on grant writing and application held by the College of Arts & Sciences will prove very helpful.
21. USF 50K research grant is a powerful incentive and more smaller 5-10K grants may help other individual faculty members in the pursuit of research grants externally to USF College of Education inventive grant programs need to expand. Excellent grant management support staff within each College.
22. Increased support in locating funding sources and grant writing.
23. We need 2 additional faculty members to reduce teaching and dissertation supervision loads of faculty. We need one support staff member to manage the budget (including grants) and other administrative functions in the department. Currently we have only 1 support staff person at 80% time to provide support services for all faculty and students for the entire department.
24. Make the technical, administrative, accounting, etc. dimensions of grants easier for faculty. Official statements on grants have over-stressed the dangers associated with grants (e.g., compliance) rather than the opportunities grants present.
25. More seed grants made available for at the university – genuine SEED grants, contingent on applying for further grants (half of grant should be withheld until proof of application for external grants).
26. Encouragement efforts for interdisciplinary research through elimination of barriers to such, building bridges to grant applications for science and humanities combined projects.
27. Clerical assistance; continuation of identification of grant opportunities by Sponsored Research and Provost's office; additional research time for faculty seeking grants.

2. Goal: Enhance Faculty Research and Scholarly Productivity

2.A. What strategies are currently used to achieve this goal in your department?

Summary: Focus on scholarly publications and citations as an integral part of annual evaluations, mentoring junior faculty, travel support to conferences, strategic multi-year goal-planning for scholarly output, lighter teaching load through course release, course buy-out,

teamwork, support staff for grant writing, new faculty hiring in strategic areas, focus on new sub-areas of research that enhance funding and scholarship, raising expectations for doctoral dissertations, encourage and reward graduate student productivity, fostering interdisciplinary research and providing credit to all partners, permitting teaching overloads in one semester to free up the next semester for research, increasing expectations for T&P, well-articulated research agendas, high-quality graduate student population.

1. Publications considered in annual evaluation.
2. Mentoring junior faculty; publishing in high-impact journals is very important part of annual evaluation; provide as much travel support as possible to attend important conferences; attempt to bring in Ph.D. students in areas of interest that match faculty research
3. We reward faculty for publication by recognition and when possible by use of departmental financial resources to sustain professional activity.
4. The Chair has initiated annual faculty plans for each calendar year, as a focal point for faculty-Chair/supervisor discussions regarding goals and objectives for the upcoming year. We've established departmental metrics related to research, teaching, and services, and at the request of Dean [dean] have completed a 1-3-5 year plan to increase research and scholarly productivity.
5. All tenure earning a tenured faculty have a somewhat lighter teaching load in order to promote research activity.
6. Faculty conduct their work mostly through team work within and outside of the department; Chair invests funds (e.g., Department RI account dollars) into consultants, external reviewers of grants and publications; support of junior faculty travel to national conferences; establishment of a department biostatistician position; two support staff who contribute to grant writing and grant submission.
7. Course release for research and scholarly activity; rating of research work above satisfactory requires national or international focus.
8. Same as above. Internal funds and assigned duties (research time).
9. With an additional 4 faculty positions, we should be able to increase research funding, and publications. More emphasis is placed on the quality of publications and the quality of PhD students. Even with the expected 4 new ranked faculty hires in early 2009, [dept] will have 4 fewer ranked faculty than in past years. We fully realize that under the severe economic conditions and the hiring freeze, the ability to rectify this situation will be delayed. As we are able, it is our plan to grow the program to increase stability and sources of revenue for research, support and infrastructure, while demonstrating community relevance. The new area of concentration in [area] will foster new areas of research and publication. Consideration is being given to another new area of concentration in [area]. Under development I an Action Plan to support the SP that would establish a methodology to assess faculty research productivity.
10. As above. Keep course load to 2 courses/semester. Provide low teaching loads to new faculty together with large startup packages.
11. We mentor young faculty. We carefully review all faculty and provide suggestions for how to improve.
12. Same as above. Recognize research intensive faculty by reducing their teaching load. Allow faculty to buyout of courses if they have research funding.

13. ISDS Research Award provides bounty money from private sources to faculty members who publish in select premier journals. Raising expectations for Ph.D. dissertations, by encouraging a three essay format, with the expectation that one of the essays be published in a premier journal.
14. Provide travel funds to meetings to increase faculty exposure and level of interaction; through scheduling provide opportunity for faculty to have "field days" to collect data vital for research; encourage graduate student writing of publications earlier in training career; encourage and reward graduate student grant writing efforts.
15. Faculty is encouraged to hold seminars to include USF colleagues and to participate in national and international professional conferences.
16. Hire outstanding research faculty in targeted areas based on a careful analysis of current and projected national trends in [area]. Encourage interdisciplinary research in targeted areas of national significance. Actively focus on both quality and quantity of scholarly publications and citations as a measure of productivity in annual evaluations.
17. Hire the best faculty, support with course releases if we can. High standards for T and P.
18. We are already very strong in research and scholarly productivity.
19. Retain research faculty.
20. Same as above, as well as faculty recognition in annual evaluations.
21. Providing as much time and support for research productive faculty to continue their scholarship.
22. Granting faculty more one-semester research leaves or sabbaticals, travel grants, and more time for research and creative activities.
23. Fostering a more collaborative research culture and giving each principal investigator credit on joint projects.
24. Consistent encouragement to be productive. Strong support and encouragement from department mentors. Frequent circulation of calls for proposals and manuscripts.
25. Faculty in the department have clear and well articulated research agendas. Encourage and facilitate collaborative work in this area between and among faculty and graduate students.
26. Reward it.
27. Our faculty is incredibly productive already.
28. Formal mentoring twice yearly of all junior faculty, and more informal meeting with chair on a regular basis. Two one-semester research leaves for junior faculty.
29. Encouragement, exhortation. Publicizing individual grant opportunities, writing support letters. Ratcheting up standards for annual evaluation and P&T. Emphasizing in hiring decisions. Starting flexible teaching schedule such that faculty can get a semester off for research by teaching overloads.
30. Course releases to junior faculty, esp., and encouragement to apply for research grants both internal and external; newsletter to highlight and praise such efforts and achievements.
31. Since most of the faculty are untenured, the reward of tenure and promotion are effective; Periodic meetings with the Chair; Recognition of productivity; attention to teaching loads; Lobby Dean's Office for travel funds; a strong graduate student population.

2.B What barriers impede your department's progress toward this goal?

Summary: High teaching loads, lack of resources for release time or summer salary, time wasted on committees, large fraction of faculty who cannot contribute effectively as they were tenured and promoted prior to current research emphasis, lack of tools to motivate unproductive tenured faculty, lack of resources for travel, lack of rewards for productive research faculty, lack of discretionary reward mechanisms for chairs, lack of adequate number of highly qualified doctoral students, loss of graduate faculty, lack of doctoral program, poor quality of undergraduate students requiring excessive remedial help, inadequate library resources.

1. Teaching loads.
2. Lack of resources to provide release time or summer salary for junior faculty starting their research careers.
3. Lack of financial resources.
4. No major barriers.
5. We need more teaching only faculty so research faculty can focus more on their research endeavors.
6. Too much time expended on faculty governance and academic committees, to many ad hoc committees being formed.
7. Significant percentage of faculty tenured and promoted in era before research was as important to the process. Significant amount of assigned creative activity on campus makes the ability of the faculty to be absent for six to eight weeks (typical of performance based work on a national scale) increasingly difficult when there are no funds for replacement faculty.
8. Funds and flexible scheduling.
9. Tools to motivate underperforming tenured faculty. Ability to compete successfully for dwindling Federal funds. There is a need for a better understanding of the components of this assessment tool and discussion on methodology employed and its applicability to various University entities.
10. Nothing written.
11. In competing with other departments nationally, our teaching load is higher.
12. Not enough rewards for research productive faculty. Raises are limited and bonuses are not usually available. Chairs and deans need more discretionary authority to provide raises based on productivity.
13. Lack of adequate number of high quality Ph.D. students.
14. Travel funds have been cut, our graduate recruitment has been cut by at least 50% over the last 2 years due to reorganization of the [dept] Department. Both have been major blows to our excellent program.
15. Lack of travel and colloquium funding.
16. Lack of critical mass in faculty size (Our [area] department has 22 tenured/tenure-earning faculty members compared to an average of 50 for [area] departments in AAU institutions). Lack of adequate state-of-the-art equipment for competitive experimental research. Lack of research space which should be partially addressed by the new ISA building.
17. Faculty are overloaded.
18. Lack of funding for research assistants. Raises given for "merit" that essentially reward all faculty about the same.
19. Lost one third of graduate faculty in 2008-2009 alone.

20. Workload and the lack of a Ph.D. program.
21. High teaching and advising loads; lack of Ph.D. program.
22. The lack of more faculty, the increase in class sizes, and too much participation by the few faculty in service activities at the departmental, college, and university levels.
23. Reduced opportunities for travel. Reduced availability of RAs.
24. Lack of funding or support available for graduate research assistantships.
25. Rewards chair has to distribute are limited. The department faculty review committee may not distinguish adequately between productivity that makes a genuine contribution to knowledge and more routine work.
26. None that I know of.
27. Other demands on faculty time including teaching and services.
28. Need more money for travel to conference and to archives. Need more released time. Need more internal awards, especially to develop proposals to apply for external grants. (At Florida State, my former institution, a portion of overhead was devoted to internal awards in Humanities.) Need more sabbaticals. Need better library.
29. Heavy committee assignments, university service roles, so many bureaucratic demands for doing official reports, filing out and submitting forms, etc.
30. Lack of funds for travel (particularly international travel); Small faculty, thus inability to vary teaching assignments very much; quality of undergraduate students – who NEED attention to basic skills development (my faculty will not pass the buck, thus spend lots of hours tutoring students).

2.C. What institutional policies or resources would help your department to achieve this goal?

Summary: More summer research funding for junior faculty, financial rewards for productive faculty, protect faculty time from excessive service, adjunct faculty funding to free research faculty engaged in scholarly activity, rewards for interdisciplinary interaction, multi-year review based on identified scholarly metrics, change the system for faculty raises focusing on merit-based raises, provision of 12-month salaries for research-active faculty, more graduate student support, increase graduate stipends, funds for travel and perhaps conference fees, more competitive start-up costs in the sciences, funds for seed grants, more high-quality faculty hires, development of adequate space, less stringent institutional demand on SCH generation.

1. More summer research funding for junior faculty.
2. Provide added financial incentives and other incentives for productive faculty.
3. Ongoing support of [college] Dean.
4. Recognize the need for teaching, exclusive faculty in professional programs.
5. Rely more on the Faculty Senate rather than ad hoc committees in order to protect faculty time.
6. Funding for replacement faculty while regular faculty are engaged in off-campus creative work.
7. Money and more flexible means of assigning duties, such as summers.
8. A framework for a t-year review of individual faculty's research/teaching/student enrollment productivity, including quality metrics related to scholarly pursuits and community engagement activities. Design bottom-up. Encourage and reward collaboration of faculty and scientists across academics disciplines. Reiteration of the

benefits of AAU membership (and other institutional ranking/rating achievements) at every opportunity. Reallocation of funds to [dept].

9. Change how raises are given.
10. Increase Ph.D. stipend amount. Increase funding to support more Ph.D. students.
11. Clearly more graduate student support, an increase in graduate stipends to help attract the best students, more funds to allow faculty to travel to meetings; more funds to support seed grants.
12. Additions funds to support travel and colloquia.
13. Increased startups for incoming faculty hires which has increased over the past few years, but is still almost a factor of two less than our national counterparts in this regard. Hiring productive faculty at the Full Professor level to USF [dept]. Almost all our hiring is directed at the Assistant, and rarely the Associate Professor level. Of course, impediments to Full Professor hires are the associated salary and start-up needs.
14. Faculty lines. More funds for research travel.
15. Better salaries and real merit for research-active faculty.
16. Swift counter offers.
17. Allow the establishment of a Ph.D. program with attendant resources.
18. Allowing chairs to better provide research productive faculty the time they need by lifting somewhat stringent SCH expectations – expectations that, if not met, reduce a department's ability to enhance its resources.
19. Financial commitment by the Provost's office or Dean's office to hire more Professors/Instructors.
20. Increase opportunities of internal research awards.
21. Some funding for Graduate research assistantships.
22. In addition to cost-of-living raises we need more merit raises.
23. More sabbatical opportunities. Funds can be made available for adjuncts to relieve some of the faculty's teaching for them to become even more productive.
24. Shorter semesters, 12-month salary option, fall break similar to spring break, summer research grants to replace summer teaching.
25. Provision of adequate space for offices, adequate secretarial support, more opportunities for sponsored research grants, more travel grants. More funds for travel to present at conferences.
26. Policies that require that the institution, when it admits students, does ALL it can to prepare incoming students (even from community colleges!) to be prepared to take on college-level studies; Less institutional demand on high enrollments; Committed, predictable travel dollars; funding for conference fees.

3. Goal: Increase faculty awards, fellowships, memberships

3.A What strategies are currently used to achieve this goal in your department?

1. a natural result of enhanced faculty research and scholarly productivity
2. a natural result of enhanced faculty research and scholarly productivity
3. Highlight, honor, and award faculty achievement

4. Self-motivation of faculty; Encouragement from the Chair; Availability of the Chair to assist with the process/write letters of nomination/recommendation.
5. Being more proactive in nominating faculty for awards. Identifying opportunities for faculty.
6. Faculty is encouraged to apply for all awards for which they are eligible.
7. (i) Informing faculty members about relevant opportunities. (ii) All our faculty members are already active participants in their professional societies
8. Encourage faculty to apply. Use successful applicants as role models
9. Make faculty aware of these awards, encourage them to consider appropriate ones.
10. Few if any in our field except for Fulbright
11. Same as in increasing research funding, above.
12. We will hopefully move in this direction with the development of our new Ph.D. program
13. Protecting research time; targeted travel to conferences; research mentoring
14. Consistent encouragement to seek awards and fellowship
15. Frequent circulation of announcements related to awards and fellowships
16. Special meetings related to fellowship application procedures
17. Keep current with potential awards/fellowships applicable to our field in education.
18. Most feasible for our area is the Fulbright – continue to encourage faculty to apply .
19. We encourage faculty to apply for fellow status in professional organizations when we believe they are ready.
20. Generally recognize all awards received by faculty. Faculty achievements are highlighted in Newsletters and Annual Reports
21. We are learning to be more aggressive and resourceful in nominating our best faculty for appropriate awards. An Action Plan to support the [Dept] Strategic Plan objective in this area (Nominate outstanding [dept] faculty for national awards) is being developed.
22. Currently, 2 of the 15 full-time faculty are on Fulbrights and 3 have received awards from the [organization], which do not carry any weight in AAU indicators.
23. Same as above
24. Have not addressed but can begin making effort to nominate individuals (e.g., [professional organization] Fellow)
25. Senior faculty review our School membership every time an award notice comes out, to see if we have a good candidate; host reception at major annual meeting so all faculty and students get to network with leaders in field
26. We provide travel and other forms of support for faculty engaged in professional activities to enhance university and departmental visibility
27. The Chair and Associate Chair have scanned available awards for faculty members, and alerted faculty of the need to apply for awards, as applicable. [College] has hosted a workshop on Fulbright awards, and the Chair has encouraged several faculty to initiate Fulbright applications.
28. Providing information and encouragement to apply. Contributing to a group that is establishing a National Academy for [profession]. They faculty already belong to and hold office in Professional organizations.
29. Encourage faculty applications for fellow status in professional organizations
30. [Dept] Research Award to encourage faculty to publish in top journals, thereby leading to recognition in the field.

3.B What barriers impede your department's progress toward this goal?

1. see above.
2. see above.
3. Not having the time to devote to the types of activities that would encourage and show appreciation for such
4. Time. Because of our commitment to quality teaching, faculty tend to honor their roles as teachers before anything else.
5. Awards are quite limited in scope, many faculty don't qualify... hard to compete on the national stage when other nominees are from tier 1 universities with a long history of providing the infrastructure to enhance faculty output and ability to sustain highly productive research programs
6. Very limited number of awards in [area].
7. Awards are related to research productivity and scholarship. So, the comments above apply to this category as well.
8. Same as above – time, and sense of being rewarded
9. Few are really feasible for faculty in [dept].
10. Not many nationally-recognized awards in this area.
11. Faculty members must pair an award with a sabbatical in order to afford to be away
12. Many prestigious memberships are outside of [academic area]
13. Several types of awards are only for senior faculty members, e.g., Fellows of learned societies.
14. Need more outlets at the college level and university level for recognizing faculty achievements.
15. Time, energy, to search for awards and to assemble the nomination packages.
16. One third of the faculty are within three years of retirement, and one third of the faculty are in non-tenure earning positions. This leaves 5 faculty to actively seek awards. Awards given by the professional associations in [area] which are most critical to establishing the professional reputations of the faculty in the disciplines (such as [organization]) do not carry any weight in AAU indicators.
17. Communication and “buy in”
18. High teaching load keeps faculty from being as productive as they could be
19. Lack of financial resources
20. No major barriers
21. By comparison to other disciplines very few awards etc. available exclusively to social work.
22. None noted
23. [College] disciplines not considered for any national academy memberships.

3.C What institutional policies or resources would help your department to achieve this goal?

Summary: The responses suggest a number of lines of approach, from better publicity about the awards and recognition for award winners, to more incentives for applicants and their departments.

1. Assistance from senior level administrators, members of the faculty, and volunteers in identifying the "who's who" in the national and international awards process. Training, replacement of lost faculty lines, and staff lines. A schedule of awards nomination solicitations, a call to specific departments as appropriate, training on writing nominations. Outline of benefits to individual and University. Resources to [dept] for staff to take on this and other responsibilities specific to supporting quest for AAU membership.
2. More inclusivity as to types of awards which are valued
3. Easily searchable databases by disciplines
4. Need better clarity as to what types of awards, fellowships, memberships are important...e.g., is becoming a Fellow of a professional group within discipline count
5. Competitive salaries to keep our current and potential award winners at USF
6. Provide added financial incentives and other incentives for productive faculty and offer support for professional activities such as journal editorships
7. Ongoing support of [college] Dean
8. Recognize and value membership and leadership in professional organizations, not just academic.
9. Encourage department chairs to invest carry forward funds to acknowledge faculty members' achievements in research, teaching, and service. Consider awards for faculty who provide national service that brings favorable recognition to the university (e.g., testimony to Congress).
10. The University and College should have a policy of "making whole" Fellowship recipients and allowing the Fellowship awards to remain in the department. There should be greater rewards/recognition for having won a fellowship, including effort reporting of fellowship applications
11. Shorter semesters. 12-month salary option. fall break similar to spring break. summer research grants to replace summer teaching.
12. Need more money for travel to conference and to archives. Need more released time. Need more internal awards, especially to develop proposals to apply for external grants. (At Florida State, my former institution, a portion of overhead was devoted to internal awards in Humanities.) Need more sabbaticals. Need better library.
13. Perhaps provide budgetary categories that would themselves to activities and involvement leading to achievements of this nature.
14. Policies that require that the institution, when it admits students, does ALL it can to prepare incoming students (even from community colleges!) to be prepared to take on college-level studies; Less institutional demand on high enrollments; Committed, predictable travel dollars; funding for conference fees.
15. More infrastructure support
16. Institute more internal awards to provide both early recognition for productive younger faculty members as well as ongoing recognition for high-performing senior researchers.
17. Some kind of incentives to individuals and departments that apply, and rewards for those who do. Eg. Guarantee a visiting line for departments whose faculty get year long fellowships (guggenheim, ACLS etc), rather than adjunct replacement.
18. Recognize the prominence of awards in our field.
19. Reduce the number of years necessary for faculty members to apply for sabbaticals. Increase the amount of support for faculty members who take two-semester sabbaticals.

20. Better communication. Have annual college meetings to recognize faculty achievements and provide some financial incentives as well.

4. Goal: Increase # of PhDs awarded

4.A What strategies are currently used to achieve this goal in your department?

Summary: Departmental chairs noted a wide range of strategies for increasing the number of PhD's awarded, with the more frequent responses including: (1) recently established a new PhD program; (2) recently proposed a new PhD program that was not approved; (3) currently developing a proposal for a new PhD program; (4) marketing/recruitment to attract strong PhD candidates; (5) increasing grant funding to support PhD students; and (6) including PhD mentoring on faculty evaluations.

1. Frequent discussions, surveys, etc.
2. Developed [clinical degree]-PhD track; developing Bachelors to PhD track
3. Recruit and admit only very good applicants; use salary savings from faculty grant buyouts to support Ph.D. students; attend conferences where students are recruited; mentoring of Ph.D. students is important part of annual faculty evaluation
4. We have established and accessible, achievable, affordable program for established professionals. Program is oversubscribed, allowing us to choose the best candidates.
5. n/a We mentor doctoral students from other departments. Our faculty have served as major professor for 10 doctoral graduates from [dept].
6. Aggressive marketing to attract high quality Ph.D. students.
7. We are increasing the number of Ph.D.s we are awarding
8. working to develop interdisciplinary PhD programs in conjunction with related departments
9. The [dept] Dept has had to cut back our number of doctoral students owing to a loss of tenure-line faculty. We need 7 such faculty to get back to where we were a decade ago. We need at least 20 to get to where our peer universities are. We are currently wasting money on adjuncts that could be used instead for TA stipends to support more doctoral students if we had the faculty to teach them and supervise theses and dissertations. We could conceivably increase our doctoral student population by 50% (another 35 students) if we had the faculty.
10. Acquire a Ph.D. program. (We have put forth a proposal in the past, with the approval of former Provost Khator.)
11. Look to increase # PhD students per faculty member; add faculty members who can successfully train PhD students; decrease time to completion of award
12. Graduate students are advised to attend seminars and to focus on choosing a Ph.D. director early. Faculty is encouraged to direct Ph.D. students.
13. (1) [Dept] has increased the number of doctoral students from 4 (in 2000) to 62 (in 2008) by increasing Research Assistantships through grant productivity; (2) by actively monitoring individual progress to degree completion at the department level
14. Admit only the best. This year we have 180 graduate applications. We can choose the best, but we lose many because we cannot fund them. We actively encourage students to apply

- for NSF, Fulbright etc, to speed completion. And we are getting more success. Also developing more grant-funded assistantships
15. We are doing all we can with existing resources—we are very productive in terms of both numbers of PhDs graduating and time to graduation.
 16. The School has applied for the establishment of a Ph.D. program.
 17. [Dept]'s PhD Program will begin in the Fall of 2009
 18. We continue to tight requirements that allow students to more efficiently complete their programs of study.
 19. Increase the number of applicants admitted to doctoral programs
 20. Moved to a cohort model for admission to the doctoral program in fall semester only
 21. Seeking to recruit and admit a higher proportion of fulltime students into the doctoral program
 22. Submitted request for approval of an independent Ph.D. program in [Dept.] which would facilitate more timely completion of the Ph.D. program than currently occurs under the [another Dept. in same college] umbrella.
 23. Restructured schedule for course offerings to better facilitate a more timely progress toward degree completion
 24. Seeking to increase grant funding to provide for increase in the number of graduate assistantships for doctoral students
 25. The department already has about 130 Ph. D. students. This is a lot.
 26. Keep course load to 2 courses/semester. Provide low teaching loads to new faculty together with large startup packages.
 27. We focus our teaching assistant resources on students who are likely to move into research slots on their way to a Ph.D. Short of more faculty, we are not clear that we can increase.
 28. Guide the small discretionary funds available to support doctoral students.
 29. Base annual evaluations partly on phd granted

4.B What barriers impede your department's progress toward this goal?

Summary: There was much more agreement among responses concerning the barriers faced for increasing the number of PhD's awarded. The two most frequent responses were: 1) inadequate financial support for PhD students, in terms of the number of GA positions and the amount of stipend; 2) lack of faculty, especially more senior faculty, to mentor PhD students.

1. Time release to do the work by faculty; skepticism of the faculty that support would be forthcoming from USF
2. Lack of competitive funding
3. Insufficient funds to offer a truly competitive stipend, and to be able to guarantee it beyond the first year; faculty from other departments that have their own Ph.D. programs are reticent about mentoring our students
4. Major barrier is lack of senior faculty to support dissertation research, and act as major professors.
5. Lack of sufficient numbers of high quality Ph.D. students.
6. Insufficient number of teaching assistantships and graduate fellowships
7. little interest at institutional or state level for new PhD programs in the humanities

8. See box to left: The [name] Dept has had to cut back our number of doctoral students owing to a loss of tenure-line faculty. We need 7 such faculty to get back to where we were a decade ago. We need at least 20 to get to where our peer universities are. We are currently wasting money on adjuncts that could be used instead for TA stipends to support more doctoral students if we had the faculty to teach them and supervise theses and dissertations. We could conceivably increase our doctoral student population by 50% (another 35 students) if we had the faculty.
9. Politics.
10. Reduction of teaching assistant support for our department has led to reduced student recruitment. Some graduate students need to work outside of their research program in the summer because of limited summer support...this increases time to completion
11. Small number of senior faculty.
12. Lack of critical mass in faculty size (Our [name] department has 22 tenured/tenure-earning faculty members compared to an average of 50 for [similar] departments in AAU institutions); Lack of adequate state-of-the-art equipment for competitive experimental research; Lack of research space which should be partially addressed by the new ISA building
13. Insufficient GA funds. We have had to increase our Phd stipend to 15K to stay competitive, but we have had no increase in GA funds to cover that. Obviously that means fewer admittances. And competitors are now paying 18K or above. We cannot compete if funding stays stagnant.
14. As I have said on multiple occasions, our stipends are below what are offered by our competition, causing some students to have to work outside the dept.
15. Second, we are limited in the number of students we can support, and with more stipends, we could, with existing faculty, manage more doctoral students.
16. School has been pushing for the establishment of a program since 2006.
17. Enrollment is limited by the number of faculty advisors
18. Enrollment limited by accreditation standards
19. Lack of funding to offer scholarships or graduate assistantships to students which would allow for admission of more fulltime students into the doctoral program
20. Current stipend for Graduate assistantships are not competitive
21. Limited support for full-time students.
22. Our teaching load is higher than other comparable departments in the very dynamic field of [area].
23. Lack of resources to recruit high quality doctoral students

4.C What institutional policies or resources would help your department to achieve this goal?

Summary: Responses closely reflected the responses listed above for barriers, with two comments being dominant: (1) increase the number and size of stipends in support of PhD students and, (2) increase the number of faculty positions to support PhD education. Several responses also related to (3) the need for policies regarding the accounting of faculty time/effort for PhD student mentoring.

1. Money for time release and clear policies of support – statements by leadership in direct support, followed by money

2. Increased funding levels; more competitive funding
3. Establish University wide norms regarding workload for PhD supervision.
4. Provide acknowledgment and/or awards to faculty who have: (1) Served as major professor for high numbers of doctoral graduates; (2) Have helped doctoral students publish, write grants, or otherwise enhance their career; (3) Helped PhD graduates obtain work in prestigious placements (e.g., top tier universities; government; industry)
5. Increase Ph.D. stipend amount. Increase funding to support more Ph.D. students.
6. Promote USF brand to attract quality applicants.
7. The number of teaching assistantships should be significantly increased; there should be a few graduate fellowships assigned to PhD-granting Departments
8. more attention to the role of liberal arts as a central feature of prestigious universities
9. See box to left: The [name] Dept has had to cut back our number of doctoral students owing to a loss of tenure-line faculty. We need 7 such faculty to get back to where we were a decade ago. We need at least 20 to get to where our peer universities are. We are currently wasting money on adjuncts that could be used instead for TA stipends to support more doctoral students if we had the faculty to teach them and supervise theses and dissertations. We could conceivably increase our doctoral student population by 50% (another 35 students) if we had the faculty.
10. Institutional policies that consider the inclusion of the historically excluded, in context of our 21st century social, political, and economic reality; Consistent institutional support; A more apparent process.
11. Improve graduate student support levels, improve the number of teaching assistantships in the department
12. Additional faculty lines at the Associate or Professor level.
13. Provide a larger number of TAs (which is justified based on increased SCH) so that the total support for graduate students can be increased; Provide more Fellowships to attract high-quality applicants to USF
14. Same thing. More funds for assistantships, more fellowships on a par with presidentials. Some internal funds for fieldwork/dissertation research.
15. Thus, first, increase the amount of our PhD and MA stipends.
16. So, increase our OPS budget for graduate student support.
17. Recognize the importance of a Ph.D. program in our area, to be competitive with other top-notch schools.
18. Additional faculty positions in programs that consistently produce doctoral graduates
19. Increase in number of fellowships /scholarships available to incoming doctoral students (e.g., Graduate School Fellowships, scholarships from private donors)
20. Increase in stipend for graduate assistantships at the doctoral level to allow for them to be more competitive with other Research 1 institutions
21. More doctoral fellowships.
22. More faculty to reduce course load
23. Support a 2 and 1 teaching load or departments to have to constantly revise their courses.
24. Increase support for recruitment of graduate students

5. Goal: Increase number of postdocs

5.A What strategies are currently used to achieve this goal in your department?

Summary: Departmental chairs noted several strategies for supporting and increasing the number of post-doctoral fellows currently used at USF, including: 1) increasing focus and awareness of faculty through faculty fellowship committees or encouraging faculty to pursue support for fellows; 2) securing funding/support for fellows through identification of additional departmental funds, including support for a fellow in multi-year grant proposals, and pursuing grants specifically for supporting fellows (foundation, T32, etc); and 3) participating in the provosts new post-doc initiative.

1. The Chair has appointed a departmental post-doctoral fellowship committee. Chair has dedicated RI funds to support post-doctoral fellows to support a subsequent NIH T32 grant application that would provide funding for 2 fellows.
2. We have hired postdoctoral fellows by splitting a faculty line for which we were prevented from hiring a full-time faculty member. Then this line was cut. We now try to fund postdocs by grants and contracts and we plan to participate in the [college's] proposal on postdoctoral training.
3. We are cooperating in the Provost's Postdoctoral Pilot Project.
4. We may get a postdoc this year as a result of the Provost's new program for the Humanities and Social Sciences. We could take on as many postdocs as there is money to support them.
5. Faculty are encouraged to include post-docs in grants; provide space for those post-docs supported on grants.
6. Faculty is encouraged to find grants to support postdoctoral students.
7. Increasing research activity and associated grant support for postdoctoral scientists.
8. We have hired 2 on grants. We plan to use grant buy-out funds to hire more.
9. Besides the PostDoc program from the Provost's office, I have been in conversation or negotiation with a PostDoc who wants to come here next year to do work in health comm.
10. Encouraging PIs to include post-doc positions in their multi-year grant proposals.
11. Identifying funding sources that would support training of postdoctoral candidates. Actively seeking to attract postdoctoral fellows.
12. We are encouraging able to apply for grants to support postdocs. One faculty has recently put in such a proposal. We also encourage them to include postdocs on large grants.

5.B What barriers impede your department's progress toward this goal?

Summary: Departmental chairs identified several barriers for their department increasing the number of post-docs, including: 1) a general lack of funds to support post docs at USF; 2) post doc experiences are not typical in some areas of specialization (e.g., business, social work, mathematics); 3) uncertainty of budgeting from year to year that hinders ability to commit to post docs; and 4) lack of time or resources to pursue funding or develop fellowship.

1. Lack of grants held by faculty.
2. Funding is not currently sufficient to support postdocs.
3. Extremely few postdoctoral fellowships directed at social work.
4. Until recently, there has not been a designation for postdoctoral trainees or fellows. Recently USF established the process to use OPS-funded lines with benefits to hire post-docs.

5. There aren't sufficient funds (or the research grants) to support Post-docs in the Humanities.
6. Minimal support from the university to support post-docs.
7. Grants in [academic area] do not generally support postdoctoral students.
8. Uncertainty from one year to next – will we be allowed to keep buy-out fund accumulated at end of year.
9. No resources; not a long and strong tradition of postdoctoral work in Communication—we received a small number of applicants this year, with several truly outstanding.
10. There are a few opportunities for grants to support post-docs in the disciplines represented in the department.
11. Limited to no funding to support postdoctoral candidates.
12. No funds.
13. The time to write the proposals to get the funding. You typically need large funding to justify a postdoc. This often means a large team and a large proposal.
14. Lack of funds.

5.C What institutional policies or resources would help your department to achieve this goal?

Summary: Departmental chairs identified several policies and resources that could help them increase the number of postdocs, including: 1) on-going support and prioritization by USF leadership (e.g., Provost, Deans); 2) more direct support or funding (including matching funds) for postdocs by the university; 3) provide more flexibility and discretion in how current departmental funds can be used and 4) uniform policies/programming such as recent initiative by Provost.

1. Funding for interdisciplinary postdoc program would be helpful.
2. Ongoing support of [college] Dean.
3. Uniform policies regarding postdoctoral fellowships.
4. Acknowledge mentorship of postdocs when postdocs make major contributions or move on to prestigious careers thanks to their experience at USF.
5. The Provost is to be commended for the steps he has already taken.
6. Improve the amount of research space available; develop a robust program for university supported post-docs.
7. Direct support for postdoctoral students.
8. Provide matching funds for postdoctoral scientist support to units that are currently supporting postdocs through research grants. This will create a nonlinear increase in more grant funding (better investment of USF funds).
9. Give us more flexibility and discretion about how we use our funds.
10. Provide further resources for this.
11. Figure out a way to support release time for large proposal efforts that will result in postdocs.
12. Provide funding or partial funds for support of post docs.

6. What form should an effective post-tenure review take?

Summary: There are some outliers in these responses, but a fair consensus emerges about two poles: i) A full review, similar to a mid-tenure review, every 5 to 7 years; ii) Some procedure that

follows the annual review, if a faculty member receives unsatisfactory marks for 2-3 years in a row. Given that it would be difficult to imagine a situation such that the post-tenure review could be negative after many years of positive annual review, the two poles could be combined into one: robust annual reviews plus periodic more intense reviews in some cases.

1. Post-tenure reviews should be toughened up. Perhaps a 5-year review of progress on establishing a long-term research program, progress on research project objectives, ability to attract/retain graduate students and post-docs, including outside letters assessing a researcher's effectiveness in his/her field.
2. Every five years a college committee review of teaching, research, and service. Must achieve satisfactory or above in all three areas and if not achieved in any area a re-review in two years. If, after two re-reviews the faculty member has not achieved satisfactory in all three, he or she would be subject to dismissal. During the probationary time, there should be mentorship from the chair/director and funds for faculty development to address the problem area(s) should be made available.
3. Every five years after tenure. Once a prof is at Full rank, then every 7-10 years, there should be a means for salary increases similar to promotion. For high achievers, of course. Otherwise, similar procedures to T&P should be utilized.
4. Not sure we really need this IF annual evaluations were done appropriately. Unless there is reward/consequence for a post-tenure review, not sure what it would do except add another level of meetings.
5. Annual reviews should provide honest feedback about performance. Chairs and deans should meet annually to discuss outstanding performance that needs to be rewarded, to make sure those faculty continue to be outstanding. At the same time, they should discuss how to move more of the faculty into the outstanding category, so as to increase productivity. For those not measuring up, chairs and deans need to assess the problem and work with the faculty member to either become productive or consider other alternatives to their current assignments.
6. Every seven years a procedure modeled on the mid-tenure should be used to evaluate all faculty. In a "for-cause" case when a tenured faculty has received three consecutive years of "weak" in research and publication they should undergo a review.
7. Possibly involve the Chair and peer faculty committees in post-tenure reviews, with merit raises tied to identified performance benchmarks.
8. establish clear expectations, and indicators. If these are clearly not met in annual evaluations for five years in a row, the post-tenure review should be initiated
9. Formal review every five years, with some consequences to the faculty member for not meeting minimum expectations.
10. The issue should be a matter for the Chair and Personnel Committee of the Department. A Post-Tenure review should be undertaken if a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory annual evaluation for two consecutive years.
11. We could do a committee-judged seven-year review triggered by annual evaluations. I assume the goal would be to increase teaching for faculty with poor research records (assuming the teaching was good enough not to do a disservice to the students).
12. Not sure.

13. The assessment of continued scholarly productivity in relation to the agreed upon (by faculty as well as administrators) objectives of the University. Specific forms would be determined by Colleges and Departments.
14. Too complex to answer here, would need to have extensive conversations...what is the goal of the post tenure review?
15. The practice we currently have of reviewing publications/ lectures presented/ teaching/ and grants seems acceptable.
16. Rather than post tenure review, it is recommended that we do a thorough job of annual evaluations and tie them to discretionary annual merit increases. Also, the annual evaluations should take into account a rolling period including the past three years to smooth out variations in year-by-year productivity, as well as variations in the available annual resources for related salary increases.
17. I don't quite know what you mean when you say "form." We do need a better post tenure review that rewards productive faculty.
18. Haven't thought about this, and don't know what is being contemplated. We are evaluated a lot—evaluations are done every year on every faculty member, as well as at the mid-tenure point and for tenure and promotion. I guess what is being considered is a less frequent but major review that would, I guess, involve people outside the dept (maybe a College committee or something) and that would examine a series of years? The first question that needs to be answered is what is the purpose of this review that will provide different information than the reviews we do already.
19. Previous form of post-tenure review worked well in my opinion. One faculty member retired in our unit.
20. Review every 1 or 3 years for full profs, annually for assoc. profs.
21. First, evaluation at the departmental level. If the evaluation is not positive, then the file should be forwarded to a College committee.
22. I think post-tenure review should start with a faculty members annual goals in relation to a Department goals. Both need to be progressing forward. I do believe USF is making – obtaining external funds – a new faculty advancement criterion where possible for many faculty including new faculty members as an expectation for tenure-faculty or certainly as a criterion for incentives.
23. Assuming that the rationale for post-tenure had been explained in some detail, the actual process should involve the faculty member under review submitting video segments that focus on teaching and advising, documents /publications related to current research, and a survey of satisfaction from a sample of the faculty member's graduates. This material should be reviewed by a group of three or four senior faculty members who report their findings to the faculty member in person. The faculty member should then have the opportunity to either accept the findings of the committee or be given a week to refute their findings. If the faculty member and the committee cannot resolve their differences, both groups should meet with the chair and the decision of the chair should be final in terms of the department. If the faculty member is not satisfied, the matter should be referred to the associate dean of the college whose findings will be binding.
24. Faculty should provide current vita, statement of accomplishments in areas of assigned duties since last promotion or promotion with tenure. Review should take place at the department and College levels, and report of outcome sent to the Provost's Office.

25. Need to be tied to merit or some other reward.
26. Similar to the one that took place about 10 years ago.
27. A committee that every 7 years evaluates teaching, research and service. If it is below standards, no raises until it goes up. If not up in 3 years, go to the next step.
28. Allow more discretionary raises to be given to faculty who are productive.

7. How should tenure and promotion processes encourage community engagement and global research?

Summary: There is not much consensus in the responses to this question; they run the gamut from rejecting T&P procedure being based on such criteria to making global research an additional consideration in the research category. If there is any consensus at all, it is that there should be diversity in dealing with this topic: global and engagement issues might be worth only service credits in some cases or might be worth research credit in others; it depends upon the discipline.

1. Identify what motivates tenured faculty to participate willingly and build that into institutional expectations. Provide leadership opportunities, e.g., running major workshops to ID progress, problems, opportunities in his/her field; participation on panels making big decisions and/or advising major decision-makers, nationally and internationally.
2. Value them. If those activities are not as highly valued as other types of activity there is little or no reason for faculty – particularly those seeking tenure and/or promotion – to be involved in them
3. This should be written into the documents if it is really important to this institution and its faculty. It is my understanding that such exists at other institutions already.
4. Clear definitions of community engagement and global research, with clear expectations of outcomes. While a community based project may take longer to produce outcomes (e.g., publications), it should still produce outcomes. Many of us in [dept] do clinical research, which takes longer to produce outcomes than some other lab-based type work, but we still produce.
5. If relevant to the department, community engagement and global research that lead to research productivity should be recognized as valuable. However, it must lead to research productivity to have an impact on promotion and tenure decisions.
6. This is difficult to address because the connections between research and scholarship and the community takes many forms – some research has immediate and obvious relationships, others more basic and less apparently connected, but promising of rich and profound future applications.
7. Specify these activities in the formal tenure and promotion documents, so that these areas will be carefully considered by the tenure and promotion review committees, Chairs, Deans, and by the Provost.
8. need to have clear published indicators.
9. No resp.
10. Should not.
11. It should be fully credited, along with Service and Administrative Tasks, if that is where such activities fall, and within teaching and research, if that is the main locus of the activities

12. No resp.
13. I don't think they should be linked. Some disciplines do not naturally involve community engagement and global research. These activities should be encouraged in other ways among appropriate disciplines.
14. By making community engagement a category of evaluation and global research an additional consideration in the research category.
15. By recognizing the value of community engagement and the PROCESS of (global) research. These spheres of scholarly activity ought to be valued equally in relation to teaching and publications. Let faculty know this during candidate interviews, new faculty orientation, and by informing them in T & P workshops that these areas do count, that an outstanding in service/community engagement and in (global) research is equal to outstanding in the other areas. And "research" needs to be defined/understood according to discipline.
16. Not sure they should. While these are areas of emphasis for USF, not all faculty are equally able to do either. To have these included in tenure and promotion changes the categories of "teaching, research and service" which are common metrics to all faculty to much more specific foci that "favor" some faculty over others.
17. The processes currently in place for mathematics and statistics already encourage global research and I am not sure that community engagement should be uniformly encouraged for departmental faculty.
18. This is not a relevant area for [dept] T&P since community engagement and global research encompass service aspects rather than research for our faculty members.
19. Make sure outside reviewers and internal committees understand what they need to evaluate. Clarify these terms – community engaged scholarship is not the same as community service.
20. Don't know.
21. Significantly if part of the unit's mission (as it is in our case).
22. Award extra points for these activities.
23. Place value on both these forms of research, rather than on just global research. Reward projects and scholarship relating to community engagement.
24. I don't believe tenure and promotion decision should be based on either one of those issues.
25. Incentives in each area and a solid commitment of engagement in either will lead to favorable consideration for tenure and promotion. I personally prefer that they are not a tenure criterion but certainly a promotion or incentive opportunity.
26. In order for this to occur, the importance of service to the community and the development of internal collaborative must be elevated. There would have to be more than one explicit path to promotion and tenure. USF would have to adopt policies in these areas such as those of large land-grant institutions such as the University of Wisconsin or NC State University that do reward extension activities
27. The nature of what this entails depends on the disciplinary area. Such engagement and research initiatives takes a great deal of time and effort as well as resources for travel, telecommunications, infrastructure support; this should be taken into account in faculty member's assignment. The University has to factor this in when looking at FTE and SCH, number of publications, etc. On the front end , time is needed for start up!

28. Tenure and promotion processes already “encourage” worthwhile work. If you mean should community engagement and global research be distinguished from everything else in the tenure process—and be required—I think that’s a mistake. There are many worthwhile things that can be done with other goals as well.
29. This is not a big issue in our process.
30. We do look at citations from around the world and participation in international conferences in the process. Community engagement is ill-defined to me for us. We do have projects for students in the community and some industry research, both of which are encouraged
31. May add some words to tenure criterion to emphasize community engagement and global research.

8A. What institutional strategies are (or would be) helpful to recruit new faculty needed to meet department’s and USF’s strategic goals?

Note: For questions 8A and 8B, we summarized responses rather than providing listing the verbatim responses from individual chairs. Responses are grouped by topic (italics). If a comment occurred more than once, the number of times it occurred is listed in parentheses.

- *Better faculty compensation and benefits*
 - More competitive salaries (8)
 - Tuition waivers for spouses and/or children
 - Funds for moving expenses
- *Improved start-up package to support research*
 - Increased start-up funds (7)
 - Reduced teaching load during initial semester(s) (5)
 - Funds/incentives for presenting at national conferences (4)
 - Additional and better-equipped physical space (2)
 - Summer support for research, such as summer grant writing programs (2)
 - Graduate student(s) assigned to assist new faculty member
- *Clear institutional support for increasing size of individual units in need*
 - Reestablish or provide lines to replace faculty who have left (4)
 - Better compensate departments who lose faculty to administrative assignments
 - Demonstrated commitment to hire even during economically-challenging times
 - Return control of funding for staff/faculty lines to units, who can decide what positions needs to be added/searched
- *Support for hiring for positions other than general assistant professors*
 - Opportunities to hire professors at the associate and full levels (3)
 - Expedited hiring process for outstanding candidates (2)
 - Strategic hires for/through research clusters (2)
- *Interdisciplinary research focus*
 - Opportunity to be part of an interdisciplinary faculty
 - Need clear statement that USF values interdisciplinary research
- *Improve institutional research support (and rewards) for all faculty post-hire*
 - Return salary savings from externally funded research to departments (2)
 - Rebate funds from externally funded research to PI

- Graduate student support
- Funds to provide counter-offers to retain talented, productive faculty
- *Other*
 - Improve strategic planning and fair resource allocation, including to departments that are small and/or productive (2)
 - Allow job search to begin before final approval is given for the particular search
 - Standard junior leave policy
 - Additional funds for recruitment process (e.g., for advertisement of position)
 - New building with more office and classroom space
 -

8B. What institutional factors hinder your ability to recruit new faculty?

- *Inadequate faculty compensation and benefits*
 - Relatively low salaries (6)
 - Inequity between current, respectable starting salaries and low salaries of colleagues hired under prior administrations
 - No tuition waivers available for spouses and/or children
- *Inadequate start-up package to support research*
 - Insufficient start-up funds
 - Inadequate physical lab/office space (2)
- *Logistical problems related to search process*
 - Uncertainty regarding if an approved search will lose approval prior to securing a candidate (2)
 - Insufficient funds for search process (e.g., advertisement, moving costs) (2)
 - Late approval of searches
- *Insufficient university support for hiring faculty of adequate size and skill*
 - Loss of line when faculty member leaves (3)
 - Insufficient commitment to strengthen/support departments that are productive or small (2)
 - Not permitted to hire professors at the associate or full level
 - Shortage of senior faculty members
 - Lack of funds to hire adjuncts while faculty pursue research/creative endeavors
- *Inadequate institutional support for research*
 - Poor technical support (e.g., statistics consultants, clerical support) (2)
 - Inadequate financial support for research during summer
 - High teaching loads
 - Low graduate student support
- *Other*
 - Poor economic condition of Florida (2)