



**Task Force on Faculty Roles,
Responsibilities and Rewards:**

Report to the Provost

May 15, 2009

**USF Task Force on Faculty Roles, Responsibilities and Rewards:
Report to the Provost**

The recommendations of the three workgroups of the Task Force on Faculty Roles, Responsibilities and Rewards; their supporting materials; membership; and compilations of comments and other discussion by members of the USF community following release of a preliminary report.

Contents

Main Report

I.	Introduction and Overview: Task Force Charge, Assumptions, Structure, Content, and Responses	2
II.	Roles workgroup Summary: Findings & Recommendations	10
III.	Responsibilities Workgroup Summary: Findings & Recommendations	15
IV.	Rewards Workgroup Summary: Findings & Recommendations	21
V.	Participants	28

Appendices & Supporting Material

I.	Initial Task Force Charge	32
II.	Roles Workgroup Appendices	
A.	Preliminary Feedback	33
B.	Duties and Productivity Measures	47
C.	Definition in Other (AAU) Universities	53
D.	Links and Other Documents	58
E.	Literature Reviews	65
III.	Responsibilities Workgroup Appendices	
A.	Form: Survey of Department Chairs	82
B.	Summary of Chairs' Responses	89
IV.	Rewards Workgroup Appendices	
A.	Observations from Faculty Survey	115
B.	Faculty Rewards: A Review of the Literature	116
V.	Comments in Response to Preliminary Reports	
A.	Comments via Website & Email	121
B.	Formal Response from United Faculty of Florida	136
VI.	Summary of Research Council Survey & Focus Groups	144

I. Introduction and Overview

Background and Timeline

Late in the academic year 2007-2008, USF Provost Ralph Wilcox convened a steering committee to develop a task force to define and launch “a comprehensive study of faculty roles, responsibilities and rewards” at USF and issue a report at the end of the spring 2009 term. The steering committee refined the charge and convened three workgroups late in the fall term to conduct the study. Overall task force membership was generally representative of the distribution of faculty across colleges. The regional campuses and the College of Medicine chose not to participate formally; although there was some participation or input by faculty in those settings, recommendations necessarily primarily reflect a Tampa campus perspective. All workgroups obtained input in some form from the broader university community to inform their recommendations, which were released for review by the USF community in late April. Feedback was provided through an advertised link on the Provost’s website in late April and early May; in addition, several faculty from across the campus were invited to participate in a structured group session designed to identify issues related to the recommendations. The workgroups had essentially finished their work, so the more detailed versions of their recommendations are provided with little modification. Input from all of the workgroups and the structured group session is also incorporated in this report. Following receipt of this and similar reports from other task forces, the Provost plans to continue discussion in the USF community through the fall term to develop a set of integrated recommendations to be implemented early in 2010.

Task Force Charge

“To shape, conduct and report on a comprehensive study of faculty roles, responsibilities and rewards at the University of South Florida; to develop recommendations on strategies for bringing the faculty’s academic experience, expectations and rewards more fully into alignment with the institution’s strategic plan, thereby enhancing the profile of USF faculty and academic culture and lending greater consistency with those of aspirational AAU member institutions.” Additional details of the charge are provided in Appendix I.

Assumptions

The AAU goal. Underlying both the charge and the working assumptions of the task force was a general commitment to continuous improvement in quality and performance as an institution. The university’s strategic plan as well as its stated goal of eventual AAU membership figured both implicitly and explicitly in the work of the committee. The task force recognized that existing AAU performance measures, whatever their strengths and limitations, are significant elements in shaping national perception of our standing as a university, and consideration was given to strategies that could more appropriately reflect our performance in those terms.

However, the task force also took the position that AAU and other national institutional measures (e.g., Carnegie Foundation) may not fully reflect the qualities underlying USF’s own path to greatness; that the best long-term gains should not be expected to follow from a primary short-term focus on elevation of our rankings on these narrowly defined measures; and that we

should therefore treat the long-term AAU goal as both to some degree symbolic and a source of perspective in understanding and achieving the highest possible quality in our own terms as a research-intensive, urban, state-supported university.

Fiscal climate. Task force members were sensitive to financial and other challenges presented by our stage of development as an institution and by the current fiscal climate. USF has recently undergone more rapid change, both quantitatively and qualitatively, than most institutions of longer standing, and in the process has strained itself both structurally and culturally. Our institutional wealth reflects our status as a young public institution in a fiscally conservative state. Though there are financial implications to many of the recommendations, the task force attempted to keep to a minimum those that seemed simply to call for additional resources and instead sought to highlight opportunities to reframe priorities and maximize use of fiscally neutral strategies.

Research and teaching. The task force members were also aware of the fact that relatively rapid growth in our research portfolio has led to our having a faculty body with wide variation in views about the relative importance of teaching and research in the University's mission. While teaching excellence was not in the foreground of the task force's consideration, it was recognized by the task force as a central part of the mission of AAU institutions. Moreover, feedback from various constituencies emphasized the fundamental importance of teaching in the University's mission.

Scope and process. It was clear from the outset that the very broad terms in which the task force charge was cast precluded comprehensive coverage of all topics potentially included. Rather than narrow the scope early on, the steering committee chose to provide to each of the workgroups a list of possibilities defining its general area, allowing the general task force membership to share in charting the most promising course within the domain of each workgroup. Given inevitable constraints on members' time and effort, there were necessary limitations in both breadth and depth; many potentially valuable issues simply could not be addressed. However, it was understood that the work of this task force took place in the context not only of other task forces with partially overlapping missions but also of a longer term process promising opportunity for further involvement and discussion by faculty and others in the USF community. Consistent with this assumption, there are recommendations to develop and expand opportunities for meaningful dialogue across campus, both among faculty and between faculty and administration.

Workgroups

Structure and Content. The steering committee considered at length the substantive and structural possibilities inherent in the Provost's initial sketch of the task force charge and decided it would seem most intuitive to form workgroups around the three categories in the task force title. Despite substantial overlap among many of the issues to be addressed, each workgroup was given a sufficiently distinct focus to allow more or less independent progress, with coordination provided through task force and workgroup chairs. Table 1 summarizes the respective purposes, methods and topics of each workgroup. Summaries and discussions of specific workgroup recommendations are provided in sections II through IV, and supporting documents are provided as appendices.

Table 1. Overview of workgroup tasks, methods, and products:

Workgroup	Focus	Approach	Recommendation Topics
Roles	The academic fabric of USF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed categories and definitions of faculty at USF and other institutions and impact of use of faculty categories at USF • Developed a preliminary definition of faculty at a research-intensive university • Obtained and incorporated both feedback from colleagues across USF and input from external informants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit discussion regarding core values and balance among roles • Discussion of procedures for faculty classification criteria and reclassification • The need for multiple faculty roles & assignments and differentiation of individual roles
Responsibilities	The relationship of individual faculty to the academic enterprise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted a survey of USF department chairs to address current or proposed strategies for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) improving USF standing in terms of selected AAU performance indicators b) addressing specific questions posed by the Provost • Incorporated responses from more than half of the departments into an integrated framework of recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guiding principles for addressing AAU indicators, including general strategic approach, purpose of policies, effort priorities, infrastructure & resources • Specific recommendations on strategies for increasing research funding, enhancing research and scholarly productivity, increasing faculty awards, and increasing the number of Ph.D. graduates and post-docs • Specific comments on post-tenure review, relationship of tenure & promotion processes to the strategic goals of community engagement and global research, and institutional strategies for effective faculty recruitment
Rewards	Professional development, compensation, and recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using a small-scale pilot study with workgroup members' colleagues, developed a framework for tapping faculty views on rewards as well as "what is rewarding," and conducted a web-based survey of USF faculty, obtaining both quantitative and qualitative responses • Reviewed published literature on faculty rewards and scanned web-based information on practices at other universities • Generated a critical summary of findings and issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework for understanding what USF faculty value in rewards • Principles for determination and distribution of merit-based monetary rewards • Rewards considered as resources for enabling productivity, considering both the incentive structure and infrastructure • Rewards as symbols of respect • Rewards as part of a culture of recognition throughout the university

Almost one hundred recommendations were generated, most addressing multiple issues. Nearly half of the recommendations are fiscally neutral; a lesser but significant number – approximately one third – call for allocation of resources (new or existing) to particular initiatives. Nearly that number concern research, and about one-fifth suggest or allude to incentives. Ten percent or more each address merit and evaluation; goals and priorities; organizational culture and recognition; and infrastructure. Smaller numbers of recommendations concern recruitment; staffing and role differentiation; mentoring; interdisciplinary work; communication, transparent deliberation, and collaboration; values; teaching; authority; quality; and community engagement.

Themes. Underlying the specific recommendations are several themes that can be grouped within three the general categories of goals, resources, and processes.

1. Goals

- **Develop and articulate goals in USF-relevant terms.** Although national classification schemes that can place an institution in top categories are important and useful, they should not entirely distract us from efforts to develop our own path to excellence.
- **Use long-range goals to shape short-range actions;** define progress in terms of quality improvement, not merely movement on narrowly and externally defined measures. Thus, we should not follow a strategy of chasing indicators in the short range in an effort to provide a good superficial impression; rather, we should develop strategies for improvement in quality (and not necessarily quantity in the short run) that will lead to long term strength.
- **Articulate multilevel strategies to attain long-range goals.** Plans need to be developed with the participation of those who will carry them out, e.g., at the department level.
- **Engage the university community in planning.** Faculty members need to be more effectively and inclusively engaged in identifying goals and articulating plans for implementation; they are ultimately the ones who will take action and need to be more involved in the process.

2. Resources

- **Direct resources more explicitly toward priorities.** Despite the current fiscal tightness, many of the recommendations necessarily identify resource needs; attaining many of the identified institutional goals presupposes some increases in funding in specified areas. Some actions may need to wait, or some resources may need to be reallocated.
- **Address infrastructure problems & limitations.** Granted, the shortfall is immense, but these are barriers that must be surmounted somehow if USF is to progress effectively.
- **Modify procedures to optimize use of resources and obtain more.** Some of our ways of doing business are inefficient or counterproductive, e.g., they may stymie actions that could garner additional resources; several recommendations address possibly beneficial procedural changes.

3. Processes

- **Pursue transparent discussion and deliberation.** There is need for more effective participation of faculty in addressing these critical issues. There should be greater

transparency, greater communication among administrators and faculty, including structured settings to ensure open, two-way discussion of important issues. The assumption that the current task force work is only a stage in an ongoing process is consistent with this vision; these conversations should continue.

- **Develop a more explicit culture of recognition.** Many faculty have the impression that their contributions are little valued, whether formally or informally. Responsibility for this phenomenon is widely shared.
- **Engage faculty more effectively.** This issue includes but also transcends participation as stakeholders. Faculty expertise could be more effectively brought to bear in addressing issues of institutional development. The task forces represent examples of this kind of involvement at an early stage; subsequent steps could make more rigorous use of evidence and expertise provided by faculty.
- **Address the incentive structure;** develop focused incentives. Many recommendations address issues with the nature of the incentive structure, which is not always consistent with espoused institutional goals.

Additional Input & Comments

Because of the nature of its particular charge, calling as it did for examination of fundamental issues of institutional and individual identity and purpose, this task force took several opportunities to seek input from the wider university community. Two of the three workgroups conducted formal surveys as part of the process of developing recommendations, and the third workgroup solicited feedback from faculty in seven Colleges within the University. It also seemed appropriate to subject the workgroup products themselves to general scrutiny as another stage in community dialogue. Printed copies of the preliminary report were distributed to the USF Faculty Senate, and reports and workgroup appendices were made available for public review and comment on the Provost's website.

Written comments. In addition to those who saw printed copies, over 500 individuals viewed the report documents on the website, although ultimately only 30 of them chose to post comments on the website or by email. The comments represented a wide range of opinion, incorporating a mixture of positive and negative reactions to the preliminary report and variably in support of or opposition to the purposes of the task force. In many cases respondents offered additional recommendations along the lines of those in the workgroup reports. One lengthy response took the form of a memorandum from the president of the faculty union, who identified areas where the task force had touched on topics relevant to collective bargaining. Although the number of respondents is far too small to be statistically representative of faculty opinion, their comments are attached here in Appendix V.A with potentially identifying information removed, except for the memorandum from the union, which its author circulated previously. The inclusion of these responses in this essentially public forum is consistent with task force recommendations to foster open dialogue on important issues.

The comments covered a range of topics. Many of these particular respondents felt that the report appeared to undervalue teaching and viewed a strong research orientation as a threat to the quality of teaching; a number emphasized the importance of shared governance and ensuring faculty voice in the university's direction; and some questioned the wisdom of AAU aspirations in the face of resource constraints. Additional comments concerned the tension between

community engagement and tenure & promotion expectations; the importance of having a diverse faculty; supports for junior faculty; the importance of undergraduate research; and other matters.

World Café. To elicit responses of another sort, the task force used the preliminary report as a catalyst for dialogue among a diverse set of faculty. The executive committee convened a group of 19 faculty members representative of the distribution of faculty in participating colleges to take part in a structured set of conversations using an approach called World Café, which is designed to take maximal advantage of the creative potential of a group. Participants were asked to read the preliminary report in advance and then to treat it as context in responding to two broad questions. The first part of the session focused on identification of the principle tensions, dilemmas, questions or other issues that USF would have to address to become the best it can be as a university. The second part concerned how we might arrive at a place of having successfully met those challenges; participants were asked to envision a future time when those issues had been resolved and to identify and celebrate the processes responsible.

Despite the fact that the activity entailed examination of significant, even vexing challenges, the session was overall a very positive one, supporting the suggestion that this kind of appreciative conversational process could be a constructive element in bringing about some of the improvements identified in the broader task force initiative.

Most of the identified issues and approaches to resolution can be grouped into at least one of three broad categories. Some reflect concerns explicitly identified in the workgroup recommendations, and some are broader, underlying concerns.

1. USF Identity

- **We need to differentiate USF** from other (esp. Florida) universities, to recognize what makes us unique.
- **We are two universities**, inherently in tension: a regional university with political demands that we produce (like a utility) a certain number of degrees; and a national research university where both faculty and administrators have ambitions, mobility, identity, a national peer group, etc.
- **Goals vs. resources:** we have an infrastructure shortfall. That is, we lack the infrastructure to attain our espoused goals, which we can't attain by simply restructuring what we currently have; additional resources need to be allocated.
- **Faculty is in evolution.** Many of the faculty who came here earlier have different skills, talents, and interests from those who arrived more recently, so some tension is inevitable. However, we are nonetheless not using our faculty skills and talents as well as we might.
- **Community engagement:** we need to think about how enhance this aspect of our identity and make it a strong, central part of the unique niche we seek to identify.
- **The distance between the administration and many faculty members** in thinking about AAU & strategic goals. The AAU goal, for example, would be viewed more positively if it were more understood as a means to improve quality.

2. Governance

- **Corporate vs. academic model.** Faculty need to be involved in defining vision, mission, strategic goals, which need to be communicated well. Top-down approaches don't work well in business and will fare little better here. For example, if we're aiming for AAU membership, faculty need at least to be part of the discussion to understand why and how it is that we have the resources to make it a feasible option.
- **A transformed administrative culture** would be a crucial element in achieving the progress we seek, with administrators much more directly engaged with faculty on a continuing basis (e.g., in two-way conversations like this one), in the process also providing evidence that members of the administration actively value the diverse faculty necessary to create an effective university.
- **More decentralized authority**, more effective vertical and lateral communication, and reduction of silos would all contribute to better collaboration and more locally informed decisions.
- **More positive recognition** throughout the university would be an important factor in improving the organizational climate, and this would apply to all groups – faculty, staff and administrators.

3. Productivity & standards

- **Productivity metrics tension:** the ways of measuring progress and accomplishment should be more clearly informed by the way that excellence is achieved. Thus, for example, dollars *per se* are not a direct measure of scholarly production. Scholarship should be the central organizing element in measuring performance, and diversity of scholarly activity should be valued; not everyone should necessarily be expected to contribute equally in all areas.
- **Tenure standards & processes:** these constitute a powerful component in the incentive structure underlying faculty choices, and their effects are not always consistent with stated university goals. It is not clear how we should best communicate and hold to high standards.

Research Council survey & focus groups. During 2006 and 2007 the USF Faculty Senate Research Council conducted a survey and follow-up focus groups of faculty to better understand faculty views on support for university and faculty research goals. The themes and conclusions derived from these investigations were quite consistent with the findings and recommendations presented in the current report. Top priorities articulated by the focus groups fell into three areas. First, change the culture: address the silo problem, connect faculty, and ensure broad corporate cultural change resulting in supportive environments. Second, increase procedural flexibility to minimize structural and financial barriers to research activity, and achieve this by promoting creative solutions. Third, revise priorities for resource allocation to strengthen supports for pursuing and conducting research. A number of more specific recommendations addressed issues of collaboration, bureaucracy, metrics, procedures, mission, financing & allocation, and metrics. A brief summary of this earlier work is attached as Appendix 6. The similarity of findings from earlier and current initiatives provides both mutual validation and affirmation that the identified issues call for focused, protracted attention.

These summaries of comments and other input are included here to serve as possible frameworks and as context for the work of the task force itself, expressed directly through workgroup reports following in sections II through IV.

II. Roles Subcommittee: Findings and Recommendations

Background information about the Roles' Subcommittee's Approach

The subcommittee on Faculty Roles was assigned the duty of addressing the academic fabric of USF, including criteria for faculty status and appointments, structure of academic units; academic culture, principles and values; academic freedom; collaboration.

The subcommittee pursued this assignment by reviewing various definitions of faculty provided by academic institutions including the AAU and the UFF, among others, and USF documents containing line assignments (see Appendices A, B, C, and D). The subcommittee also reviewed relevant literature as a context for understanding first, how faculty roles are defined and operationalized, and second, the impact of emerging definitions on the individuals who fulfill faculty roles and the institutions of higher education in which they work (see Appendix E). The subcommittee's responses to each component of this assignment are shown below.

Assignment	Response
Academic culture, principles, and values	Definition/values regarding faculty roles/values.
Address the academic fabric of USF	Review of existing Faculty Pay Plan at USF; interviews with key administrators; feedback from representatives of eight Departments/Colleges regarding definition/values.
Criteria for faculty status and appointments	Recommendations based on findings /recommendations based on feedback from USF faculty and administrators; interviews with administrators from AAU universities
Structure of academic units	Not addressed
Academic freedom	Definition/values regarding faculty roles
Collaboration	Not addressed

The Roles Workgroup (Roles WG) met approximately weekly from December, 2008 through April, 2009. Overall, the group worked to define its task and to do so with consideration to the potential implications for USF faculty. The Roles WG's discussions centered on three primary themes:

1. A perceived need to develop an a priori definition of *faculty* that can (a) maintain traditional role expectations in terms of knowledge generation and dissemination through research, teaching, and service and (b) that can serve as a standard against which current designations of faculty roles and measures of productivity can be described or defined.

Subtexts of these issues included concern for how the group's work might be used to make decisions about employment practices in an era of economic stress, including consideration of the following issues:

- Is there potential for a move toward hiring part-time, non-tenurable faculty and a shift of University mission and faculty roles toward teaching/service roles?
- How were Task Force members selected and would faculty representation on the Roles WG be used to validate a role shift that does not benefit faculty?

A second, but less frequently stated subtext was a commitment to defining faculty roles by our own standard rather than in relationship to AAU.

2. Efforts to address the Roles WG's charge by examining data from USF and other sources so as to better understand existing faculty roles within USF and the nature of faculty roles in AAU and other research universities. The group has to date examined data that include:

- A listing and definitions of faculty roles developed by the SUS Bargaining Unit in 2003.
- A position statement by AAU on the growth, the need for clarity in role definitions, and the need for evaluation processes and career ladders for non-tenure faculty.
- Role definitions and evaluation criteria for Library faculty (provided as an example of non-traditional faculty).
- IPEDS and NSOPF data on faculty productivity by roles.

The Roles WG attempted to systematize its work by focusing on identifying the variety of roles defined as *faculty*, their perceived value, and costs/benefits of non-traditional roles for productivity reports as well as identifying potential sources of this information. The group also made efforts to synthesize its work by focusing on how its report would be framed to address concerns expressed by all members and to address our charge.

3. Efforts to reconceptualize the group's work in terms of its contributions to the community that constitutes the University.

The subcommittee debated several approaches to its work. Based on these discussions, the subcommittee developed a definition that reflects values related to faculty roles in relationship to the University's mission and goals as described below.

Definition of Faculty at a Research University/Very High Research (RU/VH)¹

The fundamental value of a RU/VH is the disciplined creation, cultivation and dissemination of knowledge and artistic expression through multiple modes of inquiry. Faculty members at such an institution are the agents of this process. The stature of a university faculty derives from the extent to which the knowledge created at an institution is recognized by the larger community of scholars and consumers of new knowledge (in academe, government, the community, and other societal organizations) as central and critical to ongoing effort to further the intellectual reach of humanity. Consistent with this core mission, faculty members often are engaged in addressing

¹ The Carnegie Foundation's highest level of classification for a **Doctorate-granting University** (see <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=791>)

issues of importance to the local, state, national, and international communities. Both the creation of knowledge and art and community-engaged² inquiry are valued in their own right.

The stature of faculty members within a RU/VH is based upon the extent to which their individual and collaborative contributions are seen as central and critical to furthering knowledge within and beyond their disciplines, and the extent to which their disciplinary and societal contributions enhance the prominence of the institution as a whole. At such an institution, faculty roles and rewards are tailored to be consistent with this central value.

At a successful RU/VH, this fundamental value is also understood to infuse all the activities of a faculty member, including the traditional categories of research (broadly defined to include a variety of approaches to scholarship and artistic production), teaching, and service. Scholarship and artistic expression represent the knowledge creation process; teaching represents a fundamental part of the cultivation and dissemination of knowledge (publishing and other mechanisms of placing the new knowledge within the public domain represents another part of knowledge cultivation and dissemination); and service represents the direct application of scholarly inquiry through engagement with local, state, and national communities of citizens and scholars.

In a RU/VH institution, teaching activities are infused with the knowledge creation process; that is, they convey newly created information along with the disciplined ways of thinking that are used to generate new knowledge and responsive practice. An RU/VH institution values teaching as a means of cultivating new generations of scholars and promoting critical thinking.. Faculty roles and rewards pertaining to teaching should directly represent this value system.

Similarly, service at a RU/VH institution is valued in proportion to the extent to which it contributes to the knowledge creation or artistic production process and reflects engagement with community members, professionals, and scholars. Once again, roles and rewards pertaining to service should be tailored to accommodate this central value.

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

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

1. To what extent does the above statement appropriately describe faculty roles in a top tier research university?
2. Do you envision USF as having the potential to be a top tier research university? Why or why not?
3. To what extent does this statement accurately describe your role at USF?

² The Carnegie Foundation defines **Community Engagement** as follows: the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=1213>).

4. In the absence of a similar definition of faculty roles at USF, would you support adoption of this statement? To what extent would you expect others in your department/college to support it?
5. Do you agree that USF should aspire to be a top tier research university?

Summary of Responses to the definition: (see Appendix B for complete responses by department/college)

- USF should aspire to maintaining its status as a Research University/Very High Research.
- Resources must be allocated to support research, to recruit outstanding students, and to hire new faculty. If the faculty's research activities are supported, rewarded, and acknowledged by the University, then we can continue to produce good work, improve our reputation, and attract top quality researchers and students, as well as acquire external funding.
- Differentiation of faculty roles may be necessary to reach our goals. As one example, the university might consider a designation such as *Academic Professional* or *Fellow* to create a culture that provides recognition, as measured externally.
- Definitions of research should not presuppose or favor particular approaches or methods and should recognize the value of multiple forms of research, scholarship, and creative activity including the arts.
- Teaching and research on teaching should be valued in their own right. Teaching involves dissemination of knowledge, co-construction of new understanding, development of habits of thought including critical thinking, promotion of social justice, and appreciation of diversity.
- Multiple forms of service including community engagement should be valued.
- Community engagement should be explicitly valued. USF should strive to maintain its Carnegie Foundation designation as a Community Engaged University.

Recommendations

- Because previous overuse of the faculty pay plan has negatively impacted some indicators of USF performance, we should pursue discussion about steps to accelerate use of a more appropriate classification framework:
 - Institute greater transparency with respect to the issue
 - Consider incentives to facilitate reclassification of current incumbents
 - Discuss the above with UFF
- Provide incoming faculty with explicit expectation of balance among research, teaching, and service in keeping with the values statement.
- Prioritize ensuring a sufficiently robust faculty to advance the USF and disciplinary & interdisciplinary missions
 - Acknowledge the need for differentiated assignments and the value thereof in a Very High Research university (RU/VH), e.g.,
 - Primarily instructional personnel
 - Research professor track
 - Eminent practitioners

- Observe caution regarding efforts to diversify faculty appointments & reduce proportion of tenure-track faculty
 - Expansion of non-tenure-track positions is a slippery slope
 - To prevent erosion of the value system:
 - Maintain attention to the values underlying the definition of faculty in a RU/VH
 - Ensure that the highest rewards are consistent with high performance in terms of these values
- The issue of quality of teaching is worth pursuing in its own right, despite not being at the heart of the RU/VH definition.

III. Responsibilities Workgroup: Findings and Recommendations

The observations and recommendations in this report are based primarily on responses provided by 33 Department Chairs within USF Academic Affairs to a survey conducted in January-February 2009, and Workgroup members' discussion of those responses. A blank copy of the survey is attached as **Appendix A**. Summaries of survey responses by topic/question are provided in **Appendix B**.

Part I of the report focuses on five key aspects of the academic enterprise that are reflected in the Phase I AAU indicators, listed below. General principles that may be useful in guiding institutional policies related to one or more indicators are described first, followed by specific recommendations related to each indicator.

- 1) research funding
- 2) research and scholarly productivity
- 3) prestigious faculty awards, fellowships and memberships
- 4) number and quality of PhDs awarded
- 5) number of postdoctoral trainees

Part II of the report addresses four specific questions that were posed by the Provost in his original charge to the Task Force.

- 1) What form should an effective post-tenure review take?
- 2) How should tenure and promotion processes encourage community engagement and global research?
- 3) Should instructors take part in the annual evaluations of tenure-track faculty?
- 4) Are there institutional strategies for supporting effective faculty recruitment?

Part I: Key aspects of the academic enterprise related to key AAU indicators

A. Guiding principles

- USF should take a strategic approach to achieving long term goals that are identified in the USF strategic plan, but should not focus on “chasing the numbers” associated with AAU indices.
- USF policies and institutional practices must facilitate, and not unintentionally hinder, faculty productivity.
- Faculty time is a valuable resource that should be allocated to critical academic tasks, and not drained by excessive service requirements or tasks that are better allocated to support staff.
- Faculty productivity depends on ready access to human (staff and student) and material (infrastructure and financial) resources.
- Faculty productivity is best sustained through recognition and reward.

B. Specific recommendations

1. Strategies to increase research funding

Survey responses indicated variations in the approaches taken by different departments with helpful strategies in one unit being identified as barriers in another. The range of recommendations for desirable changes in institutional practices centered on improved pre- and post-award operations, adequate recognition and rewards for faculty, and strategic planning for enhanced infrastructure (both human and material).

a) Identify recurring funds to:

- reward research-active faculty who vigorously pursue and successfully obtain external grant funding by providing salary increments, additions to summer salary while grants are active, reductions in teaching load, travel awards, etc.
- provide graduate student fellowships for entering students that are competitive with those at other universities
- provide higher levels of support, including summer stipends, to continuing graduate students

b) Facilitate the pre-award phase at USF through:

- funded summer research appointments for grant-writing, particularly for junior faculty
- faculty seed grants that support pilot studies and interdisciplinary explorations needed for larger grant submissions
- grant-writing workshops provided by representatives of Federal funding agencies who have knowledge of national funding priorities
- enhanced mentoring of junior faculty by grant-active senior faculty, resulting in team submissions of grant proposals to secure external funding with increased probability of success
- funding for faculty (especially junior faculty) to attend national research conferences and workshops
- increased staff support for grant writing within Colleges
- identification and communication of grant opportunities to relevant faculty
- facilitation of collaborative research and grant submissions across departments and colleges, including grant initiatives between sciences and humanities
- awarding of supplemental stipends to recipients of USF internal grants who submit larger applications within one year of the internal grant award

c) Facilitate the post-award phase at USF by:

- reorganizing the post-award process to achieve efficient grant management and avoid unproductive use of faculty time
- providing support for grant management within Colleges to reduce burdens on faculty time
- insuring that faculty researchers receive sufficient support from the overhead monies generated by their grants

d) Institute University-wide policies to support interdisciplinary collaborative research (indirect cost-sharing among units, credit for multiple-PI projects, etc.)

- e) Coordinate strategic planning between Unit Heads and the Provost for the development and maintenance of shared infrastructure.
- f) Insure that the research-infrastructure needs of PI's are adequately served by the overhead monies that they generate.

2. Strategies to enhance research and scholarly productivity

Survey responses demonstrated significant overlap with recommendations for increasing research funding.

- a) Provide adjunct faculty funding to support reductions in teaching loads by research faculty engaged in scholarly activity.
- b) Provide specific rewards for interdisciplinary interaction.
- c) Use a "rolling" multi-year (3-year?) evaluation procedure, based on identified scholarly metrics, to better assess, recognize and reward research and scholarship whose timing is not coincident with sporadically available financial incentives.
- d) Use merit-based salary raises to incentivize and reward faculty productivity.
- e) Provide 12-month (calendar year) salaries for research-active faculty who do not have grant-supported summer salary.
- f) Provide travel funds for research-active faculty to present research papers.
- g) Support colloquia in units where such activity is a vital part of the research endeavor.
- h) Aim for more and higher-quality faculty hires, incorporating planning for associated higher costs and research space. Focus on more hires at the Associate, or Full Professor level, especially in doctoral degree granting departments.
- i) Provide more competitive start-up funds for new faculty.
- j) Develop a plan for legislative requests to build additional research space at USF.
- k) Aggressively seek legislative approval to create several research centers at USF in areas of interdisciplinary strength.

3. Strategies to increase prestigious faculty awards, fellowships and memberships

Survey responses suggested a number of different approaches, ranging from better publicity about the awards and recognition for award winners, to more incentives for applicants and their departments.

- a) Increase faculty awareness of awards for which they may be eligible.
- b) Provide incentives for recruiting and retaining faculty who have already won such awards.
- c) Continue and expand summer workshops which provide faculty with a stipend for submitting a fellowship application.
- d) Develop mechanisms for paying the portion of a faculty member's salary that is not covered by a fellowship, so that the faculty member and department are not deterred from pursuing these awards.

4. Strategies to increase the number and quality of PhDs awarded

Survey responses indicated two major barriers to increasing the number of PhD's awarded for existing PhD programs: (1) the number and dollar-amount of stipends available to departments for supporting PhD students, and (2) the availability of mid- and senior-level faculty to mentor these students.

- a) Given the limited funding available for PhD students and finite faculty resources for mentoring those students, it is recommended that the Provost in conjunction with the Deans and Dept. Chairs set individual goals for existing PhD programs relative to (1) the number of enrolled PhD students (and full time vs. part time status), (2) the quality of PhD students enrolled and (3) the time-to-completion of degree.
- b) Although the AAU metric emphasizes the *number* of degrees, there may be long-term benefit to USF in emphasizing the *quality* of PhD students over the absolute number.
- c) Competition for high-quality PhD candidates depends strongly on the availability of competitive levels of funding and is enhanced by the ability to guarantee several years of funding at the time of admission. Current policies regarding the allocation of TA and GA funding impede the ability of individual programs to attract the best students. It is recommended that new policies be considered that would allow Dept. Chairs to have more control over the distribution of monies allocated to PhD-student support, (1) giving them latitude to increase stipend amounts to attract highly qualified students, and (2) providing them with greater stability of funding from year to year.
- d) The responsibility for mentoring PhD students falls more heavily on senior faculty than on junior faculty. Thus, the accomplishment of goals related to PhD education requires an appropriate mix of junior and senior-level faculty with each Department.
- e) The number of Presidential Doctoral Fellowships should be increased to a number appropriate for USF's size and goals. The number of fellowships could be increased by adding a teaching requirement to the middle years (years 2, 3, & 4) of the fellowship.
- f) The Development Office could focus on gifts/endowments that would specifically fund fellowships, with individual fellowships potentially carrying names of benefactors.
- g) PhD student travel should be exempted from intermittent travel freezes if students are traveling to make presentations at conferences, as such presentations have large benefits relative to cost.

5. Strategies to increase the number of postdoctoral trainees

Survey responses reflected a wide range of experience with postdoc training. Some departments indicated that postdoc training is not typical in their field, many expressed interest in establishing a postdoc training program, and a few described active postdoc programs.

- a) Facilitate increases in the number of postdocs by allowing departments to have flexibility in the mechanisms used to fund such positions.
- b) Provide start-up or matching funds to departments who demonstrate the potential for long-term postdoc funding on research or training grants.
- c) Provide incentives to faculty members and/or departments who have been successful in funding postdoctoral fellows on research grants, for example through a matching program that funds an additional postdoc for every postdoc supported on external funds. This would increase

the critical mass of the research enterprise and lead to more grants which support even more postdocs.

Part II: Questions posed by the Provost

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

Survey responses tended to cluster around two options: i) a full review, similar to a mid-tenure review, every 5 to 7 years; ii) some procedure that follows the annual review in the event that a faculty member receives unsatisfactory marks for 2-3 years in a row.

- a) Given that it would be difficult to imagine a situation in which the post-tenure review could be negative after many years of positive annual evaluations, the two poles could be combined into one: robust annual reviews plus more intense reviews every 4-5 years.
- b) Faculty members who receive strong evaluations during post-tenure review should be rewarded with a salary increase as part of a merit-based program; those whose evaluations are less satisfactory should be considered for both mentoring and lesser or no increase in salary.
- c) A related issue concerns faculty members who successfully navigate tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, but then fail to progress from Associate Professor to Full Professor. Mid-level faculty have the greatest potential to increase the national reputation and impact of the university as they progress in their careers; thus, it is important to monitor and support them during this process.

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

There was little consensus in the survey responses to this question. Responses ran the gamut from excluding these criteria completely, to including them in the criteria for the research evaluation. Approximately one-third of responding chairs indicated that neither factor should be considered explicitly in the T&P process.

These decisions are best made at the local (department) level, since the relevance of community engagement and global research varies according to academic area and program. Higher level reviews of T&P applications (by the College, Provost, etc.) must respect the local criteria.

3. Should instructors take part in the Annual evaluations of tenure/tenure-track faculty?

Responses indicated that instructors participate in the annual evaluations of tenure-track faculty in approximately 1/3 of departments, and do not participate in the remaining 2/3. We did not solicit comments to explain these differences, but there may be department-specific reasons to include instructors in the evaluation committee in some departments.

4. Are there institutional strategies for supporting effective faculty recruitment?

Survey responses focused primarily on three issues: (i) salary and benefits, (ii) initial support for research, and (iii) policies that facilitate the hiring process itself. Some responses also indicated a need for better-equipped physical space and summer support for research activities. Finally, several department chairs commented on the need to maintain sufficient numbers of faculty lines in their departments and provide replacement lines for departed faculty.

- a) High-quality candidates should be targeted, including established scholars at the Associate and Full Professor levels.
- b) Because starting salaries appear to be less of an issue than benefits , it may be helpful to focus on increasing benefits by including a moving allowance and providing tuition credits that extend to the faculty member's family.
- c) Enhance initial research support by providing increased start-up funds, reduced teaching loads during the first year, university-funded graduate research assistants, and increasing travel funds.
- d) If a department loses a tenure-track faculty member due to early departure and/or denial of tenure, the faculty line should automatically be returned to the unit.
- e) The search process should be improved by:
 - Approving searches earlier in the academic year, or giving permission to initiate a search prior to receipt of full approval (with the understanding that the search may need to be cancelled).
 - Establishing a mechanism for expedited hiring for outstanding candidates.
 - Distributing start-up funds more equitably.
 - Re-establishing an official spousal-hiring policy.

IV. Rewards Workgroup: Findings and Recommendations

The Rewards Workgroup chose to conduct a survey of the faculty as a major component of its approach to fulfilling its charge. The survey was completed by more than 350 faculty members generally representative of the distribution of faculty across the colleges. Additional information about the survey is provided in Appendix A. Across all data collected, the workgroup found that USF faculty value four major categories of rewards: **Recognition, Respect, Support, and Competent/Caring Administrators**. These categories are also evidence of what makes USF a “rewarding” place to work; conversely, the absence of these tangible and intangible rewards and resources greatly impacts faculty morale and productivity. Impressions informed by the survey data and other sources, including the literature on faculty rewards (see Appendix B), suggest a framework for understanding faculty rewards, summarized below in section A.

As a “given” in any monetary reward structure, USF faculty overwhelmingly reported “higher salary” as their first concern, expressing a desire for monetary compensation that meets and/or exceeds national averages for Research I institutions. Beyond this predictable interest, the Rewards Workgroup drew on the responses to articulate several recommendations, summarized and discussed below in section B.

A. Framing Faculty Rewards

The Rewards Workgroup (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 RWG3 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 RWG3 invites USF faculty and administration **to consider how rewards may or may not be “rewarding” to faculty** in general. The RWG3 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.

B. 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 RWG3 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 RWG3 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 RWG3 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/sg/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 RWG3 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 RWG3 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 RWG3’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 RWG3 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

- **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 RWG3 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 RWG3 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.”

V. Participating Task Force Members

Workgroup on Faculty Roles

Jeannie Kleinhammer-Tramill* (Workgroup Chair, Special Education)
Ellis Blanton* (Information Systems/ Decision Sciences)
Carol Ann Borchert (Library)
Mark Goldman (Psychology)
Pat Finelli (Theatre & Dance)
Michael Lynch (Criminology)
Brent Weisman (Anthropology)
Tom Weller* (Electrical Engineering)

Workgroup on Faculty Responsibilities

Gail Donaldson* (Workgroup Chair, Communication Sciences & Disorders)
Roger Ariew (Philosophy)
Dmitry Khavinson (Mathematics & Statistics)
Gary Mitchum (Physical Oceanography)
Pritish Mukherjee* (Physics)
Jianping Qi (Finance)
Paul Stiles (Mental Health Law & Policy)
Shannon Suldo (Psychological & Social Foundations)

Workgroup on Faculty Rewards

Pamela Hallock Muller* (Workgroup Co-chair, Marine Science)
Joan Gregory* (Workgroup Co-chair, Nursing)
Elizabeth Bell (Communication)
Daniel Belgrad (Humanities & Cultural Studies)
James Garey (Cell Biology, Microbiology & Molecular Biology)
Vikas Mehta (Architecture and Community Design)
Janet Richards (Childhood Education and Literacy Studies)
Lawrence Schonfeld (Aging & Mental Health Disparities)
Rajan Sen (Civil Engineering)

*** Executive Committee**

Greg Teague (Task Force Chair, Mental Health Law & Policy)
Ellis Blanton (Information Systems/ Decision Sciences)
Gail Donaldson (Responsibilities Workgroup Chair, Communication Sciences & Disorders)
Kofi Glover (Provost's Office Liaison, Government International Affairs)
Joan Gregory (Nursing)
Jeannie Kleinhammer-Tramill (Special Education)
Pritish Mukherjee (Physics)
Pam Muller (Workgroup Chair, Geological Oceanography)
Dwayne Smith (Provost's Office Liaison and Task Force Facilitator, Criminology)
Graham Tobin (Provost's Office Liaison, Geography)
Tom Weller (Electrical Engineering)

Initial Steering Committee (through October 2008)

All members of the Executive Committee*

Trent Green (Architecture)
Patricia Kruk (College of Medicine)
Dave Armitage (USF Polytechnic)

Other Participants

World Café

Ellis Blanton (Information Systems and Decision Sciences)
Randy Borum (Mental Health Law & Policy)
Mike Bowen (Management & Organization)
Ann Cranston-Gingras (Special Education)
Sherman Dorn (Psychological & Social Foundations)
Chris Ferekides (Electrical Engineering)
Ben Flower (Marine Science)
Ilene Frank (Library)
Maureen Groer (Nursing)
Hunt Hawkins (English)
Pam Muller (Marine Science)
Jeff Ryan (Geology)
Brent Small (Aging Studies)
Paul Spector (Psychology)
Hari Srikanth (Physics)
Fred Steier (Communication, facilitator)
Amy Stuart (Public Health, joint appt. in Engineering)
Greg Teague (Mental Health Law & Policy, facilitator)
Joanne Waugh (Philosophy)
Jack Wilkins (School of Music)
Yu Zhang (Civil Engineering)

Graduate Students, College of Education

Ruth Slotkin
Vicki Caruna
Sarah Semon