

# Rewards Working Group: Supplementary Materials

## Appendix 1. Framing Faculty Rewards

The Rewards Working Group (RWG) frames this report and our recommendations in four broad ways based on discussions, data collected, literature surveyed, and best practices from across the academy.

### Frame #1: Multi-faceted Rewards

The RWG invites USF faculty and administration **to perceive rewards as a multi-faceted category**. While “reward structures” are the traditional language for tenure and promotion guidelines, the RWG encourages a broader definition that moves beyond tenure and promotion as the “reward” for excellent work in the academy. Rewards then include 1) monetary compensation (salary and merit raises), 2) recognition (with tangible and intangible benefits), and 3) acknowledgment (at departmental, unit, college, and university wide levels). The RWG will distinguish among these types of rewards in this report.

### Frame #2: Rewards/Rewarding

The RWG invites USF faculty and administration **to consider how rewards may or may not be “rewarding” to faculty** in general. The RWG encourages a conceptualization that moves beyond a reward as an “end product” for outstanding accomplishments to a more holistic view of community, university, unit, and departmental cultures and climates as “rewarding” ones for faculty work. As valuable information for recruiting and retaining faculty, the RWG will present results of faculty views of “rewards” and “rewarding” aspects of work at USF.

### Frame #3: Rewards/Resources

The RWG invites USF faculty and administration **to question whether traditionally defined reward practices** (research leaves, travel monies, graduate assistant assignments, space allocations, staff support) **are rewards or resources**. If these are awards, then they may instigate and perpetuate discontent among faculty who do not receive them. If these are resources, then they should be taken for granted as part the infrastructure of a Research I university wishing to support faculty productivity. The RWG recognizes this tension, especially in hard economic times for higher education, and will present recommendations that attempt to focus on rewards rather than resources.

### Frame #4: Recognition of Change

The RWG invites USF faculty and administration **to recognize that faculty interests and workloads change** throughout the span of a career. Rewards, recognition, and acknowledgements should reflect these changing emphases and the multiple ways that all faculty, and not just a select few, support the mission of the University of South Florida. The RWG will offer recommendations that account for these multiple and evolving contributions.

## Appendix 2. Observations from Faculty Survey

An online survey was developed by the Rewards and Responsibilities Subcommittees of the Task Force. A total of 361 faculty members started the survey, and all but 3 people completed the survey. Faculty were asked to rank order issues related to rewards with respect to what attracted them to come to USF and what would make it more rewarding for work/career at USF.

With respect to issues that attracted people to join the faculty of USF, the most highly ranked responses concerned the reputation of their department, the quality of the faculty within the department, professional development opportunities, USF's location, and research opportunities at USF or in the Tampa area. After those, aspects like salary, Florida's weather, and the teaching "climate" of USF were next highly ranked.

Items ranked high in response to what would make it "more rewarding," higher salary or a salary that was competitive with similar institutions, was by far, the most highly ranked. This was followed by "less bureaucracy," protection of time to conduct research, support to travel to conferences, better infrastructure at USF, more incentives for recruiting quality students (e.g., fellowships), and summer support.

Faculty members were asked to rate level of satisfaction about rewards, or the processes by which faculty are rewarded using a five-point scale (very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied/dissatisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied). Among the items with the least satisfaction were bonuses, merit pay, non-monetary rewards such as acknowledgments and "perqs," and the fairness by which awards are awarded. Items with highest satisfaction were how USF recognizes faculty accomplishments (within it publications), how the department recognizes accomplishments, how teaching or research assistants are assigned, and how resources (e.g., computers) are distributed.

Faculty were asked to indicate their level of agreement (strongly agree, agree, neither agree/disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree) about what rewards were based upon. The data indicated that strongest level of agreement focused on research productivity, followed by grants/external funding, and annual evaluations either by the Chair or the Dean. Strongest dissatisfaction was associated with policies set by the University's administration, followed by community-engaged service, teaching evaluations, community-engaged research, and number of graduate students mentored.

Overall, the 358 responses suggest that while monetary rewards are very important, there are non-monetary rewards with apparently strong influence on faculty members' satisfaction with their professional life at USF. Many of the rewards come from their departments, and involve the work atmosphere (good colleagues, students, resources).

## Appendix 3. Extended Discussion of Recommendations

Recommendation #1. Rewards should be tied to evaluation processes and criteria endorsed by faculty. For rewards *as monetary compensation*, we recommend

- credible metrics for evaluation

According to the RWG faculty survey question, “Please rate your level of agreement about faculty rewards being based on the following,” faculty were most satisfied with rewards and evaluation processes that valued research productivity (strongly agree 134; agree 162) and with evaluations performed by those closest to home--their chairs and deans (strongly agree 48; agree 198). Faculty were least satisfied with rewards based on evaluation processes and policies set by university administration (disagree 71; strongly disagree 58).

Faculty express concerns about evaluation practices that chronically undervalue contributions of individual faculty or units based on use of inherently flawed or incomplete data from outside sources (e.g., U.S. Universities Science Indicators Citations Database). If such practices are used, the individual faculty and units should be allowed to counter negative evaluations with evidence of how those databases failed to capture their accomplishments and productivity.

One faculty member wrote, “I would like to see a level of reward that reflects the level of expectation. My current perception is that the expectation is for performance of a top quality school, but the rewards and support are in no way comparable.”

- merit pay based on more than one year’s evaluation

According to the RWG faculty survey question, “Please rate how satisfied you are with the rewards or the processes by which faculty members are rewarded at USF,” faculty were least satisfied with monetary bonuses (dissatisfied at 92; very dissatisfied at 103) and merit pay (dissatisfied 113; very dissatisfied at 107).

The RWG recognizes that faculty raises are dependent on budgetary allocations from the Florida legislature. While faculty comments reflected concerns about merit-increases, across-the-board salary increases, starting salaries for new faculty, and salary compression, the small pool of merit money was worthy of mention. One faculty member wrote, “I was one of 3 people in my department that got a merit-based salary increase. It was a total of about \$30 paycheck. In my opinion, that borders on insulting. It is incredible that our salaries have been let slid to where they are now, and that there is nothing, nothing coming out of the administration to make our situation any better. I would not recommend to any young faculty to move to USF. I feel that the administration knows that we are here to stay and it is not going to do anything to make it worth for us to stay. The only reason I continue to excel on research, teaching AND service, and put the name of USF in international media coverage, is that I have a passion for what I do.”

Therefore, our recommendation is a structural one and is taken from University of Colorado's 1999 report on Faculty Rewards (available at <https://www.cu.edu/sq/messages/2958.html>.) The UC report justifies this recommendation as a way "to smooth out oscillations in the record and protect faculty from the ups and downs in the pool of money available to fund annual merit salary increases. . . . Some faculty have had the misfortune of having a great year academically during a bad year for the budget. An outstanding evaluation in a year where the merit pool is very small might result in a significantly smaller salary increase than would the same evaluation in a year where the merit pool is larger."

- not distributing large, monetary awards to just a few individuals

Overall, faculty perceive their salaries as low and administrative salaries as high. The recent news accounts and editorials ("4 USF Officials Get Bonuses, Despite Cuts," *Tampa Tribune*, March 11, 2009; "Bad Time for Big Bonuses," *Tampa Tribune*, March 13, 2009; "Cringing at USF Bonuses," *St. Petersburg Times*, March 16, 2009) contribute to this perception and, in many cases, this reality.

Wergin (2001) writes, "People everywhere want to feel valued, to know that others see their work as worthwhile. Faculty members are no different. We need evidence that someone's paying attention. That's why so many salary disputes in higher education seem so symbolic: Money, even in minuscule increments, symbolizes recognition." When four administrators are singled out for this kind of recognition and monetary compensation, faculty do not feel valued or recognized.

One faculty member writes, "A university that treats its academic stars, top 5%, exceptionally well but ignores and disrespects the rest of the faculty will not continue to attract the best and brightest among us. Salaries and rewards--and new lines or positions-- for administrators should be tied in a manner that is equitable to those provided faculty. The behavior and attitudes of this administration at all levels toward faculty is shameful."

Another wrote, "Large bonuses and base-pay increases (e.g., \$5,000-10,000) repeatedly to a very few quickly demoralizes excellent, hard working faculty who are not superstars."

Recommendation #2. Rewards should be evidence of on-going support for faculty research, creative activity, teaching, service, and community engagement. For rewards *as resources* that enable faculty productivity, we recommend

- increased incentives to support this faculty work

The top two responses to the question, "What would make it MORE rewarding for your work/career here at USF?," are 1) Higher pay/Salary competitive with peer institutions and 2) support for research.

Support for research took several forms: the ability to protect time to conduct research (total 184; 158 faculty placed this item in their top five); support for travel to

conferences or for research (total 180; 133 faculty placed this item in their top five); summer support (total 133; 93 faculty placed this item in their top five). Under summer support, providing faculty compensation for “Graduate Individual Instruction”, i.e., mentoring of graduate students, is essential to the integrity of graduate programs.

One faculty member listed many tangibles of this support, “We need more support for research. More rewards for research activities, seed grants, travel money, funds to invite outstanding scholars, and so on. The expectations and resources at USF regarding research and scholarship do not match.”

- removal of disincentives that discourage this faculty work

“Less bureaucracy” is the third top response to the question, “What would make it MORE rewarding for your work/career here at USF?” (total 196; 139 faculty placed this item in their top five).

One faculty member captured many of the items that frustrate faculty: “The major problem at USF now is the micromanagement and slow response from the Provost's office, the manner in which grant management has been complicated by complex rules and procedures, far too many layers of bureaucracy to get anything done. We can't get travel approved or reimbursed, can't hire personnel without major delays, can't get our subcontractors on grants paid, and can't get travel reimbursed for faculty who are applying for jobs. The level of frustration is overwhelming and we just can't get work done without endless delays and incompetencies.”

- improved grant infrastructure at USF

Anecdotal evidence offered in the RWG discussions and faculty comments in the survey point to the need for improved grant infrastructure at USF, especially more nimbleness in post-award procedures through sponsored research.

One faculty member wrote, “Reduce the bureaucracy in grant management and especially travel -- this alone would make things much easier. The incentives to obtain large grants and contacts (or any grant or contract) are negatively impacted by the craziness created by the poor grant management systems here.”

Another faculty member wrote in general about infrastructure concerns, “The University is putting far too much effort into the outward trappings of excellence, but does not invest enough in building the unseen core: quality core instrumentation in shared facilities, recruiting and training quality students, retaining top faculty.”

- offering faculty the option of 12-month salary dispersal

Qualitative comments offered in the RWG pilot survey spoke to academic work as on-going, off-the-clock, and year round in research, teaching and advising (especially graduate theses and dissertations), and service. One faculty member wrote, “Our 9-month contracts with no ability even to prorate our salaries fails to

recognize that a majority of us work 12 months a year FOR THE UNIVERSITY but only are paid for 9 months.”

In the RWG’s meeting with Union President Sherman Dorn and Associate Vice-Provost Kofi Glover, both Dorn and Glover reported that this inability to prorate salaries was most likely the result of state-wide computing programs and processes.

Recommendation #3. Rewards should be tangible and intangible symbols of the respect of administration toward faculty. For rewards as *acknowledgment* of faculty accomplishments, we recommend that administration

- recognize and utilize faculty expertise in projects impacting the USF community

How might faculty in Schools of Architecture and Engineering have predicted the new Marshall Center’s massive utility bills? How might faculty in the School of Mass Communications evaluate USF branding efforts, including the dubious slogan “One of Florida’s Three Top Research Universities”? One faculty member surveyed wrote, “Can you imagine Harvard or Yale saying this? Whoever thought this slogan was a good idea ought to be fired.”

Recognizing and utilizing faculty expertise should be a *given* in all out-sourced projects impacting the university. While the RWG is not mandating how this expertise ought to be utilized (whether formal Advisory Boards, “Friends of the Court” briefs, or informal discussions with contractors), a sure sign of respect for the work of faculty at USF would be soliciting our expertise and acknowledging our advice.

One best practice on utilizing faculty expertise comes from the Rutgers’ Center for Organizational Development & Leadership Recognition Programs, a faculty program providing “assistance to academic and administrative departments in the creation of non-financial approaches to encourage and recognize individual, team, group, and departmental excellence. Programs in this area focus on contributions to specific unit or university goals, and to broader institutional values of excellence, mutual respect, collaboration, and community.”

[http://www.cdl.rutgers.edu/core\\_progs/fac\\_staff.htm](http://www.cdl.rutgers.edu/core_progs/fac_staff.htm)

- be rhetorically sensitive in communicating with USF faculty and limit use of blanket, email broadcasts that “thank” USF faculty for hard work

Recognize that blanket, email broadcasts that “thank” USF faculty for hard work are often ignored or viewed with cynicism. Both organizational theory and educational theory advocate praise as an important incentive and reward. According to Grob & Zublin, acknowledgement should be immediate, personal, timed-well, sincere, simple, public, and celebratory. Blanket emails that thank faculty, especially couched in belt-tightening messages, do none of these things. One faculty member surveyed wrote, “Every time I get a group or broadcast email from some university

administrator (dean, provost, president) saying thanks for all your hard work, I laugh because it's empty words. Talk is cheap.”

Recommendation #4. Rewards should be part of a culture of recognition for *all* faculty work across all levels (department, unit, college, and university). For rewards *as recognition* in economic hard times, we recommend these “low-, no-cost” ideas:

- establish university-wide awards that recognize the many ways faculty contribute to the mission of USF, including
  - new research initiatives
  - outstanding mentoring of graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, and junior faculty
  - outstanding interdisciplinary collaboration
  - outstanding graduate teaching
  - outstanding community engagement
  - outstanding service

Across the comments in the RWG Faculty Survey, faculty called for recognition of and reward for activities not normally acknowledged yet crucial to a Research I university, including mentoring, graduate student advising, and awards for research. Faculty comments that speak to these issues include:

“Excellent teaching is not rewarded, either financially or in less tangible ways. Mentoring students, both through academic advising and thesis\dissertation direction, is not rewarded. Only research and publishing are rewarded.”

“There are no (non-monetary) awards or honors that I have even heard of that a successful junior faculty member in a research intensive CAS department can receive from USF, which is very unfortunate because such internal awards and honors are not only essential for the recognition of young researchers in their research field outside of USF, but also for showing faculty members that their work for success is appreciated and acknowledged by USF.”

“Why is work with undergraduates – i.e., undergraduate research -- not mentioned on this survey, in the t/p promotion guidelines, etc., when it is part of our QEP?”

- to go beyond one-time teaching awards, create a “Master Teacher” Academy that recognizes, utilizes, and disseminates award-winning teachers’ expertise and experience

This best practice is taken from Ohio State University’s “Academy of Teaching,” comprised of past and present teaching award winners. This Academy serves to move beyond one-time recognition of teaching excellence and to utilize “master teachers” as a resource [“Shifting the Culture for Student Learning: The Evaluation

and Reward of Teaching.” Available at <http://regents.ohio.gov/news/plandocs/teaching.html> ]. The report suggests that “recognition for these faculty awards might take a variety of forms, including cash awards, resources for teaching, and distinguished titles. . . . These ‘master teachers’ provide a valuable resource to the state in addressing undergraduate education and faculty development, and should become an integral part of the state’s strategic planning efforts.”

- create a Presidential webpage that features faculty work not normally recognized or heralded

This suggestion asks that faculty, chairs, and unit heads be proactive and creative in forwarding accounts of faculty work; conversely, administration should be willing to support this webpage as evidence of the depth and variety of faculty accomplishments. Ideas for faculty work recognition can include graduating a landmark number of PhDs, service-based courses and their projects, letters from graduates to faculty members, and recognizing faculty who teach large classes particularly well. This latter suggestion is a best practice from Eberly Center University and Carnegie-Mellon University [“Signs of Change: University Case Study,” available at <https://notes.cc.sunysb.edu/Pres/boyer.nsf/webform/IX> ]

- create a web-based clearing-house for all departmental newsletters to better acknowledge departmental and unit-level work and to disseminate these to larger constituencies

The RWG Faculty Survey found that most faculty were very satisfied (46) and satisfied (113) with department level recognition of their work. While this recognition may be available to local audiences, alumni, and disciplinary colleagues, collecting all this department- and unit-level recognition in one place as endorsed by the President and Provost is an indication that this work is valued.

- in USF promotional materials, include faculty work from across the university rather than focusing exclusively on research that garners grant monies. This work can include

- books published
- creative work produced, show-cased, and/or taught at USF
- critical work in the Humanities

One faculty member wrote, “It’s clear that USF doesn’t give a fig about the Humanities. Just look at the glossy USF magazine that I find in my box--it’s science from cover to cover, with a small corner of one page reserved for research in the Humanities. Don’t pretend you value what we do if you’re not willing to give us adequate space to showcase our efforts. The reorganization of the College of Arts

and Sciences is just one more indication of the irrelevance of the Humanities at this institution.”

## Appendix 4. Faculty Rewards:

### A Review of the Literature

By Victoria Caruana

Although many universities share a sense of value for faculty rewards, what they value and how they prioritize those values impacts what types of rewards become available to their faculty. As we consider what is meant by *rewards*, we find that the literature compounds the term by combining both incentives to *attract* high quality faculty and rewards to *retain* high quality faculty. This distinction should be made as universities reconsider their current reward systems. A similar distinction can also be made between the inherent rewards of promotion and tenure and other additional rewards – both tangible and intangible (i.e. free parking, travel money, higher quality students, peer recognition, more time for research). The most coveted prize at any university is tenure. Once attained, other, often less tangible, rewards are valued by faculty.

The familiar triad of teaching, research, and service does more than define roles and outline faculty responsibilities; it also illustrates a specific reward structure. Universities categorized as teaching universities provide different reward structures than those classified as research universities. When those institutions shift from a primarily teaching focus to a research focus, they may experience a crisis of reward identity where what was once highly valued (teaching) is now deemed less so. In addition, large universities comprised of numerous colleges and supporting departments have different visions of what constitutes reward. Efforts to revision this differentiated reward system into one that satisfies and motivates all faculty are misguided and often misrepresented. The goal is not consensus, but one of validity. Does faculty value the rewards currently in place at their institutions and do those rewards actually compensate for the desired behaviors demonstrated by faculty productivity and commitment?

There are a variety of ways that universities attempt to assess what their faculty value. University-wide climate surveys, college or departmental focus groups, and informal assessments can all provide insight into what attracts, motivates, and satisfies faculty. The question is whether or not what is discovered impacts a reward system already in place.

This literature review is divided into three sections. The first section offers insight into commonly held values about university rewards. The second section provides the distinction of the terminology used to describe what attracts, motivates, and satisfies faculty (incentives, rewards, supports). The final section investigates examples of reward structures at both teaching and research universities.

#### **What Do University Faculty Value?**

It is difficult to make a basic determination of what faculty value because there exists a determined, institutional-level tension between the disinterested and the more engaged (Boardman & Ponomariov, 2007). The connections between what faculty value, how they're rewarded and their productivity and commitment are important to

understand especially when an institution is interested in restructuring its system of rewards. There is incongruity between what the institution values and what individual faculty value. This being said, is there hope for shared values? We question whether or not this is the hope we should even pursue. The ethos of an institution conceptualizes, operationalizes and then often pervades its advertised values leaving individual scholars to wrestle with residual dissonance.

University faculty is not a homogeneous group. Universities no longer have a one-track mind when it comes to faculty appointments. Not all appointments result in tenure. Along with this differentiated faculty comes differentiated roles and reward structures. According to Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey & Staples (2006), “colleges and universities are offering a wide variety of faculty appointment types, each with its own unique hiring procedures, ranges, and promotion benefits” and as a consequence, unique reward systems. Differentiated reward structures are a common response to differentiated faculty. The hope for the one true reward structure, a result of a common value system, is still out of reach.

Another reason it is difficult to distinguish faculty values as a group is that missions differ across institution types and among colleges within institutions. When these missions differ, faculty value tenure and rewards more, which in turn affect how they pursue their work (p. 115). Differing missions result in differing expectations which may lead to uncomfortable ambiguity. Faculty struggle with this ambiguity and what results are “conflicts between institutional rhetoric and the realities of reward structures, and the emphasis on research to the detriment of teaching and service in promotion and tenure decisions” (O’Meara, 2002, p. 57).

Finally, existing values of faculty do not easily change when the institution shifts its mission. “Just because a college changes its written definition of scholarship” and rewards “does not mean that institutional members wake up the next day with a new view of faculty work” (p. 58). “Prisoners of their own thinking” (Senge, 1990, p. 27), faculty hold values about their “roles, scholarship, and institutional identity that contradict the values inherent in the new reward structure” (O’Meara, 2002, p. 59). Values and beliefs are the foundation of reward systems. Acknowledging that first sheds light on an ever-increasing phenomenon – more diverse faculty with differing missions. O’Meara concludes her study by stating that their findings “underscore the argument others have made that the values and beliefs sustaining traditional academic reward structures do not support the professional interests of a diverse faculty nor a diverse mission” (p. 75).

### **What Are Rewards?**

In order to conceptualize rewards, it’s important to consider the framework within which rewards reside. Over the past 20 years higher education has been described as “controlled by managerialism or new managerialism” (Deem, 1998; Hardy, 1996; Levin, 2001; Rhoades, 1998 as quoted in Levin, 2006, p. 66). In an effort to homogenize views and values of faculty and align those views and values with those promoted by the institution, universities have shifted to the more private sector practices of marketization. “Productivity and efficiency behaviors in the context of institutional orientation to the marketplace are likely to affect both faculty work and faculty values” (p. 66). Rewards are then often defined and understood as those things that lead to increased productivity of faculty. For a research university, or one that aspires to become a

research university, productivity and efficiency coupled with accountability are the stable rungs of the reward ladder.

There are a myriad of rewards offered at institutions: some are tangible and some are less tangible. Beyond pay increases, which are often only in the jurisdiction of the bargaining unit and directly tied to the economic climate, what rewards do faculty receive? According to Wergin (2001), “the question is not, ‘How should we change the reward system?’, but ‘How do we create environments most conducive to productive faculty life?’” (par. 2). The environments that are highly valued offer opportunity to recreate reward structures. Tangibles such as teaching awards, professional leaves, and summer fellowships all have a place in a value-added reward system. However, less tangible rewards such as recognition, acknowledgements, or appropriate space to do one’s work. According to the Provost at Georgia Southern University in 2002, faculty rewards are encompassed in “programs such as the Awards for Excellence, educational leave, and faculty development, research, and service grants” all constitute a reward system. Those deemed as less tangible and less formalized include “the amount of departmental travel funds or office and research space allocated to a particular faculty member” (<http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/frr/faq.html>).

The definition of rewards has begun to shift from promotion and tenure to *incentives*. What motivates faculty to be productive? According to Wergin (2001), four incentives draw faculty and retain faculty: autonomy, community, recognition, and efficacy. How a university determines these types of incentives should align with their mission and roles. The distinction between what attracts faculty to a university and what retains them should first be made before outlining a new reward structure.

### **Teaching and Research Reward Structures**

Although many universities reward teaching with awards, those awards are not always highly valued by faculty. The nebulous nature of the reward criteria for teaching awards diminishes its motivating power. Faculty often question how those judging them “decide whether candidates have the appropriate characteristics or record of performance” (Chism, 2006, p. 589). Even if the university established a set of criteria, disclaimers attached to the criteria might create ambiguity. For example, according to Chism (p. 593), one program cautioned its candidates stating:

In the past, the committees that have judged the candidates for this award have stressed the following characteristics. While there is no guarantee that future committees will look at the packets in the same way, these are some of the basic properties and activities that are considered. [A list follows.]

If a university values both teaching and research, then additional reward structures may be in place. Grant seeking faculty receive monetary reward by virtue of their grant seeking activity and consequently raise the status of the university. Faculty who routinely receive grants may experience increased status which in turn generates more productivity. Teaching faculty may not experience the same increase in productivity based solely on teaching awards. Ambiguity does not motivate. The judgment for teaching awards “may be obscure, which can lead to controversy and skepticism” (Chism, p. 602). The goals for rewarding teaching should be specific and not only symbolic. Chism proposed that “unless a form of convenient symbolism is the only end, all of these goals are better achieved when teaching awards are nested within

a broader system of evaluation of teaching that rests on consensus about characteristics of excellent teaching” (p. 608).

In university climate surveys, faculty often express a desire for rewards that are not monetary. According to Grob & Zublin at Weber State University, both *recognition* and *acknowledgements* are highly valued by faculty. Recognition includes psychological benefits that are both tangible (office, parking, secretary, awards) and intangible (respect, flexibility, appreciation). Acknowledgements should be immediate, simple, personal, public, timed well, celebratory, and sincere. Annual climate surveys may help illuminate both faculty satisfaction and dissatisfaction, which may in turn lead to creating a more valid and reliable reward structure. For example, in the 2007 Harvard Faculty Climate Survey, the tenured faculty was least satisfied with administrative support for grants and special research facilities, while the tenure-track and non-ladder faculty were least satisfied with the availability of nearby parking. Rank-based differences should be assessed and addressed when considering rewards.

## References

- Battles, D. (2002). *Faculty Roles & Rewards: Questions and Answers*. Georgia Southern University Academic Affairs Newsletter. Retrieved on March 10, 2009 from [http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/newsletter/aanews\\_11-02.html](http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/newsletter/aanews_11-02.html).
- Bland, C.J., Center, B.A., Finstad, D.A., Risbey, K.R., & Staples, J. (2006). *The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions*. The Journal of Higher Education, v77, n1, pp. 90-123.
- Boardman, P.C. & Ponomariov, B.L. (2007). *Reward systems and NSF university research centers: the impact of tenure on university scientists' valuation of applied and commercially relevant research*. The Journal of Higher Education, v78, n1, pp. 51-70.
- Chism, N. (2006). *Teaching awards: what do they award?* The Journal of Higher Education, v77, n4, pp. 589-617.
- Grob, J. & Zublin, C. (2005). *Faculty Advisor Recognition and Rewards: Learn the Very Basics before Trying to Hit the Jackpot*. Presented at NACADA 2005 National Conference.
- Harvard University Faculty Climate Survey 2006/7. Retrieved on March 10, 2009 from <http://www.faculty.harvard.edu/01/0151.html>.
- Levin, J.S. (2006). *Faculty work: tensions between educational and economic values*. The Journal of Higher Education, v77, n1, pp. 62-88.
- O'Meara, K. (2002). *Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship*. The Review of Higher Education, v26, n1, pp. 57-80.
- Wergin, J.F. (2001). *Beyond carrots and sticks*. Liberal Education, v87, n1.