M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: 6/04/2004

TO: Dr. William Flores, NMSU Interim President

FROM: Donna Alden, Chair, Roles and Rewards Taskforce (Faculty)

Members Of The Faculty Roles And Rewards Task Force

RE: **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE IN THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM AT NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY**

Over the past two years, this task force has explored the complexities of faculty roles and rewards. When we began this process in October 2002, we quickly realized that the topic itself was too disparate to reasonably be assessed within the body of one report, so we submitted to you last fall a report titled "Initial Findings: A Preliminary Report of the Faculty Subcommittee of the Roles and Rewards Task Force." Our second report, "Recommendations for Change in the Faculty Evaluation System at New Mexico State University," in conjunction with the first report, offer recommendations to meet the strategic Target:

Attract, develop, reward and retain a high-quality faculty and staff

However, we realize that it is impossible to address the role of faculty without looking at the way in which faculty are recognized through the promotion and tenure system at NMSU. This report describes problems that we have identified and recommendations that would provide more equity within the faculty evaluation system. We realize that these are concerns best addressed through the Faculty Senate. Right now, though, we would like the NMSU administration, including the Provost's Council and the Associate Deans Academic Council, to read our report and comment on our recommendations. It is important that we begin this communication now so that we can gain buy-in and can make revisions prior to bringing these recommendations to the Faculty Senate. Members of this committee are available to meet with appropriate committees or councils to discuss our proposals.

This committee's investigation has resulted in the following recommendations.

1) Much of the work currently required of NMSU faculty is neither acknowledged nor appropriately rewarded under the traditional categories of teaching, research, service, and extension. This situation is not attributed to neglect by the administration; rather, it is a reality of the educational environment that demands greater returns in a time of changing resource constraints. Beyond the traditional areas of teaching, research, service and extension, NMSU faculty now have

additional obligations in areas such as development, recruitment, and community outreach. No single faculty member possesses the diverse skill set and areas of expertise necessary for effective contribution to all university activities. Accordingly, the university should develop a more flexible approach to defining appropriate and differentiated models for the assessment of faculty performance. The models should be developed and communicated in such a way as to guarantee collegial respect for the importance of these different models in realizing the overall mission of the university. Departmental / unit functions and criteria statements should be subject to periodic departmental / unit review. (Appendices A, B)

2) The committee recommends that each department (or comparable academic unit) create its own model which emphasizes the department's unique contributions to the university's mission, and the role of the unit in delivering value to the people of New Mexico. The models must be specifically developed to support the university's mission and be subject to the approval of the Provost or his/her designee. (Appendices A, C)

3) Performance expectations relevant to the approved models must be clearly explained and communicated to the faculty and all persons involved in faculty performance evaluations. In order to ensure that a fair and equitable review occurs, all personnel involved in evaluation of faculty must understand that each academic unit has different guidelines and that the model for the respective unit must be considered the benchmark for evaluation of the unit's faculty members.

4) The various colleges, branch campus community colleges, and the University Library should develop documentation that describes in more detail than does the current policy manual (section 5.90) the responsibilities of the groups and individuals involved in the promotion and tenure process, including the grounds for decision making, the role of departmental and college expectations in making recommendations, and the materials that committee members are expected to have reviewed before making a decision. This documentation should be distributed to the members of the committees and training sessions done for new members by each college or college-level academic unit for the members of the various promotion and tenure committees in that college.

5) In order to promote transparency of the process, the Roles and Rewards Committee recommends the following:
   a. Post formal rules and procedures on each departmental website with appropriate links to college and university rules and procedures related to promotion and tenure.
   b. Give a written copy of the functions and criteria statements and the rules governing the promotion and tenure process to all tenured and tenure-track faculty.
   c. Provide a written copy of the functions and criteria statement to all finalists for faculty positions.

6) To recruit and retain a high-quality faculty, we recommend that the administration consider four innovations that will bring NMSU into the Twenty-First Century.

       a.   part-time tenure track,
       b.   a modification of duties,
       c.   tenure clock extension (also known as "stop the clock"), and
       d.   paid maternity leave.

These innovations, already implemented at other universities, will enable faculty with family obligations the necessary tools to balance the demands of their careers with the needs of their families. Such innovations are essential to ensure gender equity because women are more likely than men to be responsible for elder and childcare. (Appendix D)

7) The process of promotion and tenure is cumbersome with numerous layers of committees and individuals involved. This process should be streamlined. In a straw vote of members of the Roles and Rewards Taskforce, we voted that the graduate dean be removed from the process. Currently the graduate dean evaluates both graduate and non-graduate faculty, and this process is enormously time consuming and redundant since the graduate dean already reviews applications for graduate faculty status. The taskforce feels that the dean's time is better spent in recruitment activities in this critical time of the academic calendar. We are recommending that the department heads also review the role of the graduate dean in the process of promotion and tenure. If the graduate dean remains part of the process, we do recommend that in the interest of transparency that the role of and criteria used by the graduate dean be clarified to faculty.

Background: Tenure and promotion procedures should be transparent to all concerned. Transparency is particularly important given the complexity of the tenure and promotion process at NMSU. There are at least nine parties to the tenure and promotion process: (1) the candidate, (2) the departmental promotion and tenure committee, (3) the department head, (4) the college dean, (5) the graduate dean, (6) the provost, (7) the president, (8) the Board of regents, and (9) in some cases an appeals board. In addition, there are numerous sets of rules and procedures for the tenure and promotion process. These include: (1) departmental procedures and guidelines, (2) college procedures and guidelines, and (3) university procedures and guidelines. University procedures and guidelines are mainly contained in sections 5.88, 5.90 and 5.91 of the Policy Manual. Additional relevant parts of the policy manual are sections 5.65 and 5.15.

We would like to meet with you to discuss our report as well as the one submitted to you in October 2003. Other than meeting in small groups to draft legislation for the Faculty Senate, we feel that the work of this taskforce is now completed. Thank you for allowing our participation in this process; it has been an enlightening and rewarding experience. We would like for you to share both of our reports with President Martin at a time you deem appropriate. We look forward to watching the transformation of NMSU as some of our recommendations become policy.

Appendix A: The Expanding Role of Faculty and Various Expectations

Faculty work lives are structured by a number of factors at New Mexico State University. First, NMSU is classified as Carnegie Doctoral/Research University Extensive with 74 bachelors, 50 masters, and 22 doctoral programs on our campus. But a majority of the doctoral programs (14 of the 22) are located in the "traditional" disciplines for which NMSU was historically known: the natural, physical and life sciences and engineering, which means that most of our academic departments offer high-quality bachelors and masters-level preparation. Teaching and research loads differ based upon the level(s) of degrees offered by academic departments.

In addition, the connection of the faculty in the College of Agriculture and Home Economics with the land-grant research and extension mission of the university means that faculty in that college are more likely than those in other colleges to be on 12-month rather than 9-month contracts and to have positions funded only partially by state I & G funds. The remainder of CAHE faculty support is derived from the Agricultural Experiment Station. Again, this has implications for the way that CAHE faculty jobs are structured.

Teaching, research, service, and extension are the four elements on which faculty are evaluated—albeit in different proportions for different individuals. At a public land-grant institution like New Mexico State University, the activities for each of these areas of faculty work often overlap and reinforce each other. But many faculty feel a sense of conflict in balancing these responsibilities. Over the past several years, the service activities that faculty have been asked to participate in, such as recruitment and development (Appendix B), are often viewed as taking time away from research activities. Furthermore, these time-consuming activities are not recognized as is research productivity within the promotion and tenure process.

Each department establishes its own balance of responsibilities, which varies greatly across departments and even for faculty within departments. Annual evaluation is conducted on all of the elements of a faculty member's job but external evaluation for promotion and tenure may, in some cases, involve an evaluation only of a faculty member's research. Because such external evaluations may not provide balanced input about the various forms of scholarship, research, regardless of its relative proportion of a faculty member's job, can occupy a more privileged position than either teaching (which might actually be a larger portion of the faculty member's job) or service. Again, departments vary substantially on the weight placed on these evaluations with some departments continuing to emphasize that research must go hand-in-hand with quality teaching and other departments placing less emphasis on teaching even when teaching is the majority of the faculty member's responsibilities.

Because of their smaller proportionate numbers, like at other institutions, minority and female faculty (especially in the science and engineering fields with few women and minority faculty) are more likely to be asked to participate in more service activities. On

the one hand, the laudable institutional requirement that committees have diverse composition means that the smaller number of women and minority faculty are called upon more often to serve on search committees. One the other hand, these faculty members are asked more often by various community groups to come to K-12 classrooms and extracurricular programs because they are important role models to children in our community.

Mechanisms to understand and value the scholarship of teaching and service (Appendix C) need to be developed to complement the scholarship of research with which faculty are already familiar. Rewards for faculty participation in the service activities deemed important by the institution – recruitment, K-12 outreach, and service on important committees at the university – need to be more clearly articulated at all levels within the promotion and tenure process.

Attrition of assistant professors who were recruited to NMSU during the five-years between 1996-2000 is shown in the table below. ADVANCE analyzed institutional data for the five cohorts of assistant professors who started work at NMSU in each of the five years to determine what percentage left NMSU prior to receiving promotion and tenure. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) includes 19 NMSU departments (14 of which have doctoral programs): College of Agriculture and Home Economics: AGHT, ANRS, EPPWS, FCS, FWS; College of Arts and Sciences: ASTRO, BIO, CHEM, CS, GEOL, MATH, PHYS; and all of the departments in the College of Engineering. Non-STEM includes all of the other academic departments at NMSU.

Faculty Attrition from NMSU: Assistant Professor Cohorts 1996-2000

	STEM			Non-STEM		
	Recruited	Left	Percent Left	Recruited	Left	Percent Left
Females	10	1	10.0%	45	21	46.7%
Males	39	9	23.1%	44	17	38.6%
Total	49	10	20.4%	89	38	42.7%

Clearly, retention of faculty, especially in the non-STEM fields, needs to be addressed. Faculty who left the institution had many reasons for doing so, but the Taskforce recommendations in this report should provide a basic foundation of change that will remedy this situation.

Appendix B: Roles of a Faculty Member

This is not meant to be a definitive list but is representative of the demands on faculty at NMSU.

Teaching undergraduate classes on campus
Teaching graduate classes on campus
Teaching undergraduate classes off campus (distance education courses) or at satellites
Teaching graduate classes off campus (distance education courses)
Teaching professional development non-credit courses
Teaching workshops/seminars
Development of class materials, web-based and traditional
Grading homework/class work
Meetings with students/office hours
Advising thesis and/or dissertation students
Advising non-thesis M.A./M.S. students
Membership on graduate committees
Screening graduate student and graduate assistant applications
Mentoring graduate students
Participation in McNair and other programs involving mentoring undergraduate students
Mentoring Undergraduate Students
Assisting students with scholarship applications
Recruiting graduate and undergraduate students
Attending department-related and student-related social activities
Grade appeals
Academic Misconduct Procedures
Writing letters of reference for students
Required attendance at graduation
Managing/mentoring teaching assistants

Conducting research
Conducting creative activities
Writing research/fund-raising/creative activity proposals
Presentations at conferences
Writing articles/manuscripts/books/technical reports
Member of large grant initiatives, (e.g. NSF)
        Proposal writing
        Steering Committees
Managing grants and contracts

Service on department/college/university committees
- Various subcommittees, social functions, regular meetings to attend, etc
- Development activities
- Outcomes assessment/accreditation activities
- Serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization
- Performing administrative tasks
- Mentoring junior faculty
- Member of Search Committee
  - Large amounts of time going through files
  - Hosting candidates (receptions, meals, etc.)
- Entertaining guest speakers; attending colloquiums
- Development and/or maintenance of departmental web pages
- Attending regular faculty meetings

Service on editorial/review boards
Service to professional societies/organizations
Chairing sessions at technical conferences
Organizing professional and technical meetings
Reviewing Research Proposals for NSF, NIH, AFOSR, NRL, etc
Service to the agricultural community with respect to:
- Diagnosing and suggesting solutions to agricultural problems
- Meeting with commodity groups
- Designing research and other programs to solve local/regional problems

Service to the environmental community with respect to:
- Diagnosing and suggesting solutions to environmental problems
- Meeting with environmental groups
- Designing research and other programs to solve local/regional problems

General correspondence
Consulting
Assisting with economic development
Outreach to K-12
- Speaking to classes in various schools
- Attending meetings with teachers, etc

Writing evaluations of tenure files for departments at other universities.
Establishment of links and collaboration with private industry and government agencies with respect to:
- Jobs for graduates
- Internships, coops, and other experience for students
- Solicitation of monies
- Research opportunities

Establishment of collaboration with other institutions
Agriculture science center collaboration
Extension service collaboration
Community outreach through extension service, such as 4H

Appendix C: Redefining Scholarship
_____

Problem:

Many faculty believe that work currently required of them is neither acknowledged nor appropriately rewarded under the traditional categories of teaching, research, and service. In addition, faculty also find that their scholarly efforts do not readily fit within these traditional categories. We now have viable alternative models, patterned on Ernest Boyer's categories of scholarship, which are being utilized at many other Universities.

Solution:

Each academic department should determine the extent to which they will reward each of these four functions of scholarship, according to the needs of that department, and incorporate that decision into the department's faculty evaluation criteria. As specific evidence for, and means to document scholarship, will vary by academic department and discipline, the following guidelines may be used as descriptive statements for departments in evaluating scholarship.

1. The "**scholarship of discovery**" corresponds to the traditional research function. Scholarly investigation is at the heart of academic life and is an essential component of faculty activity. The scholarship of discovery contributes new and original knowledge and enriches the intellectual climate of the university.

2. The "**scholarship of integration**" describes the work of scholars who make connections across disciplines, who seek to provide context for the results of research and discovery. This scholarly activity may include the interpretation of research results (one's own and those of others). The scholar may focus on questions of meaning (What do these research findings mean?) rather than the discovery of new knowledge.

3. In the "**scholarship of engagement (or application**)," the scholar seeks to apply knowledge in an effort to solve social problems or to engage with a community to work on issues of consequence. Not all campus or community "service" activities qualify as the scholarship of engagement. To be considered as such, the activities should arise from, draw upon and contribute back to the faculty member's disciplinary knowledge. Scholarship of engagement should also be a dynamic process in which new knowledge may be gained through the act of engagement or application.

4. The "**scholarship of teaching**" describes the process by which the faculty member passes on his/her knowledge. When defined as scholarship, teaching imparts real understanding and can serve to inspire future scholars. To participate in the scholarship of teaching, a faculty member must first gain knowledge through research and discovery, integration and interpretation, engagement and application. She/he must acquire and use dynamic and appropriate pedagogical methods to build bridges between teacher and student. The teacher must continue to learn as knowledge, technologies and students

change, the objective being to foster active learning and to encourage students to be critical thinkers and life-long learners.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

Character of scholarship

Scholarship develops and communicates new understanding and insights. Scholarship is characterized by the generation, synthesis, interpretation, critical analysis and communication of knowledge, methods, technologies, materials, insights, beauty, etc.

Audiences for scholarship

Audiences may be peers, undergraduate and graduate students, post-doctoral associates, clients, patrons, and other target audiences or "publics," who consume, use, or in other ways, participate in the activities of scholarship.

Means of communicating scholarship

Many different activities/products may be employed in the communication of scholarship: teaching materials and methods, classes, curricula, publications, exhibits, performances, patents, copyrights, distribution of materials or programs.

Criteria for validating scholarship

Scholarship may be validated according to some or all of the following criteria (as appropriate to the discipline and to the department):
originality, significance, accuracy, replicability, scope, applicability, breadth, depth, duration of influence, persistence of influence or use, adoption by peers, impact or public benefit, etc.

Means of documenting scholarship

The faculty member must present evidence that creative intellectual work has been validated by peers; that it has been communicated to peers and to broader audiences; that it has been recognized, accepted, cited, adopted or used by others. In other words, evidence should be provided to show that the scholarship made a difference.

**These ideas expressed are taken from *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate,* by Ernest L.Boyer (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990); pps. 16-25, and from several published and unpublished articles by Conrad J. Weiser.

Appendix D: Work-Life Balance Innovations

Women's slow movement through the ranks of academia has been the topic of much concern in recent years. Virginia Valian's widely-read book and programs like the National Science Foundation's ADVANCE: Institutional Transformation Program reflect the national interest in addressing the processes that hamstring women's participation in the professoriate. Here at NMSU, for example, in 19 science, technology, engineering and mathematics departments, among the 1995-1997 cohorts of new assistant professors, men's rate of attaining promotion and tenure was 72.4% while that for women was only 40.0%[1]. In addition, anecdotal evidence—including interviews at NMSU with women in college track positions—suggests that women are less likely than men to view the tenure track as a career worth the sacrifices to one's family life.

While Valian's work emphasizes the role played by gender schemas and the accumulation of disadvantage as a source of gender inequity in academia, other researchers are paying closer attention to the role of work-life balance issues as a source of women's disadvantage in academia. Women still remain responsible for a majority of childrearing, regardless of the job that they do and women are more likely than men to take on primary responsibility for eldercare. Indeed, eldercare issues are likely to become increasingly salient as the baby boom generation ages. As a result, many institutions have implemented various policies to enable greater flexibility of usually rigid promotion and tenure time-tables and work duties that enable faculty members—both men and women—to meet increased family obligations without compromising their careers.

Here I will briefly describe four such innovations.

(1) Half time tenure track
Drago (2000) describes this policy whereby faculty members with intense caregiving responsibilities can request to be placed on half-time status for a period of time.

(2) Modified duties
Some institutions are using the inherent flexibility of faculty roles to enable faculty to request a semester or two with modified duties. For example, a faculty member who has a distribution of teaching, research and service of 55/40/5 could request that this be modified to or 0/90/10 (or some other combination). The reduced teaching load would enable the faculty member to have the time flexibility (s)he may need for caregiving but the increased service obligation in this case could be an increase in administrative duties like the many tasks identified as important to the university, yet not valued (Appendix A).

(3) Tenure clock extension

---

[1] We have analyzed the data for the remaining departments but have not yet finalized reporting of those data.

A popular policy innovation makes it possible for faculty members to "stop the clock" or extend time to tenure. Typically this is a one-year extension, but the half-time tenure track policies described by Drago enable longer extensions.

(4) Paid maternity leave

The provisions of the FMLA provide for unpaid leave, which can be problematic. Furthermore, to "invoke" FMLA at NMSU requires that a department head approve the leave. NMSU's policy manual makes it unclear how faculty can use the FMLA to take leave. A number of institutions, such as the University of Michigan, have implemented a policy where maternity leave can be paid leave with a faculty member's teaching responsibilities paid for from the college or central administration. At the University of Michigan, a school with more faculty than NMSU, there are an average of only 7 births per year, which means that such a policy is not inordinately expensive to implement.

Many institutions are working with a combination of the above policies to address gender inequity in promotion and tenure. We recommend that similar policies be drafted for NMSU and placed in section 5 of the NMSU policy manual. Further, faculty and department heads need to be made aware of these policies. In addition, promotion and tenure committees need to be aware of the implications for a faculty member's packet of these policies. That is, if a faculty member is on a partial line (there are at least two currently at NMSU) then the packet needs to be evaluated within the context of that reduced time. If a faculty member chooses to "stop the clock," promotion and tenure committees need to avoid increasing expectations for a faculty member who had an "extra year."

References

Drago, R. and J. Williams. (2000). A half-time tenure track proposal. *Change (32)* 6, 46-51.

Quinn, K. (2004). Family work policies and practices: The UW [Washington] experience, paper presented at the NSF ADVANCE Conference, Atlanta, GA, April 20, 2004.

Valian, V. V. (1998). *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Waltman, J. (2004). Balancing family and academic work., paper presented at the NSF ADVANCE Conference in Atlanta, GA, April 20, 2004.

Participants in Completion of this Report

Donna Alden
Larry Creider
Greg Fant
Lisa Frehill
Carmen Gonzales
Maria Gonzalez
Tara Gray
Peter Gregware
Chuck Kozel
Laura Madson
Molly Molloy
Delphi Mondragon
Michael Morehead
Jim Peach
Cecilia Pino
Mary Prentice
Linda Riley
Roberta Rios
Pookie Sautter
William Taggart
Mark Workman
Walter Zakahi