

Report of the Faculty Development Committee

To Provost Winston Langley

UMass Boston

June 19, 2009

Table of Contents

Report of the Faculty Development Committee	1
Table of Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	6
2. The Committee and its Task	7
3. Faculty Development at UMass Boston	8
History and Current Practices	8
4. Results of Faculty Development Committee Survey	14
5. Faculty Development—The Larger Picture, UMass Boston Concerns and Best Practices	23
General Concerns in Faculty Development	23
Areas of Faculty Work.....	24
Career Stages and Roles	36
6. Major themes emerging from the committee’s work	43
7. Recommendations	44
A. The committee recommends, as a long-term goal, the establishment of a Faculty Development Center that will carry out the above functions.....	44
B. The committee recommends immediate action on the following university priorities.....	45
C. The committee recommends that, in conjunction with these other efforts, there be attention from the Faculty Advisory Board and the Provost’s Office to planning initial programming in areas that have been identified as significant through the work of this committee.....	48
D. The committee recommends that university and college level support be increased over time to support these recommendations and faculty work in general.	52
References and Resources	53
Appendix 1: Charge from Provost Winston Langley to the Faculty Development Committee.....	63
Appendix 2: Detailed Faculty Development/Support Information by College	64
Appendix 3: Faculty Development Survey Questions	68
Appendix 4: Faculty Development Survey Report	73
Areas of Faculty Work.....	73
Career Stages and Roles	93
Appendix 5: Additional Suggestions from Subcommittee Reports	106

Executive Summary

The following report is presented by the Faculty Development Committee in response to the charge from Provost Winston Langley to do the following: review relevant literature on faculty development and mentoring; identify existing campus resources and practices as well those of other institutions; and make recommendations for faculty development priorities, activities, and structures at all career stages and for non-tenure track as well as tenure track and tenured faculty at UMass Boston. The committee reviewed current university and college practices and the recent history of faculty development efforts at UMass Boston, conducted a faculty survey to ascertain the areas of satisfaction and the perceived support and development needs of faculty at all career stages in both tenure track/tenured and non-tenure track roles in the major areas of faculty work—teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity—and explored best practices in literature and at other universities for carrying out effective faculty development across these areas.

The survey offers a picture of a faculty that is committed to all aspects of their work, values UMass Boston colleagues and students, and has generally made use of relevant faculty development opportunities. At the same time, faculty feel overburdened, undersupported, and sometimes undervalued for the work they do, and they would benefit not only from more resources and a reduced teaching load, but from a more coherent range of opportunities for further development across the several aspects of their work, beginning with orientation for new faculty, and continuing through retirement, with different concerns becoming more prominent for faculty at different stages. While the majority of respondents feel satisfied or very satisfied with the possibilities of a productive career at UMass Boston, that percentage remains low (55%). Survey responses suggest that UMass Boston needs to approach faculty development in a way that involves not only attending to specific problems and needs, but also taking a broader perspective in creating an effective campus climate for faculty work and helping faculty shape productive and satisfying careers within its context, if the institution is to retain faculty and to help them be as productive and as satisfied as possible with the careers they build here and most willing to contribute, in turn, to institutional development.

Some specific needs that emerged from this study include the following:

- the need for better knowledge/information about opportunities, resources, and policies for faculty in all career stages, with easy access, both virtual (website), and physical;
- a coherent and coordinated approach to faculty development work on campus, with clear links between local efforts in colleges and departments and centralized university efforts, and among university-wide faculty development activities in CIT, IT, and the library;
- networking/support/mentoring both within and beyond departments;
- ongoing planning of programming to address (i) current and emerging faculty needs and interests, (ii) an evolving university, and (iii) the national higher education agenda and trends;
- programming and activities that address all aspects of faculty work (teaching, research, service) and help faculty (i) define and plan such work in appropriate ways for their academic units, and (ii) integrate these activities where possible, through all career stages and roles, and (iii) contribute to a larger campus culture which supports faculty intellectual and social life; and
- a career-building focus that helps faculty, from the moment of their entry at UMass Boston, to shape productive and satisfying careers within this institutional context while identifying ways in which they can, in turn, contribute to long-term institutional development.

When the concerns of UMass Boston faculty are seen within the context of best practices in the field, it becomes clear the university needs a) to be more comprehensive in providing, for faculty as individuals, both the resources and the faculty development needed for the full range of faculty work that will make up a satisfying and productive career, and b) to be more integrative in drawing together the various institutional components that impact such work.

In response to the identified needs and its examination of best practices, the committee makes the following recommendations:

- A. The committee recommends, as a long-term goal, the establishment of a Faculty Development Center that will carry out the functions identified above.**

B. The committee recommends immediate action on the following university priorities:

1. Creating a full program of orientation and first year faculty development for new faculty.
2. Establishing a Faculty Development Advisory Board.
3. Developing a faculty resource website.
4. Moving toward a 2-2 course load for tenure track and tenured faculty.
5. Integrating non-tenure track faculty more fully into the faculty life of the university.
6. Providing more effective support for faculty research and grant-funded initiatives through the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

C. The committee recommends that, in conjunction with these other efforts, there be attention from the Faculty Advisory Board and the Provost's Office to planning initial programming in areas that have been identified as significant through the work of this committee.

1. Developing a mentoring program.
2. Providing effective, faculty-oriented support for working with technology.
3. Furthering opportunities for faculty to share their work in various university settings.
4. Developing a program of social/collegial activities.
5. Addressing the distinct needs of faculty at all career stages/roles, including non-tenure track faculty, both full and part-time (paying particular attention to transition points), and addressing ways to integrate and/or manage all aspects of faculty work and shape a productive career.

D. The committee recommends that university and college level support be increased over time to support these recommendations and faculty work in general.

1. Introduction

Why should UMass Boston be concerned with faculty development? Like most institutions of higher learning, we want to offer our students high-quality teaching, by faculty who are engaged with the questions of the disciplines that they are teaching, and who know how to engage the full range of their students as well. We want our faculty to develop as productive scholars and to maintain that productivity throughout their careers. We want to get our institutional business done as efficiently and effectively as possible, and to have faculty engage in service that meets our institutional needs, while carrying out appropriate professional service, and, as an important part of our institutional mission, supporting our outreach to the community. We know that UMass Boston, as an urban public university with high demands on and expectations for faculty across all of these areas, a richly diverse student body, and limited resources, presents a challenging environment for all faculty, at all career stages and in all roles. We want to retain our faculty, offering an environment at UMass Boston that will be intellectually involving, collegial, and satisfying, and where the faculty, in turn, will contribute to the university's effectiveness across its institutional mission.

There is a substantial amount of literature on faculty development, much of which has been reviewed by this committee, and some of which will be referenced in this report. A question that emerges particularly strongly from that literature is whether faculty development should be focused primarily on the individual (in order to help each faculty member meet the institution's expectations for effective teaching, scholarship, and service in relation to departmental and disciplinary priorities), or whether it should also serve an institutional purpose (helping faculty contribute more effectively to a university as an organization, to address its mission and goals, and to help it shape its direction in ongoing ways.)¹ While defining those goals and the ways in which faculty work might contribute to them falls outside of the task given to this committee, the

¹ Faculty development that is both individually and organizationally-focused has often been explored in conjunction with concerns about underrepresentation and faculty diversity. A recent NSF-funded effort to increase the representation of women in the sciences suggests the need for both individual support-based and institutionally-transformative faculty development efforts. See Lauerson and Roque.

committee as a whole has envisioned effective faculty development as playing a dual role, contributing to both individual and institutional development and well-being.

2. The Committee and its Task

The committee was chaired by Ellie Kutz and included the following members: Ping-Ann Addo, Luis Alonso-Ovalle, Kristine Alster, Arthur Eisenkraft, Oscar Gutierrez, Kathryn Kogan, Donna Kuizenga, Peter Langer, Michael Novak, Frank Porell, Alexia Pollack, John Saltmarsh, Ivan Sascha Sheehan, Rajini Srikanth, Greg Sun, Lynnell Thomas, Amy Todd, Felicia Wilczenski, Vivian Zamel, and Wei Zhang; Aimee Blaquiere. Assistance to the committee was provided by Aimee Blaquiere.

The committee was charged by Provost Winston Langley with reviewing relevant literature on faculty development and mentoring, identifying existing campus resources and practices as well those of other institutions, and making recommendations for faculty development priorities, activities, and structures at UMass Boston². It met through the Spring 2009 semester.

The scope of the committee's work stems from the Strategic Plan, which addresses the following goals: 1) increase student access, engagement, and success; 2) attract, develop, and sustain highly effective faculty; 3) create a physical environment that supports teaching, learning, and research; and 4) enhance campus-community engagement through improved operational structures. The charge of the Faculty Development Committee directly corresponds with the goals 2 and 3 of the Strategic Plan.

The specific goals of the committee were to map the universe of faculty development (what exists at UMass Boston and what's possible) and develop a plan that would (i) include recommendations for a structure and (ii) propose priorities and stages of implementation for a plan for enhancing faculty development at the university.

² See Appendix 1 for the full charge from Provost Langley.

The work of this committee was structured in a combination of group meetings with the entire committee and smaller subcommittees that worked to identify best practices for faculty development in the central areas of faculty work—research, teaching, and service—as well as for different career stages. The working subcommittees prepared draft reports and reported back to the larger committee at frequent intervals. Information about current UMass Boston faculty development practices within the different colleges was gathered, while other institutional reports and resources were examined.³ In response to a perceived need from all of the subcommittees for further information from the faculty at large, a survey was prepared and distributed to all faculty, and sections of the survey responses were analyzed by teams representing the different areas of faculty work and career stages.⁴ This committee report was drafted based on the reports from the subcommittees and the collective discussions of their work by the entire committee to arrive at final recommendations.

3. Faculty Development at UMass Boston

History and Current Practices

An institution might support its faculty's development in several ways: through the type of institutional support that faculty members get as start-up funds for labs, funds to attend conferences, and other monetary support for initiatives that will contribute to a person's scholarly agenda or teaching expertise and overall career development; through competitions, such as the Healey grants; through awards that encourage excellence in teaching, scholarship and service; through campus opportunities to share scholarship or other aspects of professional practice; and finally through specific activities designed to engage faculty as learners, providing forums, workshops, or seminars for sharing ideas and best practices and learning new approaches. Discussions of faculty development are often linked to faculty personnel reviews, and to the extent that the review process provides evaluative feedback, offering guidance for future work, it can contribute to the growth of individual members of the faculty. But faculty development programs are commonly intended to focus on learning and development in ways that are separated from faculty review processes.

³ See Appendix 2 for detailed information gathered from the colleges.

⁴ The survey questions and a full report on the results can be found in Appendices 3 and 4.

UMass Boston has offered each of these types of support for faculty work to some degree. Some is offered at the department or college level (with wide variation), and some is centralized, serving faculty across the campus. Some is formal, such as recommendations for mentoring in CLA or mentoring arrangements in GCE, and some is informal, such as willingness on the part of many faculty to share their institutional knowledge with newer colleagues and to participate in informal networks that form around shared interests, such as teaching with technology.

Center for the Improvement of Teaching

In some ways, UMass Boston has been ahead of other institutions in providing formal, campus-wide faculty development opportunities, through the Center for the Improvement of Teaching, which was founded in 1983 with support from the Ford Foundation.⁵ CIT has offered a faculty-based model of faculty development, one in which faculty share their pedagogical knowledge and expertise and take responsibility for shaping the direction of the activities that the center offers. It has traditionally offered topic-focused semester-long seminars for faculty at all career stages (open to non-tenure track faculty when support is available), and more recently has also offered seminars designated for tenure-track faculty which address teaching within the context of managing the full range of expectations for tenure. The seminars offer participants the opportunity to engage in shared and extended inquiry into their work as teachers while contributing to a sense of common purpose that is important to the university's overall mission and the diverse student population that it serves. One important aspect of the seminars is that their discussions are kept confidential, ensuring that faculty will have an opportunity to seek help with the problems they might face in teaching or other areas of their work, without fear of it affecting the evaluation of that work. CIT also offers several forums per semester on a range of pedagogical topics, and an annual conference focused on "Teaching for Transformation," which brings together faculty from across campus and increasingly from other area institutions to share their pedagogical practices. With a faculty director and an advisory board made up of faculty

⁵ General information about CIT can be found at <http://www.cit.umb.edu/mission.html>. A history of CIT and a discussion of the model of faculty development that it offers appears in Kingston-Mann and Sieber, Eds. (2001), *Achieving against the Odds*. With additional Ford Foundation funding, the CIT model has been extended to other institutions, with CIT members acting as advisors as eight other colleges and universities have created their own faculty development programs, focused on inclusive teaching, through the New England Center for Inclusive Teaching (NECIT) [<http://www.necit.umb.edu/index.html>]

members who have also been seminar participants and leaders, CIT has built a network of faculty who are committed to the larger concern of continually improving teaching on the campus. Nevertheless, while there has been ongoing support from the provost and some of the college deans in providing course load reductions for participants, there has not been an equal level of support for or interest in CIT's work in all parts of the campus. With limited funding, a lack of an actual "center," and a necessary dependence on the volunteer efforts of faculty in organizing programming, there is much that is now included within the domain of faculty development that lies beyond the scope of what CIT alone can accomplish.

The faculty survey reinforced the sense that CIT seminars and other offerings were very useful to a subset of the faculty (45% of tenure track and tenured faculty had participated in such seminars, 70% were satisfied or very satisfied with their experience, and many commented on the ways in which the seminar had contributed to their teaching). However, it also reinforced a sense that the current CIT seminars, by themselves, cannot adequately address the needs of all the faculty. There was a strong thread of concern that the seminars were not of equal value to participants from all disciplinary areas (and several respondents wished for equivalent seminars focused specifically on math and sciences), while others commented on a desire for an equivalent opportunity that would focus on research and scholarship.

Educational Technology Support

With the growth of technology for teaching and research, another source of faculty development has been workshops and conferences offered by the Information Technology and Services Division. A Teaching with Technology initiative provided an introduction to a variety of programs and platforms, along with computers for participants, for several years, and provided a small amount of support for a number of Faculty Fellows to pursue ways of incorporating technology into their teaching, while ongoing workshops introduce faculty to the Blackboard Learning Management System and to other new tools as they become available.⁶

Survey responses also point to the usefulness of current educational technology workshops (60% of respondents had participated in workshops or conferences on technology and 70% of those

⁶ A more detailed discussion of support for faculty in teaching with technology can be found in the April 2009 report of the Faculty Council Task Force on ELearning Quality [<http://qualityonlinetaskforce.wikispaces.com/>]

participants were satisfied or very satisfied with the offerings), but also to some concerns about better technology support and the need for differently-focused or additional workshop offerings (including some that include more pedagogical applications).

Presidents' Office Initiatives

Two initiatives from the UMass President's Office, both now ended, provided further support for faculty development. A grant program through the Subcommittee on Academic Technology offered several years of competitive grants for faculty undertaking new approaches to using technology in teaching, through Spring 2009. In 2006-2007, the Zuckerberg Research Seminars for Untenured Faculty provided a much-valued opportunity for faculty to participate in a CIT-like seminar that focused on research.

Internal Grants

Other initiatives that provide support for faculty across the campus include competitive internal grant programs administered by the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects: the Healey Grant Program, the Proposal Development Grant Program, and Public Service Grants. Such internal grants provide critical support for faculty research and public service initiatives and can lead to outside funding.⁷ (The comments of survey respondents suggested, however, that, for many, the support for seeking and administering grants currently offered by ORSP is inadequate).

Awards

The Chancellor's Awards for Teaching, Scholarship and Service provide recognition for campus leaders in these areas. The individual colleges also sometimes offer awards and recognition.

Campus Intellectual Life

An ongoing seminar in humanities and sciences draws faculty with interdisciplinary interests, and various forums such as the Healey Library's current series, Six Degrees of Separation, the readings of creative work at the UMass Bookstore, the Junior Faculty Colloquium that existed until recently, the recent Hidden Treasures presentation of work by non-tenure track faculty in

⁷ "Internal Grant Programs Cultivate Research Success," <http://www.umb.edu/research/news/ingrants.html>

CLA, and other college and department based forums foreground faculty scholarship and provide an opportunity for faculty to share their work with colleagues.

New Faculty Orientation

For new tenure track faculty, the university offers an orientation to the campus and its resources, with an overview of expectations for and approaches to teaching, research, and scholarship. In 2008-09 the Provost's Office sponsored a series of events, both social and topical, focusing on aspects of teaching and research, for new tenure track faculty.

College Initiatives

Within the colleges, there are a number of different responses to the need for faculty development.⁸ In response to a request for information about faculty development initiatives, all of the college deans' offices that responded said that they encourage their faculty to attend and participate in CIT seminars, usually offering full-time faculty a course load release for their participation. Each of the colleges and departments has varying levels of mentorship, ranging from formal to informal. Department chairs, and in some colleges an associate dean, have responsibility for helping tenure-track faculty plan an appropriate research agenda. While many resources are focused on tenure track faculty, the colleges provide support to help all tenure-track and tenured faculty receive research funding and they also provide some level of travel funds for scholarly meetings. There is however limited support for non-tenure track faculty.

The most extensive effort to address concerns of tenure track faculty was undertaken by the College of Liberal Arts (CLA), which established, in 2004, a Junior Faculty Task Force to improve policies and procedures surrounding fourth year and tenure reviews at a time when an increasing number of new faculty were being hired. The task force conducted a survey of junior faculty and produced two reports, "On Track 1," and "On Track 2".⁹ On Track I offers suggestions and information for junior faculty, addressing common junior faculty questions regarding preparation for fourth year and tenure reviews, balancing responsibilities in teaching, service, and research, getting support, and how the tenure process works.

⁸ See Appendix 2 for detailed information on faculty development support by college.

⁹ The Task Force reports and supporting documents can be found at <http://www.umb.edu/academics/cla/faculty/junior.html>

On Track II addresses specific ways in which the College of Liberal Arts and its departments can contribute to the success and career development for tenure track junior faculty. This discussion is divided into several parts: suggestions for what departments can do right now; ideas for the future development of mentoring in the college and in departments; and a suggested method for departments wishing to clarify personnel review criteria and process. It addresses specific policies and procedures, including areas like course scheduling that can help to support the work of pre-tenured faculty, and includes a number of very useful suggestions for departments to support career development, improve mentoring, advise tenure track faculty on service commitments, and clarify the review process. The report recommends that each department set up a mentoring committee of its own, which would be charged with overseeing whatever mentoring system the department decides to design, and that tenure track faculty seek more than one source for mentoring. The task force also suggested that departments be proactive in making sure that tenure track faculty are socially integrated and involved in departmental decision-making, in helping tenure track faculty seek internal and external funding, in explaining the importance of teaching portfolios, in explaining the categories of the Annual Faculty Report, and in giving feedback on the Annual Faculty Reports each year. On Track II also includes clear guidelines for departments for developing a more transparent personnel review process.

These reports offered a valuable resource for our Faculty Development Committee and the recommendations they offer, although more strongly focused on policies and procedures at the department level, are congruent with the larger picture of faculty needs and priorities for faculty development at UMass Boston that has emerged from our own work.

An Earlier University-Wide Planning Effort--COVET

Another resource revisited by the committee was the 1997 COVET report from the Committee on Valuing and Evaluating Teaching,¹⁰ which undertook a two-year study, including gathering information about supporting and evaluating teaching from departments, surveying faculty and students, and researching the most effective ways of improving teaching performance. The last university-wide committee to address a significant area of faculty development at UMass

¹⁰ The full report is available under Resources>Teaching at www.umbfacultydevelopment.wikispaces.com. Three members of the present committee, Kutz, Langer, and Zamel, were involved in this earlier effort.

Boston, it recommended the creation of a centralized university structure, an Institute for Teaching, which would integrate faculty career development, assessment of teaching, teaching technology, inclusive teaching for diverse student, and pedagogical research. It further recommended that faculty be helped in developing individual teaching development plans and teaching portfolios, and that they be guided through observation and appropriate evaluation. Coordination at the department, college and university levels would link department-level teaching effectiveness committees with broader efforts, and strategic three year plans at the college and university level would provide a context within which individual plans would be developed. Other activities of the institute would include the development of teaching-focused publications, training sessions, and outreach to departments. The COVET recommendations were never implemented,¹¹ but the committee's work remains valuable in providing information and suggestions that are congruent with the work of the present committee.

This overview of representative initiatives on the campus and in the colleges shows that there is a great deal of activity and prior work that can be considered in support of faculty development. Yet these efforts are largely scattered and uncoordinated and do not contribute to a coherent and integrated program of faculty development at UMass Boston. At the same time, there is a persistent sense from the faculty and among members of this committee that there is much more to be done.

4. Results of Faculty Development Committee Survey

Overview

To learn more about the experiences of faculty at UMass Boston and the needs they identify for faculty development support, the committee designed a survey. The survey included general questions about faculty satisfaction in such areas as maintaining a productive and rewarding career at UMass Boston, the campus culture in relation to their intellectual and social development, and the ways in which their work is reviewed and evaluated. It also included specific questions in relation to the major areas of faculty work: teaching,

¹¹ With a change in provosts at the time that the committee's report was submitted, the substantial two-year effort was set aside without further follow-up.

research/scholarship/creative activity; and service. The survey was distributed to all faculty. The committee received 270 responses from faculty across colleges, in all career stages and roles: 46% of respondents were from CLA and almost 20% from CSM, with the rest distributed across the other colleges. Of the total respondents, 21% were tenure track faculty, 42% were tenured (almost evenly divided between associate professors and full professors), and 37% were non-tenure track (divided fairly evenly across the ranks of Lecturer, Lecturer II, and senior Lecturer, with fewer in Lecturer I). The survey yielded statistical information, and a wealth of comments that offer a sense of the lived experience of faculty at UMass Boston a number of these have been included in the full survey report in Appendix 4.) The committee analyzed the survey results by major categories of faculty work (teaching, research, and service) and by career stage/role.¹²

Teaching

In response to questions about their teaching at UMass Boston, respondents indicate that they are more satisfied than dissatisfied, although many (more than 70%) are less than satisfied with the resources, guidance, and support available to them from the college and university, and indicate that they depend substantially on their peers. Comments highlight these concerns, mentioning the lack of resources: inadequate physical facilities, insufficient administrative and staff support, little support for underprepared students, virtually no support for creating new and innovative courses, and perhaps most importantly, the competition for time between teaching, research, and service. While 60% of respondents are satisfied or very satisfied with the ways in which their teaching is valued and evaluated, many are concerned that it is not valued as highly as research, and that there is no adequate, organized and systematic effort to recognize, reward, and share good teaching practices. While the strategic plan seeks "to promote best teaching practices for our diverse population" and "to promote academic engagement" for all students at all levels through such practices as active and collaborative learning, reflective thinking, and community-based learning, only about 43% of the respondents are either satisfied or very satisfied with the support for engaging in such teaching at UMass Boston.

¹² A link to the overall survey results can be found at <http://umbfacultydevelopment.wikispaces.com/>. The filtered responses can be found on the "Ideas for" pages for each career stage on that site.

CIT seminars have offered one of the primary vehicles of faculty support for teaching; 45% of tenure respondents have participated in a seminar (there has been only occasional support for the participation of non-tenure track faculty) and, of those, over 70% have been either satisfied or very satisfied with the experience, although comments suggest a need for seminars more connected to the teaching concerns of those in specific disciplines such as math and science or with other areas of focus. A slightly higher percentage (51% of tenure stream, 46% of all respondents) has participated in CIT workshops and conferences. Other teaching support has been in the form of workshops offered by the educational technology staff of IT. While there are many complaints about the Blackboard learning management system and a number of faculty have created their own website alternatives, with about 60% of respondents using one or the other, nearly 70% of those who have participated in IT workshops have been satisfied with what they offer; concerns include a desire for less technical jargon, a stronger focus on pedagogy, a and more follow-up workshops.

For further support of teaching, many respondents call for a 2/2 load, better resources, a more collaborative environment for teaching improvement, and better information and coordination. Overall, the survey responses suggest that faculty often feel that the development of their teaching is an individual effort or something they engage in with a small group of close colleagues, rather than a well-supported and well-valued collective university-wide priority.

Research and Scholarship

Overall, the survey results portray a faculty that is very committed to performing high quality research and scholarship at all career stages, with faculty engaged in a range of scholarly work. Faculty respondents place a high value on the support received from colleagues, both within and outside of UMass Boston, which has helped them to achieve success in their fields of study. Yet their comments suggest a belief that their research and scholarship has been severely hampered by an institutional environment characterized by relatively heavy teaching loads and service responsibilities, and inadequate administrative and technical support for research.

Although the majority of faculty members at all career stages indicated that they were generally satisfied with respect to the way their scholarship is valued and evaluated at UMass Boston,

when asked about specific forms of institutional support, there was considerable dissatisfaction, particularly among the tenured faculty. Fewer than 30% of respondents reported to be satisfied or very satisfied with the level of monetary support for research (e.g., for labs, travel, etc.), the guidance received in seeking external and internal grant funding, and the release time provided in support of scholarship. In particular there was widespread concern about the lack of time for scholarship due to heavy teaching loads at UMass Boston.

The survey results also show widespread dissatisfaction among faculty with the activities of the ORSP. About 71% of tenure track and tenured respondents sought grant support for their research, scholarship, or professional activity through ORSP. However, a relatively small minority of them expressed satisfaction in response to questions about the various aspects of their experience (30% or fewer).

In responding to an open-ended question about the factors that have most contributed to individual effectiveness as a scholar or researcher or in creative endeavors, responses focus on both the paucity of formal institutional support, faculty self-determination, and the strong informal support system provided by peers. They portray a faculty that is proud of its own individual efforts, which have allowed faculty members to achieve success in their fields in spite of an institutional environment that has not generally provided resources commensurate with UMass Boston's aspirations for scholarship and research productivity. Comments emphasize the need for reduced faculty teaching loads, a revamped ORSP that will provide better administrative support for proposal development and administration, and university policies that reward rather than hinder faculty in their efforts to acquire intramural and extramural grant support for their scholarship.

Service

The majority of survey respondents across career stages are somewhat satisfied with the ways in which their service is valued and evaluated, and more are satisfied than dissatisfied with UMass Boston's support for their service work at the university, in the community, and to the profession (although the most often selected response was "neutral"). The service aspect of their faculty

work was most problematic for non-tenure track faculty who view service as an integral part of their development and want opportunities for meaningful service as well as recognition for that service.

Common concerns that emerged from the responses were that service demands are too great (felt across faculty stages) and that there needs to be release time for demanding service obligations. In further support of service at UMass Boston, the responses included better compensation for demanding service (e.g. CLR's), more opportunities and support for collaboration across departments and within the community, more opportunities to align service to research (e.g. research centers, applied research), less bureaucracy and streamlined paperwork, more support from staff/classified staff, and more recognition/reward for service. Two-thirds of respondents had not been involved in any activities that might have helped them to plan and engage in effective service, and there was a marked absence of answers that attributed effective service to UMass Boston institutional support. In addition, service opportunities are difficult to navigate for many faculty (junior faculty, in particular, find it difficult to determine how to access service possibilities and which to choose) and a number of faculty would welcome more planning and guidance. As with research, the faculty who felt that they had shaped a successful service profile had done so largely through their own efforts or through the informal support of colleagues/mentors, students, and/or professional staff.

In the end, survey responses show that many faculty are motivated in their service by their sense of responsibility to colleagues and the institution as well as by a commitment to the urban mission and the larger community. They would like opportunities that would allow their service to be better planned, and more effective, as well as more highly valued. Beyond that, they would like the service that they do to be meaningful, to draw on their knowledge and skills, and to contribute to their professional identities.

General Experience

In addition to questions about teaching, research and scholarship, and service, faculty were asked several questions about their general experience at the university. Overall, about 46% of respondents (44% of tenure stream) felt satisfied or very satisfied with the possibilities for managing and/or integrating their teaching, scholarship and service at UMass Boston, with another 30% neutral on this topic, and 56% (58% of tenure stream) were satisfied or very satisfied with the possibility of having a rewarding and productive career at UMass Boston, with another 22% neutral on this topic. However, only 37% (36% of tenure stream) were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall campus culture as it impacts the social and intellectual development of faculty in their career stage, and about 40% (41% of tenure stream) with the way their work is recognized and evaluated through current review processes, and they again raised concerns about the workload. They feel generally supported within their departments and most (78%) have good lines of communication with their chairs, but they are less satisfied with communication with their deans, the clarity of expectations for faculty work and how it will be evaluated, the information they received about the faculty review process, and the usefulness of AFR comments. Fewer than 50% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with information that they have received about their next major review.

Few faculty (less than 20%) have received formal mentoring, although many have been mentored informally by friends and colleagues. Comments suggest that many would appreciate more formal processes, mentoring for post-tenure career stages, and mentoring from those outside as well as inside the department.

Career Stages and Roles

While faculty at all career stages and in both tenure stream and non-tenure track roles voiced many common satisfactions and dissatisfactions, particular concerns emerge more strongly for faculty at particular career stages.

Several themes emerge from the comments of the eight brand new UMass Boston faculty who responded to the survey. One is a need for more support in teaching our diverse student population, along with some frustration over the lack of formal and structured orientation to

teaching techniques. The second is that the teaching load is unreasonable, given the other demands on their time.

Brand new and recently hired faculty were generally satisfied with the introductory activities and information they had been offered, but had a number of specific suggestions for improving orientation and providing workshops and other support activities in the first years.

Tenure track faculty echoed common concerns raised in the survey:

- the current teaching load being too high to meet research demands,
- the lack of institutional support for research, in general,
- the lack of appropriate travel funding, in particular,
- the need for a pre-tenure sabbatical year,
- the need for more explicit criteria for promotion, and
- the lack of appropriate support for grant proposal development and grant administration from ORSP.

They asked for structured mentoring and guidance in all three areas of faculty work.

Tenured faculty also voiced concerns about the conflict of teaching loads with research expectations, the lack of financial support for research, and the lack of appropriate support from that office. In addition, they pointed to

- a lack of mentoring for teaching beyond at the beginning of the career,
- the constant changes in the university's priorities and direction, and
- a general feeling in all areas of being cast out on one's own, except from those who considered themselves to be in departments with a strong departmental culture.

Those recently tenured voiced, as well, concerns with

- the current sabbatical leave policy,
- the lack of time for grant preparation and administration,
- the excessive cost of course buyouts, and
- the heavy service burden.

Those who had been tenured over seven years commented, as well, on excessive administrative assignments, although they continued to be willing to engage in meaningful service, and a number of longer-tenured faculty commented that the university could use their experience to mentor other faculty members.

Overall, the positive elements of their UMass Boston experience for all tenured faculty are their students and colleagues. But too many see the institution as a barrier to effective research, teaching and/or service, and it is clear that the institution needs to do more to give senior faculty opportunities to revitalize their work, and to feel appreciated---even those who are quite productive in any or all of the three areas.

In most areas, the percentages of non-tenure track faculty responding in particular ways about their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with various aspects of support for their work at the university were not substantially different from those of tenure stream faculty. Specific concerns raised were the following: that the development opportunities for non-tenure track faculty are highly dependent upon departmental organization and culture, with some feeling valued and central to their departments and others undervalued and peripheral; that many have received little or no orientation to the resources available for faculty development, that release time opportunities are needed for participation in faculty development; that those who are active scholars would like their work in this area to be recognized and supported at UMass Boston; that they would like more opportunities and support for participation in campus faculty development activities, more support for their teaching of diverse students, and more involvement in curriculum development beyond the individual class.

In reviewing survey responses, the committee also applied a filter to see whether the concerns of faculty of color were substantially different from those of other faculty—whether faculty of color raised concerns that were unique to their experience at UMass Boston. Because no pattern of unique concerns appeared in the survey, the committee has not addressed the faculty development needs of faculty of color as a separate category in this report. Nevertheless, the university should be sensitive to the experience of this demographic group, and some useful

resources for future consideration of such needs are included in the references and resources section of this report.¹³

Survey Conclusions

In summary, the survey offers a picture of a faculty that is committed to the several aspects of their faculty work, values UMass Boston colleagues and students, and has generally made use of relevant faculty development opportunities. At the same time, faculty feel overburdened, undersupported, and sometimes undervalued for the work they do, and that they would benefit not only from more resources and a reduced teaching load, but from a more coherent range of opportunities for further development across the several aspects of their work, beginning with orientation for new faculty, and continuing through retirement, with different concerns becoming more prominent for faculty at different stages. While the majority of respondents feel satisfied or very satisfied with the possibilities of a productive career at UMass Boston, that percentage remains low (55%). Their many suggestions of specific ways in which their work might be enhanced should contribute to further planning for faculty development.

While the survey points to a variety of faculty needs and concerns across the different areas of faculty work at different career stages, the committee is particularly concerned about faculty responses to questions about their general experience at UMass Boston. Although 46% of faculty respondents (and 44% of tenure stream faculty) reported feeling satisfied or very satisfied with the possibilities for managing or integrating the several aspects of their work and 56% (58% of tenure stream) were satisfied or very satisfied with the possibility of having a rewarding and productive career at UMass Boston, the committee feels that for the long-term health of the university, these levels of faculty satisfaction need to be significantly higher.. In addition, only 37% (36% of tenure stream) were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall campus culture as it impacts the social and intellectual development of faculty in their career stage. These responses suggest that UMass Boston needs to approach faculty development in a way that involves not only attending to specific problems and needs, but also taking a broader perspective in creating an effective campus climate for faculty work and helping faculty shape productive and satisfying careers within this specific institutional context.

¹³ See, for example, Moody, *Faculty Diversity*.

5. Faculty Development—The Larger Picture, UMass Boston Concerns and Best Practices

General Concerns in Faculty Development

The concerns of UMass Boston faculty are reflective of those in the larger academic community. A 2006 study of faculty development in higher education¹⁴ surveyed faculty development scholars and practitioners (including faculty, directors of teaching and learning centers, and academic administrators) from a wide range of institutions, all of which had established faculty development programs, and identified a number of challenges looking forward. These include changing faculty roles as faculty are under increased pressure to keep up with new directions in teaching (including integrating technology, focusing on learner-centered teaching, active learning, and the assessment of learning outcomes), and research (including keeping up with new specialties and with increased calls for interdisciplinary research). At the same time, there are increased demands on new faculty as they navigate the tenure process, a growing and increasingly long-term part time and non-tenure track faculty whose needs haven't been addressed by most faculty development efforts in the past, and, for all faculty, a concern about balancing work and life. (Each of these challenges is present at UMass Boston). Faculty development work then requires a coherent plan to address a wide range of concerns, with attention to emerging issues as well as those that are identified at present.

In a study of faculty turnover in research universities, Jay Dee and a colleague looked at the effect of structural factors (collegial communication, equitable rewards, work autonomy, presence or absence of role conflict, and a role in organizational decision making), psychological factors (job satisfaction), and organizational commitment (congruence between individual and organizational goals and identification/involvement with the organization) on faculty satisfaction and likelihood of staying in their present situation.¹⁵ They found the largest effect on likely faculty retention to come from communicative openness, and pointed to the importance of venues and forums for faculty communication, socialization, and mentoring, connecting all

¹⁴ Sorcinelli et al, 2007.

¹⁵ Daley and Dee, 2006.

segments of the faculty population. There was also some evidence that commitment to the institution was related to trans-departmental networks (e.g. interdisciplinary research opportunities), and that when faculty were narrowly tied to one department or discipline, they were likely to see other institutions as offering equal or better opportunities. The frequent responses to the faculty survey that cited students and colleagues as positive elements in the satisfaction and growth of faculty members suggest that faculty development activities that help to strengthen the sense of collegiality and communication can have an impact in mitigating other more problematic aspects of the work environment at UMass Boston. Yet it remains important that faculty feel more satisfied with the larger institutional context in which their careers are unfolding.

Areas of Faculty Work

In this section of the report, we will review general concerns related to faculty development that were raised by the different subcommittees, connecting them to the survey results and placing them within the context of the literature on best practices.¹⁶ Within this broader context, the various subcommittees identified, through their reviews of the literature, inquiries to colleagues at other universities through professional organizations, and searches of websites for urban 13 and other comparable institutions, a number of best practices related to the primary areas of faculty work in teaching, research, and service, and in relation to the various career stages and roles.¹⁷

Common concerns raised across group and committee discussions include the following:

- The need for a planned approach for individual faculty as they try to balance the various areas of their faculty work while enhancing their teaching, shaping a coherent professional path, and engaging in service that is meaningful and makes the best use of their talents.
- The need for better direction by administrative leaders in guiding faculty, especially newer faculty, toward appropriate faculty development opportunities.

¹⁶ The following discussion draws from the reports of the different subcommittees and later committee discussion. The original subcommittee reports are available at <http://umbfacultydevelopment.wikispaces.com>.

¹⁷ Resources used by the subcommittees are posted to <http://umbfacultydevelopment.wikispaces.com>.

- The need for better preparation for administrative leaders, particularly department chairs, as an aspect of their own faculty development and to support the development of their faculty.
- The need to provide better information about resources that are available to faculty (see discussion of a website under recommendations).
- The need for faculty development that addresses all areas of faculty work.

In addition, a number of specific concerns were raised as the subcommittees and full committee discussed these areas of faculty work and the needs of faculty in different career stages/roles.¹⁸

Supporting Teaching

UMass Boston concerns

“Everyone says teaching is valued – but no resources actually value it. As long as we teach our three or two courses each semester, we’re fine. But nothing really is done to help, or to supervise, or to provide focus” (survey comment).

Despite the fact that UMass Boston offers a number of resources for supporting teaching, such as CIT seminars, the workshops for new faculty sponsored by the Provost’s Office in 2008-09, and workshops sponsored by IT and the library, faculty are often unaware of the existence of these resources or of their specific offerings or suitability for specific purposes. (For example, a number of survey respondents indicated that they knew little or nothing about CIT.) In terms of existing resources, then, there is a need for better information, but also for chairs to communicate their expectations, especially to new faculty, that faculty avail themselves of these resources. Tenure track faculty, for example, might be asked to document, perhaps through a “teaching portfolio,” their participation in activities related to teaching and the impact of such activities on

¹⁸ The committee focused on areas of work as defined by the Redbook and evaluated through the AFR process. The creation of subcommittees in these areas does not suggest that these areas should not be integrated to the degree possible in the lives of individual faculty, with research carrying over into teaching, and service, both professional and institutional, arising from both.

their subsequent teaching, providing an opportunity for faculty reflection that would impact teaching positively.

Beyond the current seminars, workshops, and conference offered by CIT, there is a need for activities that address the concerns of faculty in a wider range of disciplines (a number of survey respondents asked for seminars focused on science and math teaching), that address more topics, and that address curricular as well as pedagogical concerns.

“Beyond the CIT seminars and the technology workshops, there does not seem to be a sustained set of initiatives related to teaching practices; e. g., a series of workshops on service learning, a series of workshops on teaching research methods to graduate students; a series of workshops on collaborative learning, etc. UMass Boston needs greater capacity to address and develop faculty skills in new and innovative pedagogical practices that can address student needs. Also, the university does not seem to do much in the way of socializing new, first-year faculty to their teaching roles. Can something be structured for them?” (survey response).

“I'd love to see what a "master teacher" (as defined by the parameters of academia) knows and is able to do in a sample classroom. Small group invitations to be a part of such master teachers' practices for a couple of hours.”(survey response).

There is also a need for further attention to how teaching is evaluated/measured and what types of benchmarks are expected. The university needs to give some attention to the question of how faculty can be encouraged to experiment with new methods of teaching within the constraints imposed by the system of teaching evaluations that currently exists.¹⁹

The demand for “21st century skills” and the increasing role of educational technology in teaching places new demands on faculty. While IT-based workshops offer instruction in the use of new technologies, they are typically run by staff without experience in a faculty role and generally lack a pedagogical focus. (Survey respondents had mixed reviews of the support they

¹⁹ These issues were addressed in detail in the 1997 COVET Report.

received from IT staff, some praising that support and others complaining that it was too little or ineffective. (But comments included a number of calls for a stronger pedagogical focus in workshops.) Studies of faculty involved in such teaching show that it often involves a shift in instructional roles and that faculty have ranked “redesigning and rethinking faculty roles as the highest priority to be addressed in professional development sessions” that prepare them to teach in e-learning environments.²⁰ Such professional development requires that this area of teaching be addressed within a faculty-centered and not just a primarily technology-centered program, something that will become increasingly important as more faculty become involved in such teaching, including offering fully-online courses.

Best practices for supporting teaching

The evidence from other campuses suggests that best practices for supporting teaching include a number of elements:

- Teaching centers, structured around different models with some faculty-driven and others led by administrators, with some focused almost entirely on teaching, and others as part of a more comprehensive faculty development center.²¹ Increasingly, such teaching and faculty development centers also encompass faculty support for teaching with technology. According to a 2005 report prepared by Jay Dee on teaching and learning centers:

Two variables differentiate how most teaching and learning centers are organized. The first variable is governance: faculty-governed or administratively-driven. Faculty-governed centers are led by a faculty member who serves as director of the center. Administratively-driven centers are led by instructional designers or professional staff members who are not faculty. The second variable is whether instructional technology support for faculty is also included in the mission of the

²⁰ See McQuiggen 2007 for a review of the literature on faculty development and elearning. The Spring 2009 ELearning Quality Education Task Force Report to Faculty Council reviews the literature on effective practices for faculty development for teaching with technology, and makes a number of recommendations for UMass Boston.

²¹ Jay Dee (2005) report, Centers for Teaching and Learning.

center. On some campuses, instructional technology is part of the mission of the center; on other campuses, a separate unit provides these services to faculty.

While UMass Boston has relied entirely on a faculty-governed structure in CIT, it has not offered the administrative supports more characteristic of administratively-driven models, and a blended model might be more appropriate to this university at this time. Whatever the structure, faculty development is made a campus priority by virtue of the fact that the center is well-resourced and adequately staffed (e.g. George Mason University appointed an Associate Provost for Faculty Development to lead the center, in addition to a faculty fellow and an administrative staff).

- A full range of programs that includes not only seminars, workshops, and forums, but also luncheons and other activities that contribute to the overall social and intellectual climate of the campus while addressing issues related to teaching effectiveness (some organized around specific themes and some more “free-form” in nature and meant as an opportunity for faculty to discuss matters important to them). Some topics that arose in survey comments include assessment, working with diverse learners, and developing curriculum.
- A well-organized, easy-to-navigate, resource-heavy website that displays information about resources and programs, including resources related to best practices/scholarship of teaching and learning; campus workshops related to teaching effectiveness; consulting/mentoring services available to faculty; resources related to evaluating, documenting, and examining one’s own teaching; interdisciplinary, multi-site workshops and short courses; a clear mission statement consistent with the purpose of the university; and links to university-wide assessments of teaching effectiveness.
- A reduced course load. In some ways it seems ironic that an important way to support effective teaching is to give faculty an opportunity to do less of it. Yet it is clear that a demanding 3-3 load along with heavy responsibilities in other areas of faculty work give faculty little time for the thoughtful development of new approaches to their teaching or of new courses or course designs.

Supporting research, scholarship, and creative and professional activity

UMass Boston concerns

“Research takes time, effort, and undivided attention. A 3/3 teaching load makes it very hard to compete in research with universities offering a 2/2 and increasingly a 1/2 teaching load. I want to continue to help the college and the university increase the research profile, but this is very difficult to do with a 3/3 teaching load - and full to over-full classes” (survey comment).

Survey responses suggest that UMass Boston faculty, on the whole, are committed to maintaining and developing a significant agenda of scholarly endeavors but find it challenging to do so in the face of a heavy teaching load, substantial service demands, and inadequate university support. Of tenure track and tenure stream faculty respondents, 57% were satisfied or very satisfied with the ways in which their scholarship had been evaluated, and another 17% were neutral. Yet the survey responses confirmed a set of concerns identified by the subcommittee: a general concern about the level of support for faculty research at all stages, a lack of appropriate mentoring and support, and a lack of a professional support staff. Inadequate support affects both tenure track and tenured faculty throughout the career span, with much of the support that does exist for junior faculty falling off after tenure. The subcommittee pointed to an expectation that senior faculty members will attract more funding, and to the different career paths that exist between those whose development depends on external funding and those who don't. However scholarship is defined, the committee agrees that faculty should have available mentoring, contacts, and appropriate resources to help them carve out scholarly programs, even at later career stages.

Committee discussions also raised the question of the different epistemologies or philosophies underlying the ways in which scholarship might be defined. While some members of the committee preferred to focus a discussion of faculty development in the area of scholarship on the traditional research categories of basic and applied, others argued for a broader

conceptualization of scholarship to include, for example, public scholarship.²² While the university is classified in the Carnegie classifications as both a research university and a community engaged university,²³ the full implications of this dual classification for faculty scholarship have not been fully explored. The subcommittee also noted that a broadly-defined notion of productivity might be particularly useful for faculty at later career stages whose program of traditionally-defined scholarship has slowed.

Survey responses suggested, however, that while such definitions and the approaches to scholarship they suggest may be of concern to a subset of the faculty, the majority of tenure stream faculty are satisfied with the ways in which their work is evaluated, and in the responses of those who were not, there was no comment suggesting a problem with the ways in which scholarship was being defined. Further, responses to a question about how they would define their own scholarship (basic, applied, creative, public) suggest that faculty are quite comfortable in applying more than one term to the type of scholarship they do (with 55% selecting the term basic research, 42% applied, 24% as creative activity, and 33% as a form of public scholarship). Other suggested terms included “teacher research”, “scholarship of teaching”, “interdisciplinary scholarship”, “clinical research”, “theoretical work”, “policy analysis”, “literary history”, “criticism”, “biography”, “editorial work”, “archival work”, and “participatory action research”. It appears then that although it is certainly important, in the context of faculty development, for UMass Boston to help interested faculty engage with the community as part of their research agenda (and some responses to other questions asked for more support for community-focused work), UMass Boston faculty do not seem to be experiencing particular tensions about the ways in which institutional definitions and priorities are affecting the scholarship that they do. Rather, faculty doing all types of scholarship felt a need for more institutional support for their endeavors.

²² Boyer, in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990), Boyer argued for expanding the concept of scholarship to include several dimensions: the scholarship of discovery (traditional scholarship), the scholarship of teaching, the scholarship of integration (interdisciplinary scholarship), and the scholarship of application (often through outreach to and collaboration with the community beyond the university), now more commonly referred to as public scholarship. See Ellison and Eatman, *Scholarship in Public*, for a full discussion of the implications of enhancing the role public scholarship at universities...

²³ UMass Boston’s Carnegie classification information can be found at <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/sub.asp?key=748&subkey=14671&start=782>.

Another general concern that arose in various committee discussions was the value of interdisciplinary knowledge in a world that is facing complex challenges, and thus the need to encourage and build forums for collaborations across disciplines, as well as providing appropriate faculty development and support for individuals who engage in interdisciplinary scholarship.²⁴ While 63% of respondents reported having been involved in interdisciplinary collaborations at UMass Boston, and several commented positively on such work as “some of the most exciting things I’ve done at UMass Boston,” or “one of the exceptional shining lights at UMass Boston,” most collaborations (78%) had been built through personal connections, without particular university support, and comments increasingly called for more opportunities for such work, more institutional support, and more structured guidance and mentoring in this area for junior faculty

An important element of support for faculty scholarship is providing opportunities for faculty to showcase their work and share it with other colleagues. For several years, a junior faculty lecture series in CLA provided such an opportunity (and participants in the current CIT junior faculty seminar have expressed a desire that it be reinstated), as did a recent one-day conference focusing on the work of non-tenure track faculty in the college. While the survey showed that 80% of faculty have participated in such forums and valued them (“I’ve found the feedback to be immensely useful in helping me complicate and deepen my thinking”), there is still a desire for more such opportunities, on a more regular basis, with better publicity (such as “a University Research Forum once a year to promote the sharing of research by faculty and students in a forum similar to a professional meeting”).

Finally, a concern not anticipated by the committee but which emerged very strongly in the survey was a substantial level of dissatisfaction with the level and types of support for faculty grant-seeking initiatives offered by the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects. While 57% of faculty in all roles (71% of tenure stream faculty) sought grant support for their research, scholarship, or professional activity through ORSP, fewer than 30% of respondents were

²⁴ The need to produce interdisciplinary scholars is being felt especially strongly in the sciences, and one of the more useful resources addressing this concern is a report of the Council of Environmental Deans and Directors [<http://ncseonline.org/CEDD/cms.cfm?id=2044>].

satisfied or very satisfied with the grant information or other services provided by this office. Their concerns are detailed in the survey report in Appendix 4.

Best practices for supporting research/scholarship

The subcommittee also considered the role of a faculty development center as a resource to support research and scholarship, pointing to the idea that a centralized structure can achieve economies, as opposed to letting every department define their own protocols and support mechanisms and addressing the question of a proper balance between these two approaches. Increasingly, faculty development centers are addressing the full range of faculty work, rather than focusing exclusively on teaching, and such centers are effective in helping faculty to integrate the various aspects of their work.²⁵

Advantages to a centralized structure for supporting research include the fact that it would provide a formal organization, that it could provide effective mentoring on research initiatives and support idea generation, and that it could help faculty address common concerns such as time management, publication strategies, securing external funding (peer-based), and developing projects. Liaisons could provide linkage between the center and the colleges. A decentralized model might more offer more effective, college-based personal mentoring (but a number of faculty prefer mentors outside of their own departments or colleges). A centralized research support structure might alter the role of ORSP. The group also pointed to the need for adequate staffing and infrastructure for grant support, particularly for science faculty.

Other best practices include a further expanded internal grants program, with more effective outreach to faculty, better matching of external funding possibilities with faculty expertise, and workshops that go beyond grant proposal preparation to broader conceptualizations of funding strategies for a long-term research agenda.

Supporting service and outreach

²⁵ Examples of the many faculty development centers that address research include those at Eastern Michigan University [www.emich.edu/facdevel/research/index.html], UMass Dartmouth [www.umassd.edu/nfi/tenure/planning.cfm], and UMass Lowell [www.uml.edu/fdc/default.html]

UMass Boston concerns

“I worry that service is presented to junior faculty as a bit of a chore, a line item on our AFRs and review dossiers, and I worry that that is precisely its value when we are evaluated. Perhaps the university might consider ways not only to look at the service contributions we make at the department, college, and university level as a meaningful part of our professional identities. Also, rather than presenting department-, college-, and university-level service as a checklist at the 4th-year and tenure stages, chairs and deans might be encouraged to consider the amount of work many of us devote to outside service (e.g., editorial and advisory boards) when advising us to serve on internal committees.” (survey comment)

Survey responses suggest a faculty that is generally committed to carry out service that will support the institution, the community, and their professions. (Typical responses to a question about what has contributed most to their effectiveness in service at UMass Boston were, “I have fundamental responsibilities to my colleagues and institution to make it all work well,” “UMass Boston's urban mission and students'/community needs,” and “I was taught to view professional service as a privilege and a responsibility, and given the nature of my field, it is part of my scholarly and political identity.”) Yet these efforts, like those in teaching and scholarship, are hindered by a too-heavy teaching load, as well as too little administrative support, a sense that some amount of service is wasted on demanding activities that come to naught, and a lack of knowledge and guidance about service opportunities that will make good use of a faculty member's skills and contribute to a professional identity outside of the immediate department.

The service subcommittee and the larger committee identified three areas of service that should be supported through faculty development efforts: departmental and university service, professional service, and outreach to the community. Service to the department, college, and university is rarely guided by the planning of a coherent service path that will allow an individual to build a set of skills and specific domains of institutional knowledge, but is more often random, based in quick efforts to fill vacant slots on committees, on enhancing the service profile before a major faculty review, or on attempts to create committees with appropriate representation across colleges, with attention to faculty diversity, but without adequate attention to faculty interest and

expertise. (Service demands can prove particularly burdensome to faculty of color.) Both individuals and the institution would be better served by more effective planning and guidance for institutional service and by better information about service opportunities on committees at all levels of the university.

Professional service is a significant part of the career of most successful scholars, offering networks, opportunities for collaboration, and a significant understanding of how knowledge is shared and valued in a professional community, yet again there is rarely any significant discussion of how faculty in early stages of their career might shape a professional service path or how faculty in later stages have learned (or could still learn) to negotiate that terrain. The topic of professional service has some discipline-specific elements that suggest it be addressed at a department or college level, yet there are enough commonalities across disciplines to make it a worthwhile focus for discussion across university boundaries.

Outreach to the community is an important part of UMass Boston's urban mission and its role as a "community-engaged institution," and a great deal of community outreach is done by faculty in across colleges, in all career stages and roles. Yet again there is little guidance, support, or information for those who would like to find opportunities to engage with the community and who aren't already affiliated with one of the university's community-focused centers and institutes. It is also the case that the boundaries between community service and public scholarship or between community service and community-focused teaching/teaching in support of service learning are quite permeable, and a carefully shaped community service direction can enrich both scholarship and teaching, offering a continuum of teaching, research, and service that allows for substantial integration of these elements of faculty work.

UMass Boston does have an Office of Student Leadership and Community Engagement, with information for faculty who are interested in developing a service learning course or connecting with service agencies and community organizations through the Campus Compact database. In addition, the current NERCHE-sponsored presentations on Community Engagement are exploring current issues of scholarship, service and teaching in this area. Faculty development efforts in this area might intersect with related initiatives on the campus.

Best practices for supporting service and outreach

Faculty service of all types is most effective when supported by a clear and coherent institutional perspective. Faculty at different career stages may need different support for service within the institution, and some faculty development centers offer guidance to tenure track faculty, for example, or academic leadership programs for tenured faculty as they assume positions of more responsibility within the university.²⁶ There is a rich literature on professional outreach to the community, and the NERCHE working papers on professional service provide a relevant starting point for conceptualizing the ways in which UMass Boston might further such work.²⁷

The service subcommittee focused on the availability of information for various types of service, particularly institutional and community. For university service, a number of survey responses expressed a desire for more information about possible committee work outside of the department, and tenure track faculty, in particular, have an interest in gaining broader university perspectives through such work. A central resource with posted information about committee opportunities would contribute to such opportunities. On the model of other institutions,²⁸ the subcommittee also suggested a comprehensive resource and web-based directory for faculty seeking to connect with other faculty, departments, and programs involved in community-focused work, as a key piece of infrastructure to support faculty development, as well as a resource page for faculty service within the university. While other institutions that are involved with community-engagement/service learning projects offer sometimes extensive resources in support of faculty who teach such courses, the term “community engagement” or “community service is linked almost exclusively to service learning” on most campus websites and it is hard to find a “best practice” model that would make visible and available the full extent of community outreach activity on this campus. One best practice might be borrowed from a

²⁶ See the information regarding service at the New Faculty Institute at UMass Dartmouth [<http://www.umassd.edu/nfi/tenure/service.cfm>] and the Academic Leadership Program at Purdue University [http://www.purdue.edu/provost/shtml/faculty/development/cic_alp.html]

²⁷ http://www.nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=48&Itemid=38

²⁸ See, for example, the website of the Office of Community Partnerships at IUPUI, which offers a database of such partnerships and opportunities for engagement [<http://csl.iupui.edu/onp/index.asp>]

different information-gathering resource on this campus---the database of global initiatives that faculty are involved in.

Career Stages and Roles

While some of the concerns raised above are relevant to all faculty, the committee nevertheless identified specific areas most relevant to different career stages and to faculty in non-tenured as well as tenure track and tenured positions. For tenure track faculty, while there are a number of ways in which support can be improved and made more consistent and coherent across colleges, there are some existing college and university initiatives to build on. For tenured faculty, there was a sense that specific research support, for example, falls off once faculty have become tenured, while mentoring activities, to the extent that they exist, are focused only on junior faculty. This is reflective of the academic world as a whole, and the subcommittee addressing the development of tenured faculty found comparatively little information on post-tenure development, with more focused on post-tenure review for evaluative purposes.²⁹ Likewise, there was a very strong sense from the subcommittee addressing the faculty development needs of non-tenure track faculty that there was little support in place at UMass Boston at present, and that this situation reflected a more general state of affairs in academia. Finally, there is increasing evidence that faculty in all career stages and roles can benefit from formal mentoring, in ways that help faculty grow into new responsibilities, and the growing literature on mentoring is relevant to faculty development at all stages.³⁰

New and Tenure Track Faculty

New faculty step into an institutional setting that is “already in progress.” They have been hired for the rich resources of scholarly knowledge and teaching expertise that they are expected to bring or develop, but in order to realize that potential in a way that benefits both them and the institution, they need help in shaping their work in appropriate ways within their new institutional context.

²⁹ Two useful resources from other universities were the website of the University of North Carolina Center for Faculty Excellence, <http://cfe.unc.edu/> and a document written by a faculty member at MIT, http://amps-tools.mit.edu/tomprofblog/archives/2007/04/793_understandi.html#more. Altstete reviews the faculty development literature as it addresses post-tenure faculty.

³⁰ See Sorcinelli (2009), “Finding a Mentor.”

One way of thinking about this is to focus on what has been missing for new faculty. Studies of new faculty show that they are largely satisfied with the intrinsic rewards of their career—the nature of academic work, its opportunities for intellectual discovery and growth, the quality of intellectual and collegial exchanges with colleagues—yet they experience their work as increasingly stressful over the first several years because of time constraints, lack of collegial relations, inadequate feedback, recognition and reward, unrealistic expectations, insufficient resources, and lack of balance between work and personal life.³¹ Supporting the professional development of new faculty involves addressing such constraints, but also taking steps to help faculty plan and shape a professional life. New faculty need support as teachers, and as scholars, but also guidance in networking, building relationships, and developing opportunities for collaboration, in general and discipline-sensitive ways.³²

“[The things that have contributed to my overall satisfaction at UMass Boston thus far are the] support of faculty in discussing teaching, balancing teaching and writing, navigating service responsibilities” (survey comment).

“[I would like to have faculty development in the following areas:] 1 - Forums on the micro-aspects of getting writing and publication done in the humanities. 2 - Forums to present work and receive feedback. 3 - Continued financial support for research travel. I need to conduct archival and field research to finish my book. 4 - Financial support for travel in order to share work with a broader intellectual community and develop and maintain professional networks. 5 - Forums on teaching challenges and opportunities for collaborative teaching that counts as teaching a course on one's own. 6 - Forums on developing and building syllabi, course assignments, and effective pedagogy” (survey comment).

As faculty move along within the tenure track, they begin to place their work within a larger institutional context and to be both appreciative and critical of that context.

³¹ Sorcinelli, 1994, 274

³² See Colbeck, 2000 on strategies for supporting higher education faculty.

“I believe my department is very supportive of its members. My interactions with my colleagues within my department have been fantastic. Because of this, I enjoy my immediate working environment. However, there is only so much my department can do with respect to the infrastructure (both physical, and support [like ORSP]) that exists at the University. I feel the infrastructure defects at UMass Boston can sometimes make my experience less than satisfactory (survey comment).

I also think our diverse student population is an asset. I like the urban mission of UMass Boston, and educating these students gives me great personal satisfaction” (survey comment).

Best practices for supporting tenure track faculty include the following: initial orientation programs for new faculty, often running over several days; year-long orientation programs with workshops or seminars on all aspects of faculty work; ongoing seminars on effective teaching (like those of CIT) and research; mentoring within a program that includes support for mentors as well as mentees (with meetings for mentors and periodic meetings of groups of mentors and mentees), opportunities for service and other activities that move beyond the department, and awards that provide grants and/or release time for faculty, often with regular group meetings for participants.³³

Tenured Faculty

While much of the focus of faculty development has been, traditionally, on the needs of tenure track faculty, there is a long post-tenure career span during which it is important for faculty to stay engaged, committed, and energized in all aspects of their work.

The subcommittee considered the concerns of four groups: those newly tenured, those promoted to full professor, long-time associate professors not on track for promotion, and those who were near retirement (or post-retirement with a desire to remain connected to the university). For newly-tenured faculty, there was a sense in which the three years after their initial appointment

³³ Sorcinelli 1994 points to examples of such programs at a number of universities, including Southeast Missouri State, University of Oklahoma, CSU Long Beach, Indiana University, and Temple University.

are particularly critical, as faculty assume new roles, take on leadership responsibilities, prepare to mentor others, create a new balance in the different areas of their work, and shape a post-tenure scholarship agenda. For newly-promoted full professors, there was a concern with continuing incentives, and continued development in teaching, especially in the context of new technological developments. For long-time associate professors, there was a concern with finding ways to help such faculty get back on track (perhaps using the PMYR more pro-actively, perhaps developing new directions for scholarly activity, and making resources available to support those directions). For pre-retirement faculty, there was a concern that they be able to step down gradually with phased retirement options, and to continue contributing to the university through post-retirement opportunities (part-time teaching, field supervision, mentoring). These concerns echoed those of a UMass Boston pre-retirement focus group.³⁴

These priorities were reflected in survey responses. Newly tenured faculty offered the following comments on what they would want in further faculty development:

“How to identify/work towards post-tenure goals.”

“Opportunities to work with a group of faculty on a specific pedagogical initiative or common set of teaching issues, such as the teaching of research methods to graduate students; or the use collaborative learning in the classroom; also, some re-engagement with instructional technology, since it has been about 6 or 8 years since I have updated my skills in those areas.”

“Interest in my work. Discussion of my work. Curiosity about how to support my work --- or how to guide me to get the support from others. Fair/equitable resources to all programs.”

“How to balance demands.”

Longer tenured faculty would ask for the following:

“More discussions about being productive.”

“Ongoing mid career faculty seminars.”

“Greater flexibility in allowing faculty to choose to alter the relative amount of time in teaching, research, and service.”

³⁴ Pre-retirement faculty focus group sponsored by the Institute for Community Inclusion and Human Resources, Spring 2009.

“Professional development for partnership building, large project management, book writing, and administration.”

The comments of those who had been tenured for over seven years focused entirely on more support and time for research:

“Additional research support, additional grant writing support.”

Faculty nearing retirement would appreciate the following:

“More options to reduce my teaching and service commitments before actually retiring.”

“Opportunities to discuss the pre-retirement and retirement phases of faculty life.”

“A mentoring program for junior faculty.”

Overall, tenured faculty are likely to be more substantially involved with the university as an organization than tenure track faculty, making organizational development/leadership development an important aspect of faculty development at many institutions. They are in a position to take on roles that contribute to the development of other faculty, even as they may need new support themselves. Best practices often include involving tenured faculty in activities that can contribute to institutional goals, leading teaching circles, or participating in programs to enhance teaching excellence.³⁵ Some institutions tie post-tenure faculty development initiatives to a system of post-tenure review, with required programs for faculty whose reviews show that they need to improve their teaching or scholarship, yet there is some concern that faculty are less likely to attempt higher performance under threat of penalties. There is some evidence that, while conventional activities such as study leaves and support for conferences contribute to ongoing faculty development, collective approaches such as campus-wide activities are especially attractive to tenured faculty, letting them move beyond their immediate unit. In addition, it seems that tenured faculty were more affected than pre-tenured faculty by whether a faculty development program was effectively managed.³⁶ Faculty ownership of programs through faculty advisory boards, faculty award committees, and faculty seminar leadership is particularly

³⁵ Alstete 2000 identifies programs with specific components for senior faculty at Brooklyn College, Miami University of Ohio, IUPUI, among others.

³⁶ Alstete, 2000, p. 67.

valued by tenured faculty. As with all faculty development, the most successful approaches involve long-term institutional strategies rather than one-shot solutions.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Non-tenure track faculty positions, whether full or part time, are becoming an increasing part of the landscape of most institutions of higher education. While there is still some debate as to whether a reliance on substantial numbers of non-tenure track faculty, who are assumed to have less institutional commitment and involvement than tenure track faculty, is good for the overall health of an institution (or for the faculty in that role), the reality of academia is that a significant contingent of non-tenure track faculty plays a substantial role in the teaching functions, and often in other areas, of most institutions. Recently attention has shifted, then, from decrying this situation to making it work for both the institution and the faculty, with some universities addressing the non-tenure track role as a career path and helping faculty plan for this role as they would for others,³⁷ and an increasing number of universities addressing the development of non-tenure track faculty with programs and website resources.

At UMass Boston, a significant portion of the non-tenure track faculty have been teaching here for a substantial amount of time. Of 479 non-tenure track faculty in 2008-09, 102 faculty had over 10 years of service; there were 47 Lecturer I's, 78 Lecturer II's, and 40 Senior Lecturers; and 80 of the non-tenure track faculty were employed full time (49 over half-time but less than full-time).³⁸ Non-tenure track faculty make up a significant portion of those teaching freshman writing, general education, and introductory courses, and thus are centrally important to the retention of our undergraduate students. They also serve critical roles in a variety of programs where they may assume administrative and leadership positions.

While many opportunities exist for non-tenure track faculty throughout the UMass Boston system, there is a perception among our non-tenure track faculty that obstacles persist at all levels (departmental, colleges, administration) and that these obstacles inhibit full utilization of

³⁷ See the Brown University Career Center Resources for non-tenure track careers [http://careerdevelopment.brown.edu/phd/non_tenure_track

³⁸ Numbers provided by Lorenzo Nencioli of the FSU Office on 3/30/09.

the potential of these faculty members and impede their full integration into their departments, colleges, and the university as a whole. A program of faculty development for non-tenure track faculty that is geared toward addressing these problems while providing enhanced support for faculty to improve their teaching, research, and service activities will help to a) improve retention of lecturers, b) increase participation of non-tenure track faculty at all levels of service at the university, and c) allow the university to more fully realize the potential of these faculty. Non-tenure track faculty concerns include a frequent sense of isolation and marginalization within their departments and the institution as a whole, where existing institutional practices, structures, and programs are designed for tenure track faculty. There is also a lack of a coherent set of resources for non-tenure track faculty.

Survey respondents included 99 non-tenure track faculty. Their concerns generally reflected those of full-time faculty, but with the additional concern of feeling marginalized at UMass Boston.

“I would like someone to view me as a faculty member worthy of being developed, rather than just someone doing a good job. I would very much like to attend a semester-long CIT course but would need to be paid. I would like to see the divisions between tenure-track and non tenure-track faculty in my department be minimized, so that we could be treated as one faculty with different things to offer and more equally invested in and valued. These are core shifts that I feel need to occur to open the door to faculty development among non-tenure track faculty like myself.” (survey comment)

Best practices from other institutions involve the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty in faculty development initiatives, and the dissemination of information about faculty development opportunities to non-tenure track faculty (often through a dedicated section of a larger faculty development website).³⁹ Some universities have created comprehensive and useful handbooks for non-tenure track faculty.⁴⁰ Others have created sets of clear policies and procedures regarding

³⁹ Some examples of such websites are those at Saginaw Valley State University [<http://svsu.edu/adjunct>], and the San Francisco State Center for Teaching and Development. Baruch College [<http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/facultyhandbook/>]

⁴⁰ See Baruch College [<http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/facultyhandbook/adjunct/outline.htm>]

non-tenure track faculty, typically through the work of academic affairs committees.⁴¹ Within UMass Boston, the Sociology Department has created a very useful handbook for its non-tenure track faculty,⁴² and the recent CLA “Hidden Treasures” showcase of non-tenure track faculty work offers a valuable model for the sort of collegial support for scholarship that appreciated by all faculty.

6. Major themes emerging from the committee’s work

Through its work, the committee has identified a number of larger needs that should be addressed through a comprehensive faculty development effort at UMass Boston:

- Better knowledge and information about opportunities, resources, and policies for faculty in all career stages, with easy access, both virtual (website), and physical.
- A coherent and coordinated approach to faculty development work on campus—with clear links between local efforts in colleges and departments and centralized university efforts, and among university-wide faculty development activities in CIT, IT, and the library.
- Networking/support/mentoring both within and beyond departments.
- Ongoing planning of programming to address current and emerging faculty needs and interests in the context of an evolving university and national higher education agenda and trends.
- Programming and activities that address all aspects of faculty work (teaching, research, service) and that help faculty to define and plan such work in appropriate ways for their academic units and to integrate these activities where possible.
- Programming and activities that address the needs of faculty in all career stages and roles.
- Programming and activities that contribute to a larger campus culture which supports faculty intellectual and social life.
- A career-building focus that helps faculty, from the moment of their entry at UMass Boston, to shape productive and satisfying careers within this institutional context while

⁴¹ See University of Oregon [<http://www.academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/nttf-policies-procedures-practices>] and Indiana University [<http://www.indiana.edu/~college/faculty/policy/collegepolicies/nontenure0306207.shtml>]

⁴² The handbook is posted under resources for non-tenure track faculty at www.umbfacultydevelopment.wikispaces.com.

identifying ways in which they can, in turn, contribute to long-term institutional development.

6.. Recommendations

A. The committee recommends, as a long-term goal, the establishment of a Faculty Development Center that will carry out the above functions.

Models for such centers exist at most major universities.⁴³ They bring visibility and accessibility to the work of faculty development, typically offering a wide range of programs that reach faculty across the institution. While some faculty development centers are specifically targeted toward the development of teaching excellence, many take on the broader range of functions in relation to faculty work that the committee has deemed critical to UMass Boston. Such a center might serve as an umbrella, providing coordination, resources, and space for CIT and other existing faculty support activities. There should also be coordination with college-specific activities, perhaps through advisory board liaisons. Developed centers have a number of features and advantages that can significantly enhance faculty development:

- A designated and highly visible space (often in the library), with space for faculty/staff consultations, small group meetings, and individual work, equipped with appropriate technology.
- A dedicated staff, typically including a faculty director and a full-time professional staff associate director who can develop and coordinate programming and support fund-raising initiatives.⁴⁴
- An advisory board with faculty representatives across colleges, along with a few representatives from key faculty support areas such as the library, IT, and ORSP
- A visible entity for fundraising.⁴⁵

⁴³ See Cook and Marciovich on effective practices in faculty development at research universities, drawn from their experience in directing the faculty development centers at the University of Michigan and Stanford University.

⁴⁴ While long-term professional staffing is a key element of most successful faculty development centers, providing continuity and professional development expertise, having a faculty director (with a shorter-term commitment, to be rotated among faculty) along with an advisory board helps to create an essential connection with the various aspects of faculty work.

- A website that reflects the work of the center, provides a repository for information and resources related to faculty development from across the campus, and offers reliable, consistent, and easy access to the many types of information needed by faculty at all career stages and in all roles.⁴⁶

The committee recommends that the work of planning such a center begin in the 2009-2010 academic year, with a time-line for implementation and a projected commitment of university resources.

B. The committee recommends immediate action on the following university priorities.

1. Creating a full program of orientation and first year faculty development for new faculty

The committee sees the immediate support of entering faculty as the university's highest priority in faculty development. We recognize the efforts made by the Provost's Office to create a program for new tenure-track faculty in 2008-09 as an important step in providing such faculty development support. We urge that that initiative be enhanced in 2009-2010 and that the college deans be encouraged to plan complementary activities. In the future, with the establishment of a faculty development center, the planning and coordination of new faculty programming could be located there. The committee also recognizes the needs of entering non-tenure-track faculty, and suggests that those entering the university with full-time or substantial roles be integrated into as much of the new faculty program as appropriate to their needs.

2. Establishing a Faculty Development Advisory Board.

A Faculty Development Advisory Board is needed both to offer continued attention campus-wide faculty development concerns and to integrate shorter-term efforts into the longer-term planning for a Faculty Development Center. Many members of the present Faculty Development Committee, now well-informed about faculty development in higher education, have expressed

⁴⁵ A dedicated space can draw funding from foundations and individual donors, including emeritus faculty, who may want to the creation of a space that supports the work of their former colleagues while offering programs and activities that foster their own ongoing connection to the university.

⁴⁶ The website of the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development at Michigan State University offers one example, with rich and accessible information about the universities two faculty development strands, focusing on instructional development and on institutional leadership [<http://fod.msu.edu/index.html>] Many other examples are listed in the References and Resources section of this report.

their willingness to continue in such a role. The board should have representation from all of the colleges and from faculty in different career stages and roles. Its responsibilities would be further planning and implementation, both of relevant programming and appropriate structures to support that programming, with various areas handled by different subcommittees. The board would report to the provost and should have a means of ensuring ongoing communication with the deans.

3. Developing a faculty resource website.

While all of the most effective websites that the committee found were associated with fully-developed and staffed centers, so that the conceptualization of the center and its activities and the conceptualization of the website went hand-in-hand, there is nevertheless an urgent need for such a one-stop faculty information source at UMass Boston, even in support of our present scattered efforts. Developing such a site would require (i) gathering relevant information (some of which has been done by the present committee); (ii) conceptualizing an appropriate, realizable, and flexible design to support user-friendly access to a range of information within a structure that would necessarily be developing and changing over time; and (iii) realizing that design with the support of UMass Boston/IT's web services personnel.

4. Moving to a 2-2 course load for tenure track and tenured faculty.

Throughout the committee's discussions, the work of the various subcommittees, and the faculty responses to the committee's survey, the largest concern related to the enhancing the quality of faculty work in all areas was the need for more time to engage in that work—to develop new courses or re-conceptualize existing ones, to follow out the rich possibilities that flow from one's present research or to develop new areas of scholarship, to undertake major service responsibilities that will enhance the work of the university and its relationship to its immediate community and to the larger world. Despite finding great satisfaction, overall, in their work with their colleagues and their students, UMass Boston faculty with heavier teaching loads often feel overwhelmed by the multiple demands on their time and energy. Limited time also affects the degree to which faculty can participate in any sorts of faculty development activities.

While the needs of faculty at all career stages would be served by a reduced course load, it is especially important that tenure track faculty have adequate time to commit to the development of the several areas of their faculty work, laying the groundwork for their long-term as teachers, scholars, and effective contributors to the university and its goals. We therefore recommend that immediate steps be taken toward implementing a 2-2 course load policy, in appropriate ways for the individual colleges, with immediate consideration given to tenure track faculty. We recognize that, with resource constraints, such a policy may have to be implemented gradually but we think that a concrete plan and timeline for addressing this issue should be created by the provost and the deans.

5. Integrating non-tenure track faculty more fully into the faculty life of the university

Although non-tenure track faculty make up a substantial portion of the UMass Boston faculty, with a large portion making a long-term commitment to the university,⁴⁷ until now there has been no consistent attention paid to the needs of non-tenure track faculty, except through the Faculty/Staff Union. While CIT seminars are open to all faculty, there has rarely been funding available to support the participation of non-tenure track faculty. Some departments/colleges may provide some support for conference travel (and CLA this year supported a day of presentations of non-tenure track faculty work), but such opportunities are limited. Some departments may invite their non-tenure track faculty to play a full role in the life of the department, but more often non-tenure track faculty are largely invisible in the workings of the university, despite their substantial contribution to the work that we do. The committee recommends that, within the context of the other initiatives being proposed here, there be concerted attention paid to the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty in all appropriate and relevant ways, starting with making relevant information available through a dedicated portion of a faculty development website.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ According to the Office of Institutional Research and Policy Studies at UMass Boston, 49% of those teaching UMass Boston (representing about 40% of FTE's) are not on the tenure track..

⁴⁸ Other universities have addressed the role and development of non-tenure track faculty in coherent and substantial ways and can provide models for such efforts, from information on policies, procedures, and evaluation such as that on the University of Oregon Academic Affairs website [<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/nttf->

6. Providing more effective support for faculty research and grant-funded initiatives through the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

While the committee recognizes the efforts that have been made in the post-award service provided by ORSP, the results of the committee's survey showed deep dissatisfaction with the overall support provided by that office and identified a need for increased attention to helping faculty identify appropriate funding sources, find others with similar interests to collaborate on proposals, prepare effective grant proposals, and plan for implementation and follow-up funding. Current internal grant programs are seen as very effective in the opportunities they provide, but faculty need to have more flexibility in how they use CLR's or other resources the grants might provide, with more effective coordination with departmental needs and teaching schedules. The committee recommends that immediate attention be given to this issue by the Provost's Office, and that, in the longer term, there be close coordination between the university's larger faculty development efforts and the provision of appropriate faculty support through this office.⁴⁹

C. The committee recommends that, in conjunction with these other efforts, there be attention from the Faculty Advisory Board and the Provost's Office to planning initial programming in areas that have been identified as significant through the work of this committee.

1. Developing a mentoring program.

There are a number of models for successful mentoring programs, some departmental, some involving mentors beyond the department. The committee recommends that a coordinated

policies-procedures-practices] to a full program of adjunct faculty development at the University of Memphis [http://www.memphis.edu/alc/adjunct_faculty_dev.php] Local departmental/collegiate efforts can also be used as a model (e.g. the Sociology Department's Handbook [posted at www.umbfacultydevelopment.wikispaces.com],

⁴⁹ Including a member of the ORSP staff in an ex officio capacity on the Faculty Development Advisory Board would facilitate such efforts.

departmental/collegiate and university mentoring program be developed, focusing first on tenure track faculty, with several elements: (i) guidance for departments in assigning mentors, determining their responsibilities and recognizing and valuing this service; (ii) opportunities for faculty to have extra-departmental mentors; (iii) consistent training for chairs and mentors in regard to supporting new and untenured faculty members; (iv) opportunities for mentors to meet across departments to share their work and approaches.⁵⁰

For senior faculty, mentoring should be valued as a significant area of service, identified on AFR's, and rewarded through faculty review processes.⁵¹ There should be appropriate faculty development activities for faculty who serve in this role.

The committee also identified a need for mentoring of faculty as they move into tenured positions and take on new areas of responsibility. Such mentoring is particularly important in relation to university service, as faculty take on roles in chairing major committees, serve as GPD's, chair departments (with their own responsibility for mentoring), and assume other roles in academic administration. An effective faculty mentoring program would provide mentoring in relation to different faculty needs at different career stages.

2. Providing effective, faculty-oriented support for working with technology

The faculty development survey showed that almost 60% of respondents are using Blackboard or other educational technology in their teaching and that about half were satisfied or very satisfied with the support they've received from IT staff and through IT workshops. Yet one theme that emerged strongly in comments was the need for more pedagogically-focused faculty development for using technology, work that would focus not only on how to use particular tools and platforms, but when to use them, and why—putting the emphasis more on overall effective

⁵⁰ The subcommittee on new and tenure-track faculty recommended that mentors be assigned by the chair for first-year faculty, with flexible assignments and new mentoring arrangements made possible in subsequent years. It was also suggested that some recently retired faculty might be willing to serve in this role.

⁵¹ This is one of the many suggestions for supporting mentoring from the Office of the Provost at the University of Michigan [http://www.provost.umich.edu/reports/faculty_mentoring_study/appendix_a.html].

teaching practices rather than on the use of particular technologies. The report of the Faculty Council Task Force on Quality Assurance in E-Learning addressed similar concerns.⁵²

Comprehensive faculty development centers at other universities typically incorporate faculty development in using technology for teaching and research, with instructional designers who work directly with faculty included on the center's staff. Whatever the structure, it is important that these issues be addressed within a larger faculty development agenda. The committee recommends that the appropriate structural model for such work at UMass Boston be considered in the context of overall planning for a faculty development center.

Whether or not some functions involved with preparing faculty to use educational and research technologies are eventually folded into a faculty development center, the committee recommends that these issues be addressed within other ongoing faculty development planning (such as activities for new faculty), and that the Faculty Advisory Board address ways to inform the efforts of Educational Technology Services.⁵³

3. Furthering opportunities for faculty to share their work in various university settings

There have been a number of opportunities for faculty to share their work at UMass Boston, some through departmental brown bag lunches, some through library-sponsored presentations of faculty research, some through readings of creative work sponsored by the bookstore and the Creative Writing Program, etc. Yet there was a sense from the work of the subcommittees and from the faculty development survey that faculty would like to have more such opportunities, more consistent opportunities that they could plan to participate in, and better information about the opportunities that might be available. Such activities would help to contribute to a campus climate that fosters faculty social and intellectual development and enhances faculty satisfaction. This is another area in which the committee recommends further planning and coordination with existing efforts.

⁵² <http://qualityonlinetaskforce.wikispaces.com/>

⁵³ Including a professional staff representative of Educational Technology on the Faculty Development Advisory Board would facilitate such coordination.

4. Developing a program of social/collegial activities

The faculty development survey showed that relationships with colleagues contributed significantly to faculty satisfaction at UMass Boston, yet the committee felt that such activities were not widely or consistently available. The committee recommends, therefore, that at all levels, from the provost to the deans to the chairs, there be a significant effort to provide and support more social/collegial activities that would allow faculty to come together outside of their immediate work contexts. In particular, the committee recommends the arranging of dinners/socials for new and untenured faculty, festive occasions -- some with a predetermined theme--for newer faculty across disciplines and colleges to come together for a meal and to establish much-needed community. Such dinners would also provide an opportunity for faculty development, e.g. speakers, workshops, discussions, etc.

5. Addressing the distinct needs of faculty at all career stages/roles, including non-tenure track faculty, both full and part-time (paying particular attention to transition points), and addressing ways to integrate and/or manage all aspects of faculty work and shape a productive career.

While all of the above recommendations for actions and programming should address, as relevant, the needs of all faculty, the committee feels that it is important to reaffirm the understanding that there are particular faculty development needs for faculty at different career stages and in different roles, and that those responsible for faculty development programming should consistently attempt to identify and respond to the specific needs of different faculty cohorts. One aspect of faculty development could involve creating a more effective intersection of formative faculty development and support efforts with evaluative processes such as the AFR, promotion reviews, and the PMYR and using scheduled review processes as an opportunity for targeted faculty development (e.g. workshops or mentoring for associate professor on preparing for promotion to full professor; more significant activities around the PMYR process; more effective planning for use of professional development funds).

D. The committee recommends that university and college level support be increased over time to support these recommendations and faculty work in general.

While there is always a need for further resources, the committee wants to stress the importance of providing adequate resources to any attempt to support and enhance faculty work. In addition to developing a plan to achieve a 2/2 course load in each college, as recommended above, with leadership from the provost and the deans, the committee recommends that, within the larger resource picture, as much additional support as possible be provided in the following ways, addressing strongly-voiced needs from the faculty survey:

1. Providing buy-outs for grants that are in keeping with what it costs to cover a course (the current buy-out is far more expensive than it actually costs to pay for the course, which deters applications for these grants. One suggestion is to be 1/10 of the salary.)
2. Providing increased research assistance.
3. Providing increased travel funding for conference presentations.
4. Offering additional small stipends to support travel for such things as networking, interviewing program directors, to better understand success criteria.
5. Providing more significant startup funds. (Outside of the sciences these are very limited and insufficient.)
6. Providing increased administrative support for faculty work.

References and Resources

- Aguirre, A., Jr. (2000). *Women and Minority Faculty in the Academic Workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Alstete, J.W. (2000). *Designing Development Programs for Tenured Faculty*. *Post tenure Faculty Development: Building a System for Faculty Improvement and Appreciation* (pp. 65-115). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Angelo, T. A. (2001). *Doing Faculty Development as if We Value Learning Most: Transformative Guidelines from Research and Practice*. A paper from DePaul University - School for New Learning.
- Baldwin, R.; DeZure D.; Moretto, K.; Shaw, A. (2008). *Mapping the Terrain of Mid-Career Faculty at a Research University: Implications for Faculty and Academic Leaders*. *Change*. Volume 40, Issue 5, p. 46.
- Baldwin, R. G.; Lunceford, C. J.; Vanderlinden, K. E. (2005). *Faculty in the Middle Years*. *Review of Higher Education*. Volume 29, pp. 97-118.
- Barr, R. and Tagg, J. (1995). *From Learning to Teaching*. *Change*. Nov–Dec: 13–25
- Bensimon, E., K. Ward, and K. Sanders, 2000. *The Department Chair's Role in Developing New Faculty into Teachers and Scholars*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Blaisdell, M.L.; Cox, M.D. (2004). *Midcareer and Senior Faculty Learning Communities: Learning Throughout Faculty Careers*. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. Volume 24, Issue 97, pp. 137-148.
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Carnegie Foundation. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from http://www.sfsu.edu/~acaffrs/faculty_manual/docs/other/Scholarship_Reconsidered.doc
- Camblin, L. and J. Steger (2000.) "Rethinking Faculty Development." *Higher Education*, 39, 1-18.
- Chism, N. V. N.; Evenbeck, S.; Lees, N. D.(2002). *Faculty Development for Teaching Innovation*. *Liberal Education*. Volume 88, Issue 3, pp. 34-41.
- Colbeck, C. (1998). *Merging in a Seamless Blend: How Faculty Integrate Teaching and Research*. *The Journal of Higher Education* 69.6, 647-671.
- Colbeck, C. (2000). *Reshaping the forces that perpetuate the research-practice gap*. *Focus on new faculty*. *New Directions for Higher Education* 110 (Summer), 35-47

- Colbeck, C. and Weaver, L.D. (2008) Faculty Engagement in Public Scholarship: A Motivation Systems Theory Perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*. Vol. 12, Number 2, p. 7
- Colbeck, C. and Wharton-Michael, C. (2006) Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 105 (Spring), 17-26.
- Community Engagement Elective Classification from The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved on March 2, 2009 from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp?key=1213>
- Council of Environmental Deans and Directors. (n.d.) *Interdisciplinary Hiring, Tenure, and Promotion: Guidance for Individuals and Institutions*. Retrieved <http://ncseonline.org/CEDD/cms.cfm?id=2038>
- Cook, C.E. and Marincovich, M. (forthcoming 2009). Effective Practices in the Context of Research Universities: The Productive Pairing of Research and Teaching. In K.H. Gillespie & D.R. Robertson (Eds.). *A guide to faculty development 2nd ed.*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
[<http://www.aacu.org/meetings/annualmeeting/AM09/documents/PODWorkshop-EffectivePracticesatResearchU.pdf>]
- Crawley, A. (1995) Senior Faculty Renewal at Research Universities: Implications for Academic Policy Development. *Innovative Higher Education*. Volume 20, Issue 2, pp. 71-94.
- Daley, C. and Dee, J. (2006). Faculty Turnover Intent in Urban Public Universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*. Volume 77. Issue 5, pp. 776-803.
- Ellison, J. and Eatman, K. (2008) *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University*.
- Fagan-Wilen, R.; Ambrosio, B.; Springer, D.; White, B. The Support of Adjunct Faculty: An Academic Imperative. *Social Work Education*. Volume 25, Issue 1, pp. 39-51.
- Gibson, C. *Research Universities and Engaged Scholarship*. (a Campus Compact position paper) Retrieved March 26, 2009, from <http://www.compact.org/resources/future-of-campus-engagement/research-universities-and-engaged-scholarship-a-leadership-agenda-for-renewing-the-civic-mission-of-higher-education/4250/>
- Huston, T.; Weaver, C.L. (2008) Peer Coaching: Professional Development for Experienced Faculty. *Innovative Higher Education*. Volume 33, Number 1, pp. 5-20.

- Iannuzzi, P. (1998). Faculty Development and Information Literacy: Establishing Campus Partnerships. *Reference Services Review*. Volume 26, Numbers 3-4, pp. 97-102(6).
- Lauerson, S. and Roque, B. (2009). Faculty Development for Institutional Change: Lessons from an ADVANCE Project. *Change*. March-April 2009
[<http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/March-April%202009/full-advance-project.html>].
- Leh, A. (2005). Lessons Learned from Service Learning and Reverse Mentoring in Faculty Development: A Case Study in Technology Training. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*. Volume 13, Issue 1, pp. 25-41.
- McQuiggen, C. (2007). The Role of Faculty Development in Online Teaching's Potential to Question Teaching Beliefs and Assumptions. University of West Georgia Distance Education
[<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall103/mcquiggan103.htm>]
- Mei-Yau, S. and Sorcinelli, M.D. (2007). Technology as a Catalyst for Senior Faculty Development. *Journal of Faculty Development*, v21 n1 p23-31.
- Michael, J. (2007). Faculty Perceptions About Barriers to Active Learning. *College Teaching*. Volume 55, Issue 2, pp. 42-47.
- Modern Language Association. (2009) Standing Still: The Associate Professor Survey: Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession. Retrieved on April 28, 2009, from www.mla.org/cswp_report09
- Montell, G.A. (2002). The Fallout From Post-Tenure Review. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved on April 6, 2009, from <http://chronicle.com/jobs/news/2002/10/2002101701c.htm>
- Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty Diversity: Problems and Solutions*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- Neal, A.D. (2008). Reviewing Post-Tenure Review. *Academe Online*. September-October 2008. Retrieved on April 6, 2009, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2008/SO/Feat/neal.htm>
- New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) Accreditation Report. (2005) *Faculty* section. Retrieved March 11, 2009.
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) Working Papers. Retrieved on March 10, 2009, from http://www.nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=48&Itemid=38

- New England Center for Inclusive Teaching (NECIT). Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from <http://www.necit.umb.edu/index.html>
- Olson, G.A. (2008). Keep Your Emeriti Close. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved on April 23, 2009, from <http://chronicle.com/jobs/news/2008/08/2008081901c.htm>
- Romano, J.L.; Hoelsing, R.; O'Donovan, K.; Weinsheimer, J. (2004). Faculty at Mid-Career: A Program to Enhance Teaching and Learning. *Innovative Higher Education*. Volume 29, Issue 1, pp. 21-48.
- Sands, R. et al (1991). Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University. *The Journal of Higher Education* 62.2, 174-193.
- Sherer, P., Shea, T., and Kristensen, E. (2003). Online Communities of Practice: A Catalyst for Faculty Development. *Innovative Higher Education* 27.3, 183-194.
- Sorcinelli, M.D. (1999). Post-tenure Review Through Post-tenure Development: What Linking Senior Faculty and Technology Taught Us. *Innovative Higher Education*. Volume 24, Issue 1, pp. 61-72.
- Sorcinelli, M.D. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of Counseling & Development* 74 (May/June), 474-79.
- Sorcinelli, M.D. (2007). Faculty Development. The Challenge Going forward. *Peer Review*. Vol. 9, No. 4
- Sorcinelli, M.D.; Yun, J.H. (2009). Thriving In Academe. "Finding a Mentor." *National Education Association Higher Education ADVOCATE*. Vol. 26, No. 5
- The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (n.d.) *The University of Massachusetts Boston Carnegie Classification*. Retrieved on March 2, 2009 from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/sub.asp?key=748&subkey=14671&start=782>
- Tierney, W.G. and Rhoads, R.A. (1993). Enhancing Promotion, Tenure, and Beyond. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, Report 6. ERIC Publications.
- Williams June, A. (2009). "Not Moving on Up: Why Women Get Stuck at Associate Professor" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved on April 27, 2009, from <http://chronicle.com/free/2009/04/16759n.htm>

From the University of Massachusetts Boston:

- Backer, T.; Chang, J., Crawford, A., Ferraguto, T., Tioseco, D., Woodson, N. (2002).

- Case Study & Analysis: The Center for the Improvement of Teaching, University of Massachusetts, Boston. Retrieved on April 29, 2009, from www.faculty.umb.edu/pjt/CITstudy.doc
- Center for the Improvement of Teaching website. Retrieved on April 29, 2009, from <http://www.cit.umb.edu/>
- Dee, J.R. (2005) Centers for Teaching and Learning: A National Perspective report prepared by Jay R. Dee, Associate Professor, Graduate College of Education, University of Massachusetts Boston
- Faculty Development Committee wikispace. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from <http://umbfacultydevelopment.wikispaces.com/>
- Faculty Council E-Learning Quality Education Task Force wikispace, April 2009. Retrieved June 19, 2009, from <http://qualityonlinetaskforce.wikispaces.com/>
- Goleman, J. et. al. (2008) *English Department Guidelines for Lecturers* [at the University of Massachusetts Boston].
- Humez, J. et. al. (2005) *CLA Junior Faculty Task Force Reports: On Track I and On Track II*. Retrieved December 16, 2008, from <http://www.umb.edu/academics/cla/faculty/junior.html>
- Kingston-Mann, E.; Sieber, T. (2001). "About UMass Boston's Faculty." *Achieving Against the Odds: How Academics Become Teachers of Diverse Students*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. pp. 8-14.
- Novak, M. University of Massachusetts Boston, College of Management Intellectual Contribution Codes. Retrieved on March 18, 2009.
- Novak, M. (2007) University of Massachusetts Boston, College of Management Faculty Fellowship Awards. Retrieved on March 18, 2009.
- Novak, M. (2004) University of Massachusetts Boston, College of Management Faculty Award Descriptions. Retrieved on March 18, 2009.
- Office of Institutional Research and Policy Studies at UMass Boston. <http://www.oirp.umb.edu/>
- Report from pre-retirement faculty focus group sponsored by the Institute for Community Inclusion and Human Resources at the University of Massachusetts Boston, Spring 2009
- Tenure Expectations in the English Department, University of Massachusetts Boston* (Approved, March 2007).
- Todd, A. (Draft 3/24/09) *Faculty Development and Service at Two Urban 13*

Universities: The University of New Orleans and Wayne State University. Draft report prepared by UMass Boston Faculty Development Committee member.

University of Massachusetts Boston. Press Release for “UMass Boston Chancellor Awards Distinguished Service, Teaching and Scholarship Awards 2008.” Retrieved on March 2, 2009, from <http://www.umb.edu/news/2008news/releases/june/honorees.html>

University of Massachusetts Boston Committee on Valuing and Evaluating Teaching (COVET) (1997) Reports and Recommendations. Retrieved on February 23, 2009.

University of Massachusetts Boston Graduate College of Education. (n.d.) *Tips for Proteges*. Retrieved April 6, 2009, from the Graduate College of Education.

University of Massachusetts Boston Graduate College of Education. (n.d.) *Tips for Mentors*. Retrieved April 6, 2009, from the Graduate College of Education.

Vice Provost for Research. Internal Grant Programs Cultivate Research Success. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from <http://www.umb.edu/research/news/ingrants.html>.

J. Burr provided information for the faculty development currently in place in the McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies, University of Massachusetts Boston (e-mail communication, March 10, 2009).

J. Fawcett, G. Glazer, L. Hayman, & L. Milliken provided information for the faculty development currently in place in the College of Nursing and Health Sciences, University of Massachusetts Boston (e-mail communication, February 26 - March 23, 2009).

D. Kuizenga provided information for the faculty development currently in place in the College of Liberal Arts, University of Massachusetts Boston (e-mail communication, February 27, 2009).

W. Hagar provided information for the faculty development currently in place in the College of Science and Mathematics, University of Massachusetts Boston (e-mail communication, April 9, 2009).

L. Nencioli of UMass Boston’s Faculty Staff Union provided statistical information for this report. (personal communication, March 30, 2009).

M. Novak provided information for the faculty development currently in place in the College of Management, University of Massachusetts Boston (e-mail communication, March 18, 2009).

J. Rudivich-Higgins. Service Learning Resources at UMB. (personal communication, March 19, 2009).

L. Rudnick. Mentoring proposal. (personal communication, April 24, 2009).

F. Wilczenski provided information for the faculty development currently in place in the Graduate College of Education, University of Massachusetts Boston (e-mail communication, March 16, 2009).

University Models

Southeast Missouri State University Information Technology Faculty Roles & Rewards Action Team. (2000). "Information Technology Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Guidelines." Retrieved on May 6, 2009, from <http://cstl.semo.edu/itfrr/>.

Baruch College. Retrieved June 19, 2009, from <http://www.baruch.cuny.edu/facultyhandbook/>

UMass Dartmouth Center for Teaching Excellence. New Faculty Institute. Retrieved April 23, 2009, from <http://www.umassd.edu/facultydev/> and <http://www.umassd.edu/nfi/tenure/service.cfm>

University of Oregon. (2007) *Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF): University of Oregon Document on Policies, Procedures and Practice*. Retrieved April 7, 2009, from <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/nttf-policies-procedures-practices>

University of Pennsylvania. Penn Association of Senior and Emeritus Faculty. Retrieved on April 23, 2009, from <http://www.upenn.edu/emeritus/>

University of Washington Center for Institutional Change (n.d.) *Supporting Career Development of Pre-Tenure Faculty*. Retrieved April 23, 2009, from http://www.engr.washington.edu/advance/resources/retention/pre_tenure.html

University of Wisconsin-Madison. (1997) *Institutional Development Plan*. Retrieved December 17, 2008, from <http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/grants/InstitutionalFacultyDevelopmentPlan.html>

Academic Leadership Program at Purdue University. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from http://www.purdue.edu/provost/shtml/faculty/development/cic_alp.html

Office of Community Partnerships at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from <http://csl.iupui.edu/onp/index.asp>

University of North Carolina Center for Faculty Excellence. Retrieved on June 19, 2009, from <http://cfe.unc.edu/>

For Teaching, retrieved on April 29, 2009:

Gustavus Adolphus College (n.d.). *John S. Kendall Center for Engaged Learning*. Retrieved April 29, 2009, from <http://gustavus.edu/kendallcenter/>

New Mexico State University. Teaching Academy. Retrieved April 29, 2009, from <http://www.teaching.nmsu.edu/>.

University of Oklahoma. Faculty workshops for new faculty, preparing for tenure. Retrieved April 29, 2009, from <http://pii.ou.edu/>.

Associated Professor of the South. Teaching And Learning Workshop. Retrieved April 29, 2009, from <http://www.colleges.org/summerteach/summerteach.html>

Gettysburg College. Retrieved April 29, 2009, from http://www.gettysburg.edu/about/offices/provost/support_for_teaching/center_forcreative_teaching/Grants and http://www.gettysburg.edu/about/offices/provost/support_for_teaching/center_forcreative_teaching/

Indiana University. Retrieved April 29, 2009, from <http://www.indiana.edu/~sotl/whatis.html>.

Bucknell University Retrieved April 29, 2009, from <http://www.bucknell.edu/x18957.xml> and <http://www.bucknell.edu/x18957.xml>.

Furman University. Retrieved April 29, 2009, from <http://ctel.furman.edu/web/main/index.phpGrants><http://ctel.furman.edu/web/main/index.php>

Harvard University. Website of Bok Center. Retrieved April 29, 2009, from <http://bokcenter.harvard.edu>

University of Massachusetts Amherst. Retrieved April 29, 2009, from <http://www.umass.edu/cft/>

Williams College. "PET" program (Project for Effective Teaching). Retrieved April 29, 2009, from <http://www.williams.edu/go/PET/>

Faculty Development Centers at 20 Public Universities retrieved on March 3, 2009:

Northern Kentucky University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://pod.nku.edu/>

University of Minnesota. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.sph.umn.edu/img/assets/9103/FacDevPlan082106.pdf>

University of Maine. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.umaine.edu/it/fdc/>

Michigan State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://fod.msu.edu/>

California State University, Fullerton. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://fdc.fullerton.edu/>

California State University, Northridge. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.csun.edu/facdev/>

Southern Connecticut State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from http://www.southernct.edu/faculty_development/

Florida State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://med.fsu.edu/education/facultydevelopment/>

San Francisco State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://ctfd.sfsu.edu/>

The State University of New York. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.suny.edu/provost/facultydevelopment.cfm>

Appalachian State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.hubbard.appstate.edu/>

Sonoma State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.sonoma.edu/ctpd/>

Portland State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/faculty-development-funding-opportunities>

The Ohio State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://ftad.osu.edu/>

California State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://ctl.csudh.edu/Faculty/Opportunity.htm>

Buffalo State, State University of NY. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.buffalostate.edu/undergraduateresearch/x481.xml>

Bismarck State College. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.bismarckstate.edu/facdev/>

Chicago State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.csu.edu/facdev/>

Idaho State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.isu.edu/ctl/faculty/development.shtml>

Fort Hayes State University. Retrieved March 3, 2009, from <http://www.fhsu.edu/ctelt/facdevelopment.shtml>

Junior Faculty Mentoring retrieved March 2, 2009:

Brown University. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from http://www.brown.edu/Administration/Sheridan_Center/programs/junior.html

University of California San Diego. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from <http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/faculty/programs/fmp/default.htm>

University of Colorado. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from <http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/mentoring.htm>

University of Iowa. CLA & Sciences Faculty Mentoring Programs reports. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from <http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/reports/mentoring.pdf>

Duke University. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from http://www.provost.duke.edu/policies/Faculty_Mentoring_Initiative.htm

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from <http://www.faculty.umd.edu/Mentoring/MentoringGuide.pdf>

University of Michigan. Provost Office http://www.provost.umich.edu/reports/faculty_mentoring_study/appendix_a.html

Michigan Center for Research on Learning and Teaching http://www.crlt.umich.edu/faculty/facment_biblio.php#links

University of North Carolina Charlotte <http://www.provost.uncc.edu/NewFaculty/FacultyMentoringProgram.pdf>

New York University (Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development). Retrieved March 2, 2009, from http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/faculty_affairs/juniorfacultymentoring

University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from http://www.sas.upenn.edu/home/views/GUIDELINES_FOR_MENTORING_JUNIOR_FACULTY.pdf

University of Rhode Island. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from http://www.uri.edu/advance/faculty_development/mentoring_proposal.htm

University of Vermont. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from <http://www.uvm.edu/~mentor/>

University of Washington. Mentoring New Faculty. Retrieved March 2, 2009, from <http://faculty.washington.edu/olmstd/research/Mentoring.html>

Appendix 1—Charge from Provost Winston Langley to the Faculty Development Committee

One goal in the campus strategic plan is to “attract, develop, and sustain highly effective faculty.” A related objective is to institute “a career-span, institution-wide faculty development and mentoring program.” I seek your recommendations for how to conceive, structure, and implement such a program so as to provide the best possible support for our faculty as they strive for excellence in their teaching, research, and service roles.

Specifically, I would like you to prepare a report for me in which you:

1. Summarize the most useful and relevant literature on faculty development and mentoring.
2. Identify existing campus resources, e.g., the Center for Improvement of Teaching, departmental and collegiate mentoring programs, etc., and make recommendations about how they might inform or be incorporated into the program.
3. Identify the most important elements of successful faculty development programs on other campuses, and make recommendations about how they might inform or be incorporated into the program.
4. Indicate which program elements should be based in the departments, in the colleges, or centrally.
5. Suggest faculty development and mentoring activities for faculty at various stages in their careers, e.g., new faculty holding first academic appointments; other junior faculty; senior faculty, including those who are participating in a Periodic Multi-Year Review; and part-time faculty. Include activities related to all three spheres of faculty responsibility: teaching, research, and service.
6. Suggest a structure for implementing and evaluating the proposed program.
7. Describe resources that may be required, e.g., course load reductions for new faculty.

Appendix 2: Detailed Faculty Development/Support Information by College

The following information was provided by the dean's offices of each college in response to an inquiry from this committee about their faculty development efforts.

The College of Liberal Arts (CLA) has tried to focus most of the faculty development initiatives towards junior faculty and tenure-track faculty. While CLA would like to focus on the adjunct faculty as well, the college has said that there are limits on their funding to do so. CLA currently provides faculty development in the following ways: the faculty research fund (half of the funding is reserved for junior faculty); a faculty travel fund for scholarly meetings (half of the funding is reserved for junior faculty); all new hires receive a minimum of 2 course releases; all faculty with a successful 4th year review receive an additional course release; Healey grant recipients receive a course release; Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) has a staff member dedicated to CLA; there is an informal junior faculty sabbatical option; and two junior faculty task forces produced the reports "On Track 1," and "On Track 2".⁵⁴ In addition, all departments were invited to write more specific guidelines for reappointment, promotion and tenure.⁵⁵ Dean Donna Kuizenga was instrumental in encouraging research opportunities for faculty by developing the policy that allows faculty who receive competitive research grants (intended as salary substitutes) to have the university top off their salaries, so that they do not incur a financial loss by taking the grant. Dean Kuizenga, with the support of the Vice Provost for Research Richard Antonak, was also instrumental in the creation of the book subvention fund.⁵⁶ Each of the departments has its own approach to mentoring, with some departments offering formal mentoring and others informal.

The College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS) offers teaching and writing for publication support available to all faculty and research support available primarily to tenured and tenure-

⁵⁴ The Task Force reports and supporting documents can be found at <http://www.umb.edu/academics/cla/faculty/junior.html>

⁵⁵ The guidelines prepared by the English department in negotiation with the dean and the provost can be found at <http://umbfacultydevelopment.wikispaces.com/file/view/Tenure+Expectations+in+the+English+Department--Final+Approved+Version.doc>

⁵⁶ Program Description and guidelines can be found at <http://www.umb.edu/research/funding/documents/subguidelines.pdf>

track faculty, but also available for interested non-tenure track faculty. All faculty in each stage work closely with the department chair and the associate dean for research to establish and maintain a research and publications trajectory and balance among research, teaching and service. New tenure-track faculty work closely with the department chair and relevant other faculty to develop or enhance any needed teaching skills. In addition, the Associate Dean for Research in Office of Research meets with new tenure-track faculty from both departments to facilitate the faculty's establishment and maintenance of a program of research and scholarship. New faculty are also offered the opportunity to have an external mentor in the faculty member's conceptual or methodological areas of research interest. Non tenure-track faculty meet with the Associate Dean for Research as well; however, plans and outcomes are not the same as for tenure-track faculty. Continuing faculty meet with the Associate Dean for Research regarding their progress and future plans for research and scholarship. Support for research and scientific review and critique of proposals is available to all faculty at all career stages.

In the Graduate College of Education (GCE), the dean's office reimburses faculty up to \$1000 for conference travel when presenting a paper. At least two of the three departments have had ESS money to support faculty development beyond the dean's office as well. Each department in GCE has criteria for the three areas of research, teaching, and service when Department Personnel Committees review Annual Faculty Reports for merit pay consideration. Associate Dean Felicia Wilczenski is currently trying to develop a culture of mentoring within GCE by encouraging collaborative projects and programs. At the moment, there is interest in grant mentoring, so she is trying to pair people with similar interests. For the fall, the college is planning a more coordinated effort to link faculty with people who are successful with grantsmanship. Associate Dean Wilczenski also meets regularly with pre-tenured faculty for a support group to follow-up with their questions and concerns. If that group expresses an interest that goes beyond the special concerns of the pre-tenured faculty, all GCE faculty members are invited to attend.

The College of Management (CM) asks faculty each year to submit a faculty development budget for the coming or current academic year, along with a three-year plan covering the areas of research, teaching, and service. The plan and budget are sent to the department chair for

his/her recommendation and then sent to the dean for a final decision. The budgets usually include requests for research support in the form of travel money to present papers at conferences and purchasing software and database licenses, and for teaching support in the form of purchasing course-related videos and software. The college has eight monetary awards for scholarship or professional activities and three for teaching, which are available to all full-time faculty, including: the CM Commonwealth Award for scholarship or professional activities, the CM Dean's Award for Distinguished Research for distinguished publications in basic, applied, and/or instructional areas, the CM Faculty Scholarship Award to be used for research related expenses, the CM Faculty Research Fellow award, the CM Leadership Fellow award, the Joan Moon award for undergraduate teaching, the Betty Diener award for graduate teaching, and the CM Faculty Teaching Fellow award. In addition, new tenure-track faculty get summer funding for research support in their first two years and are also guaranteed faculty development monies in their first two years for conference presentations and other research and teaching needs. In their first semester, new faculty receive a college-sponsored orientation on research, teaching, and service. Although the college does not formally appoint mentors, they are strongly encouraged.

In the College of Science and Mathematics (CSM), most departments assign a senior faculty member to serve as a mentor for new faculty. For research support, CSM provides monetary support for faculty travel to present research and interact with fellow scientists, offers Peer Multi-Year Review (PMYR) for faculty with some funding, organizes a seminar series for new faculty members to help them interact with current faculty members to foster possible future research collaboration among faculty members from different departments, and has a pilot program grants within the U-56 partnership with the Dana Farber/Harvard Cancer Center (DF/HCC). In the area of teaching, the Center of Science and Mathematics in Context (COSMIC) organizes a seminar series and the college has established Student Success Center to implement Supplemental Instruction programs for gateway science courses and organize Learning Communities for freshman students. In the area of service, CSM has several programs, including: the Boston Science Partnership program; the Initiative for Maximizing Student Diversity (IMSD); and the Watershed-Integrated Sciences Partnership (WISP).

The McCormack Graduate School does not have any formal programs in place to support faculty development. However, each department, at its discretion and within the limited resources it has, does try to provide a modest amount of travel funds for faculty to present their research at national conferences. The college is also considering establishing a "research bank" to provide startup and seed money to faculty to help promote research (and thus faculty development) at all faculty levels.

Appendix 3: Faculty Development Survey Questions

“The purpose of this Faculty Development Committee Survey is to gather information for planning a university-wide faculty development initiative for faculty in all career stages and roles. The survey should take no more than 10-15 minutes to complete. The demographic information on this page will be separated from the survey and used for statistical purposes only.

The survey questions that follow are intended for all faculty and focus on support for key areas of faculty work. In addition:

- If you are a new tenure-track faculty member at UMB, after responding to the common questions, please continue on to a few questions that address your specific experience.
- If you are not on a tenure track, teaching either full or part-time, please answer as many questions as are relevant to you in the general survey and then move to a specific set of questions at the end focusing on the experience of non-tenure track faculty.”

Background Information

1. Are you? (Female; Male)
2. Are you in a minority group under affirmative action guidelines (optional)? (Yes; No)
3. What is your college? (CLA; CM; CNHS; CSM; CPCS; GCE; MSPP)
4. What is your department (optional)?
5. Please select the category that fits you most closely: (first year tenure-track faculty; tenure track faculty; recently tenured; tenured over 7 years; nearing retirement; non-tenure track full-time; non-tenure track part-time)
6. Please indicate your current rank: (Assistant Professor; Associate Professor; Full Professor; Instructor; Lecturer; Lecturer I; Lecturer II; Senior Lecturer)

Teaching

1. How satisfied are you with the following at UMB: (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; Comment)
 - a. The ways in which your teaching is valued and evaluated?
 - b. The resources you've received related to teaching?
 - c. The courses you have been invited to offer?
 - d. Opportunities for input into course planning and scheduling?
 - e. The guidance and support you've received for teaching from your department?
 - f. From your college/dean?
 - g. From the university?
2. The UMB strategic plan seeks "to promote best teaching practices for our diverse population" and "to promote academic engagement" for all students at all levels through such practices as active and collaborative learning, reflective thinking, and community based learning: How satisfied are you with the support you have received for such teaching at UMB? (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; Comment? Suggestions for further support?)
3. Have you participated in a semester-long CIT seminar? (Yes; No; If so, approximately when? If not, please tell us why not)

4. If you have participated in such a seminar, how satisfied have you been with that experience? (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment)
5. Have you participated in CIT forums or conferences? (Yes; No; Are there specific topics you would like to see addressed in forums?)
6. Do you use technology such as Blackboard in support of your teaching? (Yes; No)
7. If so, how satisfied have you been with the technological support the university has provided for your teaching? (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment? Suggestions for other support?)
8. Have you participated in workshops or conferences at UMB on using technology in teaching? (Yes; No)
9. If so, how satisfied have you been with what the workshops or conferences have offered you? (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment? Suggestions?)
10. What has contributed most to your teaching effectiveness at UMB?
11. What would you most like to see offered in further support of teaching at UMB?

Research and Scholarship

1. Which of these terms might you typically use to describe your scholarship (you may choose more than one). (basic research; applied research; creative activity; public scholarship (engaged research, action research, community-based research); Other terms you would use to describe your scholarship?)
2. How satisfied are you with: (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment)
 - a. The way in which your scholarship is valued and evaluated at UMB?
 - b. The monetary support you've received for your scholarship (for labs, other research support, travel to conferences, etc.)?
 - c. The guidance you've received for seeking internal and external grant funding?
 - d. The release time provided by your college or the university in support of your scholarly agenda?
 - e. The creative ways offered by the college or university to help you increase or pool monetary or release time support?
3. Have you sought grant support for your scholarship, creative activity or other professional activity through the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects? (Yes; No)
4. If you have sought ORSP support, how satisfied have you been with: (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment)
 - a. Information about grant sources provided by ORSP?
 - b. Information about proposal preparation provided by ORSP?
 - c. Information about grant administration provided by ORSP?
 - d. Workshops for faculty offered by ORSP?
 - e. Targeted outreach from ORSP to faculty in your field?
5. Have you presented your scholarship at on-campus forums (library-sponsored research presentations, college or university-sponsored presentations, departmental or interdisciplinary brown-bag lunches or seminars), or attended such forums? (Yes; No; Comment)

6. 6. How satisfied have you been with opportunities to share your scholarship and receive intellectual support from your peers at UMB? (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied)
7. Have you had an opportunity to engage in interdisciplinary collaborations in research/scholarship at UMB? (Yes; No; Comment)
8. If so, did your collaboration come about through
 - a. involvement with a center/institute
 - b. Participation in a CIT or research seminar?
 - c. involvement in a teaching endeavor that crossed disciplines
 - d. an informal personal connection
 - e. other (Comment)
9. What at UMB has most contributed to your effectiveness as a scholar or researcher or in your creative endeavors?
10. What would you most like to see in further support of research, scholarship, and creative activity at UMB?

Service

1. How satisfied are you with the following at UMB: (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; Comment)
 - a. The ways in which your service is valued and evaluated?
 - b. The release time you may have received for particularly demanding service commitments?
 - c. The extent to which you have been able to plan and manage your service in relationship to your other faculty work?
2. How satisfied are you with the guidance and overall support you've received at UMB for your service: (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment)
 - a. At the university?
 - b. In the community?
 - c. In your professional world?
3. Have you participated in UMB activities that helped you to shape your service agenda or that supported your service? (Yes; No; If so, what?)
4. What has contributed most to your effectiveness in service at UMB?
5. What would you most like to see in further support of service at UMB?

General

1. How satisfied are you with: (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment)
 - a. The possibilities for managing and/or integrating your teaching, scholarship, and service at UMB?
 - b. The possibility of having a rewarding and productive career at UMB?
 - c. The overall campus culture with regards to the social and intellectual development of faculty in your career stage/role?
 - d. The ways in which your work is recognized and evaluated through current review processes?
2. How satisfied have you been with the following with regard to personnel processes: (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment)
 - a. The lines of communication between you and your chair?
 - b. The lines of communication between you and your dean?
 - c. The clarity of expectations for your faculty work and how it will be evaluated?
 - d. The usefulness of the information you receive from the annual faculty review process?
 - e. The usefulness of the comments you receive on your AFR?
 - f. Explanations you've received about expectations for your next major review (4th year, tenure, promotion, PMYR)?
3. In your current career stage/role, have you received: (Yes; No; Comment)
 - a. Formal mentoring
 - b. Informal mentoring
4. If you have received formal mentoring, how satisfied have you been with the support offered to you? (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment)
5. What has most contributed to your overall satisfaction at UMB thus far?
6. What sorts of faculty development might you want to have offered as you look forward from this point in your career?

Questions for new and recently hired tenure-track faculty

1. How satisfied are you with: (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment)
 - a. The initial orientation program for new faculty members overall?
 - b. The extent to which it addressed tenure track matters such as fulfilling expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service?
 - c. The information and assistance from Human Resources concerning health benefits, life insurance, retirement, and so on?
 - d. The introduction to campus facilities and services--the library, information technology services, the parking program, etc.?
2. If you joined the faculty this year, how many new faculty events were you able to attend? (None; 1-2; 3-4; 5 or more)
3. How satisfied were you with the usefulness of the new faculty events you attended? (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment)

4. How satisfied were you overall with the information you received about expectations and support for tenure track faculty through the orientation and/or other events for new faculty in the following areas: (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A; Comment)
 - a. Teaching
 - b. Scholarship
 - c. Service
 - d. Shaping a career at UMB
5. What suggestions can you offer for orientation, new faculty workshops, and other support for first year faculty?

Questions for non-tenure track/adjunct faculty

1. How long have you been teaching at UMB? (1-3 years; 4-8 years; 8-12 years; over 12 years)
2. How many credit hours do you typically teach each semester? (3-5 credits; 6-8 credits; 9-11 credits or more; 12 credits or more)
3. Is your current position considered full-time or part-time? (Full-time; Part-time)
4. If you started teaching at UMB recently, did you receive any orientation to: (Yes; No; Comment)
 - a. Campus facilities and services?
 - b. Human Resources issues?
 - c. Your role at the university?
 - d. Your role in your department?
 - e. The annual faculty review process and expectations for faculty in your position?
 - f. Information about departmental support of any type available to you as non-tenure track faculty?
5. Have you received any support for your teaching (opportunity to participate in a CIT seminar, travel to a teaching conference, etc?) (Yes; No)
6. Have you been involved in departmental, college, or university service? (Yes; No)
7. If you have been involved in service, how satisfied have you been with the service opportunities you have had? (very dissatisfied; dissatisfied; neutral; satisfied; very satisfied; N/A)
8. Have you had encouragement or support from UMB for any work you have undertaken in scholarship or creative activity? (Yes; No; Comment)
9. Do you feel that the work you do is appropriately recognized and evaluated through current review processes? (Yes; No; Comment)
10. What suggestions do you have for ways in which UMB could support the work of its non-tenure track full and part-time faculty?

Appendix 4—Faculty Development Survey Report

A survey of all faculty, tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure track, yielded 270 responses, distributed as follows: 46% of respondents were from CLA and almost 20% from CSM, with the rest distributed across the other colleges. Of the total respondents, 23% were tenure track faculty, 42% were tenured (almost evenly divided between associate professors and full professors), and 37% were non-tenure track (divided fairly evenly across the ranks of Lecturer, Lecturer II, and senior Lecturer, with fewer in Lecturer I). Most questions allowed the option of additional comments, and the committee was impressed with the depth and thoughtfulness of comments from faculty at all levels, some of which are excerpted in the sections that follow.

The committee analyzed the survey results through several filters: by major categories of faculty work (teaching, research, and service), by career stage/role, and looked also at whether the results for faculty of color differed significantly from those of the faculty as a whole.

Areas of Faculty Work

Teaching

Overall, respondents are more satisfied than dissatisfied with teaching at UMass Boston although many of them are not satisfied with the resources, guidance, and support available to them. Respondents are most satisfied with courses assignments: most of them seem to be teaching courses that they are interested in teaching at a time that they prefer. More than half of the respondents are not satisfied with the resources available for teaching, with more than one-fourth dissatisfied. More alarmingly, it appears that **respondents receive guidance and supports mostly from their peers.** More than 70% of the respondents are **not satisfied with the guidance and support from the college and university**, which may suggest a lack of communication on campus teaching resources.

An analysis of the textual comments echoed these themes. Many comments mentioned the lack of resources: inadequate physical facilities (e.g. the need for classrooms that can fit 100 students

with spaces between them, well-maintained facilities), insufficient administrative and staff support, little support for underprepared students (those who have problems with quantitative reasoning courses and/or academic writing and reading), virtually no support for creating new and innovative courses, and perhaps most importantly, the competition for time between teaching, research, and service. The lack of support and guidance, especially from the department chair, college, and university level, is frequently commented upon. Many respondents mentioned issues such as difficulties in adapting to UMass Boston during the first-year, lack of mentoring or opportunities to talk with colleagues, and lack of communication from beyond the department level. Moreover, it seems that non-tenure-track faculty are significantly less satisfied than tenure-track and tenured faculty as far as support for teaching is concerned.

Although close to 60% of respondents are either satisfied or very satisfied with the ways in which teaching is valued and evaluated at UMass Boston, a substantial number of respondents had strong negative feelings about this. Among the concerns are, first, some believe that teaching is not considered as important as research (and in some cases, service) during performance evaluation; second, some question to what extent student evaluation should be used as an indicator of teaching effectiveness; third, some junior faculty express concerns that they are unfairly evaluated by senior faculty who are poorer teachers than they are; and finally but perhaps more importantly, many feel that there is no adequate organized, systematic effort to recognize, reward, and share good teaching practices.

Areas of concern:

Representative comments showing the areas of most concern from the 40% of faculty who are not satisfied with the way teaching is valued and evaluated:

- I am a leader in pedagogy in several ways. Nobody particularly cares.
- I've never heard word one about my teaching from my college, my dean or the university.
- I have received no guidance from the college/dean or university on my teaching.
- Overall I find that my department allows individual faculty a great deal of latitude in making their own teaching decisions, a freedom that comes at the expense of creating a unified curriculum with generalized standards for students' knowledge acquisition and

skills development. Moreover, I have encountered some resistance in attempting to remedy these difficulties.

- Everyone says teaching is valued - but no resources actually value it. As long as we teach our three or two courses each semester, we're fine. But nothing really is done to help, or to supervise, or to provide focus.
- I am dissatisfied by the ways that the college and the university are constantly changing the priorities around undergraduate teaching -- first it's Gen Ed and small, hands-on classes, then suddenly large classes, then the push to teach on-line classes, then insisting on curriculum development at the 300 and 400 levels and then favoring introductory courses to meet the anticipated hikes in enrollments. It is impossible to meet all these expectations.
- Part-time instructors should not be judged on student evaluations alone. Being popular and being a good teacher are not necessarily the same thing.
- My courses are well received and well reviewed by students. Great ratings on course evaluations (and sometimes via word of mouth from students to colleagues) are what matter most. But there is not really discussion of how and why my evals are so good and what about my teaching, in spite of great student evaluations, could be strengthened, improved, changed, developed, etc. And I honestly don't see where the time and resources for those conversations/projects, etc., would come from....

Responding to the strategic plan re. teaching

It should be noticed that the lack of resource, support, and guidance apparently affected respondents' attitude toward the new strategic plan that seeks "to promote best teaching practices for our diverse population" and "to promote academic engagement" for all students at all levels through such practices as active and collaborative learning, reflective thinking, and community-based learning. Only about 43% of the respondents are either satisfied or very satisfied with the support for engaging in such teaching at UMass Boston. For example, respondents commented:

- The number of courses one is required to teach does not support this strategic goal. I sometimes face 90 students in a semester across three different courses. And a ton of service commitments. And research. And I'm supposed to focus on diverse population also? How do we promote academic engagement, anyway? Obviously I'm suggesting that far too much is expected from us, at least from me, to be able to do anything but the basics.
- I agree with the goals, but where are the resources to bring this about? This is just "lip-service": nice talk but no substance. Faculty can't simply be told "go do collaborative learning, reflective thinking and community based learning." They need instruction in these pedagogies, support from their colleagues in trying to implement some of these, and above all they need the time it takes to study, adapt and perfect these practices.
- I continually work to address the needs of all students, but the significant increase in student demand and desire to increase the college's research profile make achieving this goal more difficult.
- We need more training on how to teach ESL students and how to teach very elementary writing (in graduate school they prepared us to read dissertations and comment on them, not to teach people how to write basic sentences.)

CIT Seminars and Conferences

CIT seminars and conferences have been of crucial importance to many faculty, but only 32% of the respondents (45% of tenure stream) have participated in CIT forums or conferences. Some have not heard of the seminars (particularly newcomers), some are interested but lack time to participate or point to scheduling conflicts or departmental needs that conflict with the opportunity, and the participation of non-tenure track faculty has not generally been funded. There are comments suggesting that some faculty feel the seminar topics have limited applicability for teaching in their disciplines, especially the sciences.

Of those who have taken a semester-long CIT seminar, over 70% of the participants are either satisfied or very satisfied with the experience. Many respondents commented on the helpfulness of the seminar (e.g., "Best formal, systematic support I've got") and the value of sharing ideas

with other faculty, although there are a couple of complaints about the management of a particular seminar offering. For many, the seminar, CIT conferences, and university IT support are the only support for teaching they get from the university. Several respondents wish for CIT or CIT-like seminars that are more oriented toward teaching in the sciences.

There seem to be two areas that can be improved. First, many respondents indicated that they are not aware of such seminars and conferences. For those who are aware but have not participated, time and lack of compensation appears to be the most important factors that prevent them, especially non-tenure-track faculty, from participating. Second, the content and topics covered by the CIT seminars and conferences can be improved. Some suggested that both the seminars and conferences should be more focused on specific questions/problems faculty encounter in teaching and should do more to promote more the scholarship of pedagogy.

Teaching with Technologies

Although the Blackboard system has been used for quite a few years, more than 40% of the respondents are not using it or equivalent technologies in support of teaching, and less than 60% of the users are either satisfied or very satisfied with the technical support the university has provided for teaching, although it seems that the users are more disappointed with the product itself than with the supports they received from the IT support crews. One user commented,

--I think it is the Blackboard system that has some quirks and some areas that are not user-friendly. IT support is generally pretty good, although students have reported mixed reviews of it.

Many complained about the inadequacies of the Blackboard system (e.g., the mail function, the inability to stream videos effectively, the navigation). Many others seem to be frustrated by the frequent switching of the learning management system and subsequently the time or efforts it requires to learn a new system. Instead of using the Blackboard system, quite a few faculty chose to use their own website to avoid the frustration and save the time of learning a new system. Still others wanted more support for such efforts (e.g. asking for “Better communication with web services for faculty projects”).

In general, workshops or training sessions are helpful. 60% of the respondents participated in workshops or conferences at UMass Boston on using technology in teaching, although scheduling problems interfered with the participation of some faculty. Nearly 70% of those who participated are satisfied with what the workshop or conferences have offered. There are some complaints about the content of offerings (e.g. “Too technical. . .spent much time trying to translate the jargon”), some requests for more or a continued focus on pedagogy (“Continue with workshops that include pedagogical applications”), and a desire for more follow-up workshops (“so that the information and skills learned in a day can be honed”), and some praise for recent offerings (“The technology offerings have consistently been on topics that stretch my teaching. I trust that IT will continue to inform me of what is cutting edge in technology and teaching.”).

There is also appreciation for recent improvements in the availability of technology, particularly in smart classrooms. But faculty voice concerns about lack of coordinated access and support across the resources now available.

--I appreciate the smart classrooms, the Healey e-reserves option, and the willingness of IT staff to set up server space and password protection for faculty who develop individual course websites. But it is not easy to access these features; lack of information about services, lack of time to seek them out, and uncertainty in knowing whether a smart classroom request will be granted or how long any IT request will take are significant barriers to access. Similarly, while it is useful to have online teaching and advising information, the WISER system is far less useful than those I have experienced on other campuses, particularly in relation to advising.

--There are so many areas on campus that deal with technology (library, media labs, IT, Help Desk, etc.) that don't seem connected. It is overwhelming for the User to figure out who does what and where to go for help. As a person attempting to use many of these services, it also appears disorganized and not consistently responsive to faculty needs.

Contributing Factors and Suggestions

While dedication to teaching and benefiting students, teaching skills, and a great student body appear to be the most important factors that contribute to the respondents' teaching effectiveness at UMass Boston, the respondents do offer a broad collection of other factors in their responses about what has most contributed to their own teaching effectiveness. These factors include the following: trainings they received as graduate students; CIT seminars; effective formal mentoring; informal conversations with and supports from peers; technical trainings on using technologies; the support of a dean or department head; and improved supports for teaching (e.g. TAs and administrative supports). Many respondents pointed as well to their colleagues and their students.

Answers to the question “What would you most like to see offered in further support of teaching at UMass Boston?” are similarly diversified with three outstanding themes. **First, many suggested a 2/2 teaching load**, “particularly in light of the university goals to increase research productivity” and “to allow for concentration on the course content, introduction of more new cutting-edge course content.” **Second, more resources are required to better support teaching.** These resources include more TAs, more and better administrative support, more and better technical support, mini-funds to support new course development, better equipped classrooms, more support for faculty personal development (like training with new technologies or teaching methods), and more reliable office machines. **Third, a more friendly and collaborative environment for teaching improvement is desirable.** For example, faculty development workshops might be offered at department levels as well as college and university levels, with a clearer valuing of teaching in the tenure and promotion process, and “more collaborative spirit from the administration and from other colleagues.” **Fourth, there is a need for better information and coordination.**

In summary, faculty often feel that the development of their teaching is an individual effort or something they engage in with a small group of close colleagues, rather than a well-supported and well-valued collective university-wide priority.

Research and Scholarship

This section summarizes the major themes reflected in the quantitative and qualitative responses to the Faculty Survey regarding research and scholarship. Overall, the survey results portray a faculty that is very committed to performing high quality research and scholarship at all career stages. Faculty respondents are engaged in a range of scholarly activity and define their scholarship in various ways, with overlapping labels: 55% would typically describe their scholarship as basic research, 42% as applied, and 24% as creative activity, with 33% sometimes describing it as public or community-engaged scholarship or action research. Other terms included teacher research, scholarship of teaching, interdisciplinary scholarship clinical research, theoretical work, policy analysis, literary history, criticism, biography, editorial work, archival work, and participatory action research.

Faculty respondents place a high value on the support received from colleagues, both within and outside of UMASS Boston, which has helped them to achieve success in their fields of study. At the same time, the results portray a faculty that believes that their research and scholarship has been severely hampered by an institutional environment characterized by relatively heavy teaching loads and service responsibilities, and inadequate administrative and technical support for research. Our summary of results is organized around the survey's three main areas of inquiry with respect to research and scholarship:

- general institutional support for scholarship,
- support from the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (ORSP),
- factors contributing to the effectiveness of one's scholarship.

General Institutional Support for Scholarship

Although the majority of faculty members at all career stages indicated that they were generally satisfied with respect to the way their scholarship is valued and evaluated at UMass Boston, when asked about specific forms of institutional support, there was considerable dissatisfaction, particularly among the tenured faculty. Fewer than 30% of respondents reported to be satisfied

or very satisfied with the level of monetary support for research (e.g., for labs, travel, etc.), the guidance received in seeking external and internal grant funding, and release time in support of scholarship. In particular there was widespread concern about the lack of time for scholarship due to heavy teaching loads at UMass Boston. A few representative examples of comments about heavy teaching loads are found below:

- The university gives lip service to its appreciation and support of faculty research, but frankly a "3/3" teaching load won't cut it. You can't have it all: teaching, research and writing all tap the same energy. The teaching load must be lightened.
- Research takes time, effort, and undivided attention. A 3/3 teaching load makes it very hard to compete in research with universities offering a 2/2 and increasingly a 1/2 teaching load. I want to continue to help the college and the university increase the research profile, but this is very difficult to do with a 3/3 teaching load - and full to over-full classes.
- If UMass Boston is to be a "research" university, it needs to provide a pre-tenure sabbatical.
- Junior faculty cannot find adequate time to do the needed research when teaching a 3-3 load.”

While some individuals expressed appreciation for the support that UMass Boston provided for their own scholarship, it was more generally suggested that there is discord between the University's laudable goals for research and scholarship and the support it provides to achieve those goals. One respondent characterized this as “the University expects huge things in research. They provide nothing in the way of money or support or time to do those things.... The University either doesn't understand what needs to happen for the level of research they want, or they choose to ignore it.” Another respondent remarked “give us time to do serious and engaged research; don't expect it to be done on nights, weekends, and holidays (including summer, when we are not technically employees).”

Support from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP)

The survey results show widespread dissatisfaction among faculty with the activities of the ORSP. About 57% of respondents at all career stages sought grant support for their research, scholarship, or professional activity through ORSP. However, a relatively small minority of them expressed satisfaction with their experience. Although only 26.1% of faculty respondents reported to be satisfied or very satisfied with the information that ORSP provides about grant sources, UMass Boston faculty appear to be more satisfied with this service than with all other types of services rendered by ORSP. In particular, faculty expressed considerable dissatisfaction with the assistance provided by ORSP for proposal preparation and grant administration.

Interestingly, the survey questions about satisfaction with ORSP activities appeared to strike a nerve for many respondents, as there were more written comments expressing dissatisfaction with the ORSP than for any other issue raised in the survey. A number of the written comments directed at ORSP were extremely harsh, and in some cases, reflected a deep anger over the current state of this university office. Omitting the small minority of comments that were either extremely harsh or generally favorable toward ORSP, we provide a representative sample of the sentiments expressed toward ORSP by UMass Boston faculty below.

- ORSP is notoriously difficult to work with in terms of developing proposals, responding to RFP and maintaining databases of funding sources.
- I feel that ORSP does not support faculty with respect to research. I don't feel like they listen to, or value, faculty input.
- I had to be very proactive in working with ORSP. There really wasn't any 'outreach.'
- I have no idea what ORSP is supposed to be providing. As far as I can tell, all they do is add a week on to the process at the end.
- ORSP has often impeded rather than facilitated efforts to access external funding. Additionally, lack of timely processing of external support accounting and additional information extracts valuable time and energy away from researchers who must check, double-check, and trouble-shoot externally funded project administrative details that ought to be managed by ORSP.

- The university's ORSP is virtually useless. Most people there (and I am discussing the people who are in the decision making positions) have no idea what is going on. They make bad decisions and many errors. They have cost lost money and grants for me.
- ORSP is very ineffective at engaging with faculty, a lot of smoke screen, little real support and understanding. Attention to large grants is important (and at times not sure how the resources flow) but there is very little mentoring and real support, too many administrative types with little investment in the scholarly piece.
- To date this institution has operated in the virtual absence of a functional ORSP. Many practices have added to faculty work-load without improving either the rate of grant applications or the success rate of submitted grants. The ORSP staff is undertrained and ill-equipped to handle much of what the faculty need them to do. Budgeting software is obsolete and in need of re-writes in many instances. Accounting information is often filled with errors or out-of-date. External collaborations often benefit by submitting grants through other institutions with more efficient grants offices.
- ORSP is very focused on compliance, but is not service oriented and fails miserably if their objective is to facilitate research and increasing the research funding on the campus. Communication is poor between ORSP and the PIs; and between ORSP and other relevant offices... The red tape is overwhelming to the PIs with resultant low morale. They rarely support grant preparation. There are hardly any incentives to do the hard work to get and maintain grants. Routine administrative chores such as account management, budget adjustments, etc. are dumped back on the PIs. In summary, ORSP's functions, objectives, and priorities must be revisited if the campus is to become a serious player the research.”
- There have been improvements in ORSP over the last several years but recently there have been odd edicts emerging that interfere with incentives to conduct research on campus.

While faculty at all career stages expressed dissatisfaction with ORSP activities, dissatisfaction appears to be greatest among faculty members who were recently tenured or tenured for more than 7 years but who are not near to retirement. This is a potential cause for concern since UMass Boston faculty are likely to spend many more years in these two post-tenure career stages than in pre-tenure and near retirement career stages.

Factors Contributing to the Effectiveness of One's Scholarship

The open-ended survey question about “what factors have most contributed to your effectiveness as a scholar or researcher or in your creative endeavors” provides a perspective on UMass Boston faculty perceptions about both the paucity of formal institutional support for their work, their own self-determination, and the strong informal support system provided by one's peers. A representative sample of written responses is provided below:

- The CLR's I've received (for teaching graduate courses and freshman seminars). Time is really the most important and most scarce resource.
- Department RA support has been very helpful; otherwise, I have done this on my own despite obstacles such as heavy teaching loads and lack of mentoring.
- My persistence, energy and intellect and passion for science
- Self determination; Collaboration with outside colleagues
- The opportunities for learning the application of research seems to come from the individual seeking it out.
- My own persistence, inventiveness, and ability to engage extramural collaborators. I have done reasonably well at UMass Boston despite this institution not because of it.”
- Help from my department and also from colleagues outside UMass Boston.
- The personal, informal support of my chair, my dean, and colleagues of mine across the CLA has been enormously beneficial.
- Intellectual engagement with colleagues and students

In summary, the survey responses portray a faculty that is **proud of its own individual efforts**. These efforts have allowed faculty members to achieve success in their fields in spite of **an institutional environment that has not generally provided resources commensurate with UMass Boston's aspirations for scholarship and research productivity**. Comments about what is needed to further support scholarship at UMass Boston generally reflect the concerns already noted. In particular, these comments emphasize the need for **reduced faculty teaching**

loads, a revamped ORSP that will provide better administrative support for proposal development and administration, and **university policies that reward rather than hinder faculty** in their efforts to acquire intramural and extramural grant support for their scholarship.

Service

The questions on service did not elicit as many of the strong responses (positive or negative) that were elicited in response to questions on teaching and research. The majority of respondents across career stages were somewhat satisfied with the way that their service was valued and evaluated, and in response to other questions the middle category—neutral—was the one most often selected. More faculty were satisfied than were dissatisfied with UMass Boston support for their service work at the university, in the community, and to the profession. Nevertheless, comments revealed a number of common concerns, as detailed below.

One group for whom the service aspect of their faculty work was problematic were non-tenure track faculty. A number of non tenure-track faculty view service as integral part of their development and full participation in university and want both opportunities for meaningful service and recognition for that service. The following is a representative comment:

--This continues to be a concern which departments resolve in their own ways, but it is worth putting on the table because this committee is meant to serve as a voice for these sorts of issues which profoundly affect the quality of work life of faculty, but which are not dealt with in any sort of standardized way across the U.

For faculty of color, the committee was concerned about unbalanced service loads for underrepresented faculty who are often sought out for service on committees. In filtered survey responses for this group, that particular concern was not seen, although these faculty echoed a sense that service in general and specific types of service (e.g. community or professional service, and informal mentoring) are not recognized/valued. Such undervaluing may have a more pronounced effect on the satisfaction of non-tenure track faculty and faculty of color.

Common concerns that emerged from the responses include the following: service demands are too great (felt across faculty stages); and a lack of release time for service, despite demanding service obligations.

--I feel exploited.

-- At UMass Boston, [heavy] service is needed/required due to the lack of administrative/secretarial support available. Given the bureaucracy at UMass Boston, that service is often very intensive and draining—and it is recognized with very little release time and no funding

--As a brand-new faculty member, I had no idea that I would be so overwhelmed by service work. The service obligations of this week in particular have demanded about 30 hours of my time.

--The service load is extreme across the campus, especially in small departments.

--Reorganization is needed. Deans should appreciate service, but do not. We need to hire more tenured senior faculty to replace all the senior people who have been lost since the many buy-outs.

--The service burden is punishing for recently tenured faculty

--Unfortunately many of my colleagues in the past 5 years (folks who didn't make it) got buried in meaningless, repetitive service that could have been accomplished by a more effective monitoring of the work of support staff.

Not only is service at UMass Boston demanding, but for many members of the faculty it feels unrewarding, often because of a lack of clear purpose or focus, or and marked by unnecessarily bureaucratic processes that could be alleviated by more support staff or more efficient procedures.

--Committee work has been, in my very brief experience, unrewarding and unproductive. I have failed to see the purpose for most of the committees in which I have thus far participated, and where I have seen the purpose, I have felt unable to contribute to the committee's work in any meaningful way. Service feels a bit like an "emperor's new clothes" endeavor, an activity in which I must engage in order to secure tenure but not one that I understand or derive meaning from.

In response to a question on what faculty would like to see in further support of service at UMass Boston the responses included **better compensation for demanding service** (eg. CLR's), **more opportunities and support for collaboration** – across departments, within community, **more opportunities to align service to research** (e.g. research centers, applied research), **less bureaucracy** and streamlined paperwork, **more support from staff/classified staff**, and **more recognition/reward for service**.

--First, service should be rewarded with more release time (CLRS). Second, high levels of service should be recognized and rewarded in the review process (AFR and tenure). Third, UMass Boston processes that impact departmental life on a daily basis (curriculum work, scheduling, hiring new faculty, etc) can be streamlined and made more efficient. A bureaucracy of endless committees has grown up, without ever being "pared back"; systems have become unmanageable.

--There are too many overlapping governance structures and committees. I would like to see the number and overlap reduced.

--More resources for faculty to engage with the community such as course leases.

Some faculty are also actively seeking an integration of their faculty work and more support for community outreach:

--I try to link my teaching, scholarship and service, to maximize efforts

--Build networks with community agencies that align research with faculty research - thus creating applied research agendas that actively contribute to the community.

Two-thirds of respondents had not been involved in any activities that might have helped them to plan and engage in effective service, and there was a marked absence of answers that attributed effective service to UMass Boston/institutional support. In addition, service opportunities are difficult to navigate for many faculty (junior faculty, in particular, find it difficult to determine how to access service possibilities and which to choose) and a number of faculty would welcome more planning and guidance.

--I have had trouble finding service opportunities outside my college

--The one support most important to me is a long term plan that consolidates time and effort and minimizes the likelihood of time and effort spent on initiatives that never come to fruition.

--New committee members need orientation, no? Not that I want to attend one. But as a newbie to the university, how in the world should I know what the overall committee structure of the university is, much less what each one does, who it reports to, and what my role on that committee is/should be? Either committee work serves no purpose and we're all pushing paper in order to receive promotions, or committee work matters and it is worrisome or even dangerous that I am as in the dark as I am regarding what are monthly exercises of decision-making power. Either way I need to be enlightened about this whole aspect of my job here at UMass Boston.

--More inclusive and structured mentorship [is needed].

--I worry that service is presented to junior faculty as a bit of a chore, a line item on our AFRs and review dossiers, and I worry that that is precisely its value when we are evaluated. Perhaps the university might consider ways not only to look at the service contributions we make at the department, college, and university level as a meaningful part of our professional identities. Also, rather than presenting department-, college-, and

university-level service as a checklist at the 4th-year and tenure stages, chairs and deans might be encouraged to consider the amount of work many of us devote to outside service (e.g., editorial and advisory boards) when advising us to serve on internal committees.

Two exceptions to this lack of preparation and support for service were noted: serving on committees related to general education, and, in GCE, having opportunities for professional preparation related to NCATE reviews.

As with research, the faculty who felt that they had shaped a successful service profile had done so largely through their own efforts or through the informal support of colleagues/mentors, students, or and/or professional staff.

--Informal conversations with senior colleagues have given me invaluable insight into how to make service meaningful here at UMass Boston. I am grateful for the "institutional history" that colleagues have shared with me; their perspectives on their investment in the university, the impact of the university's mission to their professional identities, and their commitment to education and the life of the mind as a human right have acculturated me to an ethic of service. I worry that many of my fellow junior colleagues are not hearing this history and learning this culture.

--I feel very valued by faculty colleagues when I do service and I feel obligated to do service as part of a collaborative effort. However, I don't particularly feel valued by administrators nor is it not given the same weight as research output in merit, tenure or promotion (where value in this case is monetary value).

In the end, survey responses show that many faculty are motivated, in their service, by their sense of responsibility to colleagues and the institution as well as by a commitment to the urban mission and the larger community. They would like opportunities that would allow their service to be better planned, and more effective, as well as more highly valued. Beyond that, they would like the service they do to be meaningful, to draw on their knowledge and skills, and to contribute to their professional identities.

General Experience

In addition to questions about teaching, research and scholarship, and service, faculty were asked several questions about their overall experience at the university. Overall about 46% of respondents (44% of tenure stream) felt satisfied or very satisfied with the possibilities for managing and/or integrating their teaching, scholarship and service at UMass Boston, with another 30% neutral on this topic, and 56% (58% of tenure stream) were satisfied or very satisfied with the possibility of having a rewarding and productive career at UMass Boston, with another 22% neutral on this topic. But only 37% (36% of tenure stream) were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall campus culture as it impacts the social and intellectual development of faculty in their career stage, and about 40% (41% of tenure stream) with the way their work is recognized and evaluated through current review processes.

--I love my department, I love my colleagues, I love my students. However, the workload here, combined with the inefficient bureaucracy, makes it difficult to balance all aspects of the job--we cannot be a "research" university with a 3-3 load and a heavy service load.

--Colleges are now silos that compete, rather cooperate. One college has been decimated (CPCS), while another given more resources than it deserves (MGS) without any reasoned reviews or general faculty input. CLA has become the cash cow of the university -- teaching the vast majority of the students, yet receiving less and less resources. Early retirements and budget cuts has place enormous service strains on senior faculty. I do not feel like this is one university as I did when I started working here (which I was thrilled about) -- but rather competing units. I have valued colleagues across the colleges and I love our student body, but I really am very dissatisfied with UMass Boston. WE have always been resource poor, but to be so horribly managed and resource poor is getting harder and harder to take. On the positive end, I love my department. It operates very well. It is open and very collaborative. Everyone is hardworking and fair.

People take care of one another (and the students) and provide enormous strength and support. I feel very proud to be in my department.

With regard to personnel processes, the majority of respondents (78%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the lines of communication with their chairs and a smaller majority was satisfied with communication with the dean, the clarity of expectations for faculty work and how it will be evaluated, information they received about the faculty review process, usefulness of AFR comments. Fewer than 50% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with information they've received about their next major review. With a few exceptions, comments suggest that faculty feel best informed and supported at the department level, and less so at the college or university level.

Fewer than 20% of faculty respondents have received formal mentoring, although many have been mentored informally by friends and colleagues. Several would appreciate more formal processes. Where the department chair has been the only source of mentoring, there may be concerns:

--Even informal mentoring from a dept. chair is problematic. If I make a mistake and ask for help from my dept. head, I could also be putting my job on the line. I would prefer a system in which less experienced teachers are mentored by tenured or tenure-track professors instead of the dept. head. (Of course the dept. head is always available as an informal mentor.)

Some have relied on mentors beyond the department and/or beyond the university. And several comment on the fact that "after tenure, you are on your own."

When asked what has contributed most to your satisfaction at UMass Boston, the overwhelming response has been interactions with colleagues and with students.

- Colleagues, students, the community, the urban mission, the ability to do engaged scholarship and teaching
- Finding colleagues with whom I connect intellectually and theoretically.
- Interactions, often leading to creative endeavors, with fellow faculty and my students.
- A wonderful department and stimulating students.
- I really appreciate the climate of the community and the mission of the university. I believe Chancellor Motley is uniquely inspiring in this regard. The faculty have all been warm and welcoming during my first year. The events for new faculty have been a real plus. The students that are interested and engaged are also great to be near.

When asked what further faculty development they'd like for their career stage/role, respondents identified a number of areas:

- More research support, including help with developing support for a research agenda, forums on the “micro-aspects” of writing and publication, and travel money for meetings, more recognition and feedback for scholarly and creative work, “Interest in my work. Discussion of my work, Curiosity about how to support my work—or how to guide me to get the support from others.”
- A mentoring program for junior faculty.
- Ongoing mid-career seminars
- Information about promotion to full professor.
- Additional professional development “for partnership building, large project management, book writing, and administration.”
- Ongoing technology enhancements, and specific tech help for individual needs.
- Greater opportunity for release time to maintain and further develop growing demands for sophisticated quantitative analyses in grant proposals.
- Greater flexibility in allowing faculty to choose to alter the relative amount of time in teaching, research, and service.

Non-tenure track faculty again voiced a desire to be recognized, appreciated, and more fully integrated into the life of the university.

Career Stages and Roles

New Faculty

Only 8 first- year faculty responded to the survey (out of approximately 40 who were hired), and of these five did not identify their department. Because there were so few responses, it is hard to generalize about sentiments on support for teaching, research, and service. Since they have not filled out an AFR and received feedback from their departments about their contributions, they mentioned that they could not comment on how their work was valued.

However, in their comments two overwhelming themes emerged, and in both cases had to do with support for themselves and the students. The two themes were about teaching our diverse student population and the unreasonable teaching load, given the other demands on their time. Several of them noted that despite the university's alleged urban mission to serve diverse students, there was actually very little commitment of resources to help them work effectively with our students. They expressed some frustration over the lack of formal and structured orientation to teaching techniques.

--I think the main challenge for teachers here is figuring out how to promote good learning among everyone, when classes contain students that are so mixed in terms of study skills, language skills, maturity, and basic academic competencies.”

The second theme was a call for a reduced teaching load (2/2) in order to balance the demands of research and teaching in particular.

A third though less emphatically articulated theme was for reduced service expectations. Some first year faculty appreciated their chairs' protecting them from excessive service obligations. They also seemed “satisfied” or “neutral” with the mentoring they have received thus far. But

over and over again, they mentioned their need for help with teaching our diversely prepared students.

A set of specific questions addressed both new and recently hired faculty, and 98 faculty responded to those questions, indicating general but not high satisfaction with introductory activities and information for faculty. Suggestions for useful activities included the following:

- Workshops after the first year at the university level about how to access information about university level committees or a research and writing workshop at the end of the year where we could meet other new faculty to discuss our research
- At the college or dept level it would be helpful to discuss research, teaching and service with the dept chair to help set goals on a yearly basis.
- ESL writing and teaching very basic writing in non-writing focused classes (for example introductory science classes)
- Opportunities for co-teaching the first semester.
- Some more nuts and bolts: what's the rhythm of the semester; what kinds of tests are normative; reading levels of students; how to address the grading challenge for classes where some students don't speak English well but need to pass in essays...; how to get your grades in-- these mysteries make the first semester more challenging than it needs to be
- More help with fundraising

Respondents also make specific suggestions about orientation:

- Orientation should be done in smaller groups that are geared toward the discipline of the faculty members involved. When faculty from public policy and biology are engaged in discussions about teaching, scholarship, and service the information provided will be so general that it loses its helpfulness.
- Have the orientation over two days -- one for benefits and getting other stuff set up and the other focused on teaching. Have the scholarship workshops spread throughout the year.

Also, I know there's probably no way around this, but having access to services and being able to set things up like e-mail before Sept. 1st would make a HUGE difference in getting started right. Lastly, a move-in day would be great -- a day when new faculty can park any where closest to their office (for example, in the short term lot without being charged the short term rates) and the gray carts are abundant and spread out everywhere so people can easily move in. Having staff available to do things like set up their computers (if they can get computers before Sept. 1st) and help with setting up phones if needed would be incredible.

Tenure Track Faculty

There were 47 tenure track respondents distributed across all colleges (though the majority was from CLA). Not surprisingly, given the larger number of respondents, there was a greater spread across the survey categories in all areas (i.e., teaching, research, and service), rather than a clustering around “satisfied” and “neutral,” which was the case with the first year faculty. However, here, too, the same themes emerged as for the first year faculty. The need for teaching support and mentoring for effective teaching practices was a repeated sentiment. Greater recognition of the need to build in formal structures to facilitate the development of effective pedagogy for our students was desired. Because these responses came from faculty members who have been here for a few years, several of them mentioned the help they had received from participating in a CIT seminar to address concerns about teaching.

A number of respondents believe that their colleges do not value a focus on teaching.

Tenure track faculty also spoke overwhelmingly of the need for a 2/ 2 course load, both for the purposes of research productivity and improved attention to teaching. In fact, one respondent noted, “Honestly, reduced course loads. I am a much more effective teacher when I concentrate on my teaching.”

In this group, 56% of respondents are satisfied or very satisfied with the way their scholarship is valued and evaluated, with 43.9% neutral, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied. And only 18.4% are

satisfied or very satisfied with institutional support for their scholarship, although 75% have sought ORSP help. And while 85% have presented their research on campus, only 40% are satisfied or very satisfied with the experience

Tenure track faculty echoed common concerns raised in the survey:

- the current teaching load being too high to meet research demands,
- the lack of institutional support for research, in general,
- the lack of appropriate travel funding, in particular,
- the need for a pre-tenure sabbatical year,
- the need for more explicit criteria for promotion,
- the lack of appropriate support for grant proposal development and grant administration from ORSP.

They asked for structured mentoring and guidance in all three areas of faculty work.

The tenure track faculty also spoke about the enormous service obligations they encountered, some of which did not lead to outcomes that were satisfying. “Meaningless repetitive service” and “the black hole of service” were typical comments.

Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty made up the largest proportion of survey respondents (42%). Not surprisingly, the themes that emerge from their responses echo those discussed above. There are repeated comments on the following:

- The conflict of teaching loads with research expectations
- A lack of financial support for research
- Concerns about ORSP and a lack of appropriate support from that office.
- A lack of mentoring for teaching beyond at the beginning of the career
- Constant changes in the university’s priorities and direction
- A general feeling in all areas of being cast out on one’s own, except from those who considered themselves to be in departments with a strong departmental culture

Of the 270 respondents to the survey, 23 were recently tenured faculty. Of this group, 55% have participated in a CIT seminar. Only 32% use Blackboard or similar technology in their teaching, although more have participated in IT workshops.

They express an interest in other types of teaching support; for example:

--Faculty need release time or funding to create new and innovative courses. I've worked at two other universities; at each, faculty were given "compensation" in the form of time or funds to create new courses. The openness to new teaching ideas in my department is great, but the lack of any university-wide release time relating to teaching is striking. The CIT offers a way to talk about teaching--but the idea of actually envisioning and implementing a new course is not supported.

Recently tenured faculty are more satisfied than tenure-track faculty with the way in which their scholarship is valued and evaluated, with 63% satisfied or very satisfied. But only 32% were very satisfied with the monetary support they've received from UMass Boston, and only 23% satisfied with guidance for seeking grant funding. Of this group, 76% had sought support through ORSP and only 20 to 30% of those were satisfied with the different aspects of the help with information, proposal preparation, and grant administration they received.

Of this group, about 86% have presented their work at UMass Boston, but only 50% are satisfied or very satisfied with the experience. More in this group (about 52%) had engaged in interdisciplinary collaboration with others at UMass Boston; for over half, based on informal, personal connections.

In the comments to the survey, recently-tenured faculty expressed concerns about:

- a. the current teaching load being too high,
- b. the current sabbatical leave policy
- c. the lack of time for grant preparation and administration,
- d. the lack of appropriate support for grant proposal development from the ORSP,

e. the excessive cost of course buyouts.

Newly tenured faculty also comment on their heavy service burden.

Faculty Tenured over 7 Years

There were 63 survey respondents who reported to be tenured over 7 years. For the most part, their responses and concerns echoed those of those more recently tenured. Of this number, 10 did not answer questions about institutional support for scholarship.

Those nearing retirement echo the same concerns, with some differences. An increased proportion (85%) are satisfied or very satisfied with the ways in which their scholarship is valued and evaluated, and a smaller proportion (50%) has sought support through ORSP (with comparable levels of dissatisfaction). About 87% have presented their work on campus and 60% have been satisfied with the experience, and 63% have been involved in collaborations with colleagues.

In the comments to the survey, faculty members nearing retirement expressed concerns about:

- the current teaching load being too high
- the lack of support from the ORSP
- excessive administrative assignments
- the fact that the University could use their experience to mentor other faculty members but doesn't

Several also expressed interest in phased retirement options that would allow them to reduce their workload while continuing to contribute to the university.

The committee also filtered the survey to look at the responses of associate professors who had been tenured over seven years, that is, faculty who could have been eligible for promotion to full professor, to see if their experiences and needs differed from those of tenured full professors. Of 24 respondents in this category, 18 responded to the questions about scholarship, with 50%

satisfied with how their scholarship was reviewed, 72% having sought ORSP report, and with higher levels of dissatisfaction for both general support and ORSP support. But 59% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the way their work was reviewed overall. This group echoed strongly the general concern about a reduced teaching load, particularly in relation to service:

--I provide a lot of service to the university, and it impacts my ability to do scholarly work

Respondents also asked for faculty development in the following areas:

- More discussions about being productive
- Midcareer faculty seminars
- Additional research support.

Overall, the positives for all tenured faculty are our students and people's colleagues. But too many see the institution as a barrier to effective research, teaching and/or service.

It is clear that the institution needs to do more to give senior faculty, even those who are quite productive in any or all of the three areas, opportunities to revitalize their work, and to feel appreciated.

Interestingly, there was not a significant difference in percentages for most questions in the survey between the overall response (including non-tenure track) and the response of only tenure-track and tenured faculty. In other words, the reported levels of general satisfaction in most areas were not significantly different across these populations. For example, in response to questions about general management or integration of teaching, research, and service, the percentage of respondents who were satisfied or very satisfied was 44% whether or not non-tenure track faculty were included; likewise the possibility of a rewarding career at UMass Boston (59% for tenure track and tenured; 55% for all); the overall campus culture (36% in both cases); and the way work has been reviewed through personnel processes (40% in both cases). Only in specific questions where the difference in role created significantly different opportunities (such as participation in CIT seminars) did the percentages change when only

tenure track/tenured faculty were examined (so that 45% of all tenure stream faculty participated in CIT seminars, vs. 32% of all respondents).

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Non-tenure track faculty made up 37% of all survey participants; 50% of these respondents have taught at UMass Boston for more than eight years, 33% for more than 12 years, and 43% currently teach nine credit units or more per semester. Thus a large portion of the respondents represent long-term faculty with significant responsibilities at UMass Boston.

In most areas the percentages of non-tenure track faculty responding in particular ways about their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with various aspects of support for their work at the university were not substantially different from those of tenure stream faculty. Nevertheless some specific concerns emerged from their responses and repeated in their comments of non-tenure track faculty.

- 1) The development opportunities for non-tenure track faculty are highly dependent upon departmental organization and culture, with some non-tenure track faculty feeling valued and central to their departments and others undervalued and peripheral.
- 2) Many non-tenure track faculty have received little or no orientation to the resources available for faculty development. While 70% reported having had a Human Resources orientation, 61% received no orientation regarding their role in the university and 51% received no orientation regarding their role in the department. Only 46% received any orientation to the AFR. Nearly 70% received no orientation about departmental support for their activities.
- 3) Non-tenure track faculty expressed the need for “release time opportunities” to participate in faculty development and course reductions for course development. Many noted that heavy teaching loads create scheduling and sheer time constraints. “I’d like to attend, just haven’t had the time” was a common response to questions about such opportunities as CIT. In addition,

non-tenure track faculty suggest more frequent, shorter workshops offered at a variety of times on such focused topics as teaching diverse students.

4) Only 30 non-tenure track faculty answered questions on scholarship. Those who did saw themselves as active scholars who would like their work in this area to be recognized and supported at UMass Boston. Of those who have research and/or creative agendas, 43% reported receiving no encouragement or support for any scholarship or creative activities. In response to questions concerning research and scholarship development, one non-tenure track instructor replied “my sense is this is N/A, even if one has a Ph.D. Without course release and a bit of money, it's hard to pursue scholarship.” Many expressed a desire for faculty development money to attend conferences and sabbaticals to pursue research and creative projects.

5) Non-tenure track faculty expressed passion for teaching in general and UMass Boston’s student population in particular. Yet only 8 of 99 non-tenure track faculty have participated in a CIT seminar (and there are currently no resources to support their participation); 1/3 (32) have participated in CIT workshops. At the same time, 68% have participated in technology workshops, and several respondents voice their appreciation for that opportunity. Overall non-tenure track faculty would like more opportunities and support for participation in campus faculty development activities, more support for diverse students (and for faculty teaching them), and the possibility of paid sabbaticals for long term faculty. One respondent comments:

--[I have received] basically no support and guidance for teaching except for a syllabus from previous instructor, and an email once from the associate dean after the first time I taught a course asking me what I would do to improve organization of tasks. I have received much valued support and encouragement at the Program level but not within the department or college. University has provided excellent support and opportunities to enhance my technology skills. I have consistently received excellent quality training and support for use of new technologies, or old technologies used in new ways, and through a variety of formats including trainings and individual faculty support. Bravo, Educational Technology.

Some also note that despite their innovative teaching, they are marginalized from curriculum development beyond the individual class.

--Arguably, our emphasis on teaching has hindered our research and publication progress - this is a matter of priorities. So it surprises me that we are not called upon for the purposes of curriculum development; we seem instead to be treated as 'hired guns' [who] come in, teach, leave.

6) Overall, non-tenure track faculty expressed the desire for more collaborative opportunities, across disciplines and categories of faculty, in both research and teaching.

7) Finally, non-tenure track faculty would like more recognition for the work they do and the role they play at the university.

--As an adjunct, I have struggled to keep up with academic life, in spite of teaching up to 11 courses per year (not just at UMass Boston, of course). I have published, got a national recognized scholarship from the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars, without any support, input or recognition from UMass --except for a merit award that amounted to US\$ 100! Our Dean organized a "hidden treasures" event for celebrating adjunct faculty... which did not even merit a mention in the UMass Boston website.

--I am a leader in pedagogy in several ways. Nobody particularly cares.

--Like most NTT faculty, I feel somewhat undervalued by the university as a whole, given the share of the teaching we actually do. E.G., not eligible for distinguished teaching or research awards, not listed in the faculty list in catalog, subject to certain degree of generalized negative commentary in master plan.

--I would like someone to view me as a faculty member worthy of being developed, rather than just someone doing a good job. I would very much like to attend a semester-long CIT course but would need to be paid. I would like to see the divisions between Tenure

track and non tenure-track faculty in my department be minimized, so that we could be treated as one faculty with different things to offer and more equally invested in and valued. These are core shifts that I feel need to occur to open the door to faculty development among NTT faculty like myself.

Non-tenure track faculty who are shaping careers at UMass Boston would like more help in doing so, with more integration into departmental activities, leadership from the provost's office, mentoring, contracts for longer than one year to promote stability and a chance for faculty to plan ahead, more chances to teach other than basic introductory courses, and opportunities for career advancement in their role at UMass Boston.

Faculty of Color

The committee filtered the survey analysis to determine whether the responses would indicate that experiences and concerns of faculty of color were significantly different from those of other faculty. Of 33 respondents in this category, about 1/3 are tenure track faculty, 56% are tenured, and 18% non-tenure track. They express similar concerns in all areas and similar levels of satisfaction with the various aspects of their career at the university: 52% (vs. 44% of all faculty) are satisfied or very satisfied with the possibilities for managing and integrating their faculty work, 56% (vs. 55%) are satisfied or very satisfied with the possibilities for having a rewarding and productive career at UMass Boston, and 50% (vs. 40%) are satisfied with the ways in which their work is reviewed and evaluated. However only 28% (vs. 38%) are satisfied or very satisfied with the overall campus culture. Several mention the importance of the university's mission and agreement with the goals of the UMass Boston strategic plan in promoting the best teaching practices for our diverse population and promoting academic engagement for all students at all levels, but one respondent comments:

--I share these values; the university's mission attracted me to UMass Boston. As I prepare for my tenure review, however, I am unclear how much the university really values my teaching.

Other Topics

Many other specific topics about the university and its functioning were raised in the comments of respondents to this survey, but two emerged strongly enough to mention here. One concern was a sense of disparity across colleges.

--Again, the bar is set very high at UMass Boston and the work loads are VERY uneven across colleges. At CLA we teach out brains out, at MGS they barely teach, yet we at CLA are required to publish as much and tend to do enormous amounts of college and university service.

--First of all, I would like to see course loads equalized. My standard teaching responsibilities are three graduate courses per term at GCOE. Others who teach at the graduate level have a standard load of 2/2. I don't necessarily want to teach less, but I know that balancing scholarship with teaching takes time away from both. I cannot do the same with my load in either scholarship or teaching as someone can who teaches 2/2.

Another was the importance of providing appropriate support to faculty in teaching all students, including ESL students, and those with other needs.

--I think the Ross Center needs additional support to help faculty address the needs of students with disabilities, especially as we anticipate a higher number of disabled veterans coming to school as well as the higher numbers of students with autism coming to campus. Ross needs a broader agenda; we need to substantially increase our adaptive technology supports/enhancements.

In summary, the survey offers a picture of a faculty that is committed to the several aspects of their faculty work, values UMass Boston colleagues and students, and has generally made use of relevant faculty development opportunities. At the same time, faculty feel overburdened, undersupported, and sometimes undervalued for the work they do, and that they would benefit

not only from more resources and a reduced teaching load, but from a more coherent range of opportunities for further development across the several aspects of their work, beginning with orientation for new faculty, and continuing through retirement, with different concerns becoming more prominent for faculty at different stages. While the majority of respondents feel satisfied or very satisfied with the possibilities of a productive career at UMass Boston, that percentage remains low (55%). Their many suggestions of specific ways in which their work might be enhanced should contribute to further planning for faculty development.

Appendix 5: Additional Suggestions from Subcommittee Reports

What follows are some detailed suggestions that emerged from the work of the subcommittees but are not explicitly included in the primary recommendations of the full committee. They are included in this appendix in the hope that they might contribute to future work.⁵⁷

The subcommittees suggested providing further faculty development several areas.

- a. Support for faculty interests in particular areas of teaching, service, and scholarship that may be less strongly represented in current faculty development efforts. Such areas might include global initiatives or locally-focused endeavors such as service learning, community engagement, and public scholarship, and support might include creating a comprehensive web-based directory of campus resources for faculty seeking to connect with others involved in such work (e.g. creating a data-base for faculty involved in community-focused work that would be comparable to the existing data-base for faculty involved in global initiatives) and offering workshops and defined opportunities for faculty interested in such work.
- b. Planning effective career paths for service as well as teaching and scholarship, including providing a resource page on a faculty development website that would include service opportunities within the university, offering workshops that would help faculty define their own balance of service within departments/colleges/university, to the profession, and/or in outreach to the community, and providing mentoring in relation to useful and appropriate service for different career stages.
- c. For tenure-track faculty, better guidance through the tenuring process, such as workshops on how to prepare fourth year/tenure review materials, what supporting materials to save, and how to identify external reviewers. CLA's On Track 1 and On Track II reports offer useful materials

⁵⁷ The still more detailed reports of each subcommittee can be found at www.umbfacultydevelopment.wikispaces.com.

and recommendations for tenure track faculty and their mentors and these could be adapted for other colleges.⁵⁸

d. For tenured faculty, offering faculty development that helps faculty maintain the momentum of their pre-tenure years. For newly-tenured faculty, that would include continued opportunities for teaching development through series of lunches or roundtables on teaching (with subjects suggested by participants, and offering some incentives for attendance), including a focus on the use of relevant educational technologies, support for research efforts such as writing groups, workshops on technology-based research tools and software, and course releases, as well as leadership development and guidance for time allocation after tenure. For newly-promoted full professors, it would include, in addition, incentives for mentoring, and for long-term associate professors, resources and support for an effective later career path. For pre-retirement faculty, appropriate support might include phased retirement options that offer the ability to step down gradually, post-retirement employment opportunities (such as part time teaching, field supervision, connection to a research lab), and other ways of contributing to and maintaining a connection with the university.

e. For non-tenure track faculty, in keeping with the major recommendation for greater inclusion in all aspects of university life, the subcommittee made a number of specific suggestions: the provision of better information on a faculty website (e.g. course planning checklists & resources; information about benefits and promotion; explanations of university structures, expectations and resources; information for chairs on contractual obligations/priority hiring, etc.); formal orientation for new tenure-track hires; a program of career building (including workshops on building a career in this role at UMass Boston, events to showcase NTT faculty achievements, and opportunities for awards and recognition that include NTT faculty); more access to development activities in teaching; better information about opportunities for and expectations for university service, and support and mentoring for research and scholarship for those who desire it).

⁵⁸ [<http://www.umb.edu/academics/cla/faculty/junior.html>]

