Report
of the
Faculty Development Domain Subcommittee
to the
University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP)

University of Kentucky

March 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted by:

Heidi Anderson, Co-Chair (Associate Provost, Faculty Affairs)
Arthur Cammers (Chemistry)
Jim Clark (Social Work)
Linda Dwoskin (Pharmacy)
Phil Harling, Chair (Associate Dean of Faculty, Arts and Sciences)
Darrell Jennings (Medicine)
John Obrycki (Agriculture)
Genia Toma (Martin School of Public Policy and Administration)
Bruce Walcott (Engineering)

Charge from the Provost

On October 4, 2006, Provost Subbaswamy charged the Faculty Development Domain Subcommittee of the University Committee on Academic Planning and Priorities (UCAPP) with the following tasks:

- to "conduct an environmental scan of best practices from appropriate institutions concerning future trends and priorities regarding the recruitment and retention" of an excellent faculty, with particular attention to be paid to resource support, professional development, and work-life issues of particular importance to faculty members.

- to identify and recommend best practices that will facilitate UK's diversity goals pertaining to faculty recruitment and retention.

- to "identify emerging creative incentives that encourage faculty productivity in all areas of scholarship," and recommend any changes in faculty reward and incentive policies needed to help achieve UK's goals and objectives."

- to "recommend faculty development leadership opportunities that will prepare future academic leaders for the university."

We have met roughly every other week of the academic calendar since receiving this charge. Our deliberations were guided by the recent *UK@Work* survey of faculty and by the benchmarking efforts of Bill Burke and Victoria Bhavsar of the Teaching and Academic Support Center (TASC), Kirsten Turner, Assistant Dean for Academic Planning and Analysis, College of Arts and Sciences, and Susan Carvalho, Associate Dean of College Affairs, College of Arts and Sciences. We are very grateful for their assistance, as well as that provided by Laura Koppes, Director of the UK Office of Work-Life, who skillfully guided us through the survey results.

Having completed our inquiries, we are pleased to make a number of recommendations under the following headings:

- o **resource support**
- o **professional development and work-life issues**
- o **the recruitment of a diverse faculty**
- o **shared governance and the cultivation of faculty leaders**

The purpose of this report is two-fold: (1) to make several specific policy recommendations, and (2) to begin a broader discussion about best practices in faculty development and how they might be implemented in ways that are well suited to UK's particular circumstances. This discussion needs to be ongoing, broadly inclusive, and focused on achieving incremental but continuous improvements. Such improvements must benefit *all* UK faculty members, and they will surely follow if UK actively seeks out best practices and is prepared to make the strategic investments necessary to adopt them.

Summary of Recommendations

I. Resource Support

1. The enhancement of faculty salaries should remain a key institutional goal.

2. UK's research-support infrastructure should be streamlined and, where advisable, decentralized in ways that expedite faculty research.

3. The central administration should work closely with the colleges to enhance research support in ways that facilitate recruitment, retention, and satisfaction by signaling an institutional commitment to faculty research success.

4. The campus community should dedicate itself to providing more thoughtful, ongoing instructional support to faculty members.

II. Professional Development and Work-Life Issues

1. The University should take concrete steps to ensure that probationary faculty members in all units operate within an institutional framework that helps them to succeed.

- **All probationary faculty members should be afforded the opportunity to take advantage of an organized mentoring scheme.**

- **Raise campus awareness of the importance of mentoring, and develop and adopt faculty mentoring guidelines that can be used to assist department chairs and mentors in their role.**

- **Make mandatory written tenure and promotion guidelines in every primary-appointment unit on campus.**

- **Implement promotion and tenure workshops for faculty, department chairs, deans, and advisory committee members.**

2. The University should take concrete steps to ensure that tenured associate professors in all units operate within an institutional framework that facilitates their promotion on a timely basis.

- **Take appropriate steps to see that the heaviest administrative and service labor is carried out by full rather than associate professors.**

- **Develop creative ways of facilitating the research programs of newly-minted associate professors.**

3. The University should recognize and reward outstanding veteran faculty members who have chosen to stay at UK.

4. The University should develop programs to foster creativity among the senior faculty.

5. The University should adopt policies that help faculty members balance the often competing demands of work and personal/family responsibilities.

- **a Modified Duties/parental leave policy attendant to childbirth or adoption**

- **a flexible tenure clock attendant to childbirth or adoption**

III. *Recruiting a Diverse Faculty*

1. The University should make a more concerted effort to ensure that departments and colleges give proper weight to the value of diversity in assessing the relative merits of candidates for faculty positions at every point in the search process.

2. The University should help to equip colleges and departments with the knowledge that will assist them in securing a diverse pool of qualified candidates.

IV. *Shared Governance and the Cultivation of Faculty Leaders*

1. Create a permanent advisory structure at Provost level in which there is broad faculty participation.

2. Ensure that deans operate in partnership with permanent standing committees that advise on a similarly broad range of issues at college level.

3. See to it that administrators regularly communicate and meet with their faculty constituents.

4. Provide ample training opportunities for the rising generation of campus leaders.

- **Create an internal administrative fellowship**

- **Enhance leadership-development opportunities for women faculty members**

- **Provide new department chairs with proper training**

I. Resource Support

1. *The enhancement of faculty salaries should remain a key institutional goal.*

The *UK@Work* survey makes it clear that the administration is quite right to focus on the enhancement of faculty salaries as an issue of salient importance in the recruitment and retention of a world-class faculty. We applaud the administration for its honesty and openness in pointing to statistical evidence that shows that, compared to their counterparts at our benchmarks, UK faculty members are under-compensated. (In 2004, faculty salaries at UK were 87 percent of the benchmark median). Thus it comes as no surprise that most UK faculty members *feel* under-compensated, and that this is likely one of the main reasons why a good many of them are testing the academic job market or seriously considering doing so. Almost 41 percent of faculty respondents strongly disagreed, and an additional 26 percent disagreed with the statement that "I feel I am fairly compensated in relation to colleagues of similar rank and experience at benchmark institutions." Since two-thirds of those surveyed feel they are under-compensated relative to benchmarks, it is perhaps small wonder that ten percent state they are currently engaged in an active search for a new position, that another 20 percent indicate that they "have thought about it frequently and have begun to explore possibilities," and that yet another 18 percent have "thought about it frequently but have not taken action." The much-publicized challenge that relatively low faculty pay poses to faculty retention at UK is clearly a real one. Improving faculty pay is a well-established goal of the current UK administration, and it is quite clearly a proper one. Since it *is* such a well-established goal, we need not belabor it here.

2. *UK's research-support infrastructure should be streamlined and, where advisable, decentralized in ways that expedite faculty research.*

Research is an integral part of faculty life at the University of Kentucky. Top 20 status will be achieved only if UK faculty are successful and productive researchers. Research is a broadly defined activity, reaching from the solitary efforts of a scholar interpreting primary sources in a distant archive to the efforts of a large team of scientists working in a biomedical laboratory. In an "engaged university" it extends to the collaborative investigations of researchers and community members working together to solve social problems. Challenging as it is to generalize about such a broad and varied activity, our discussions lead us to suggest several premises that should inform any discussion of faculty-as-researchers.

- Research activities will ultimately be defined, operationalized, and implemented by persons working in particular disciplines who are employing methodologies specific to their purposes.

- Faculty will perform more productively if they are provided with effective incentives to build and sustain their research programs; they will under-perform if they face multiple disincentives.

- Research services that are centralized in an office or department can increase efficiencies in certain areas of common need. However, centralized services cannot be tailored for all disciplines and their particular research activities, and are often perceived as obstacles and disincentives by faculty.

Committee members agree that researchers face many internal pressures and obstacles as they pursue research. One member discussed significant delays in opening project accounts that compromised the federal sponsor's timeline. Another described rigid directives from the Office of Sponsored Projects Administration (OSPA) that resulted in punishments (lost income) as his department was charged for expenses disallowed by OSPA but that could have been covered by the sponsor. Committee members agreed that they often felt disconnected from research-management decisions, and that faculty researchers frequently felt stymied by regulatory constraints, bureaucratic inflexibility, and perceived arbitrariness. Committee members aim this critique at what they perceive to be a system urgently in need of reform, not at the hard-working personnel who administer it. However, there is a consensus that major design changes in the research infrastructure are needed to enhance faculty morale and productivity. What should these changes look like? Because research is so heterogeneous at UK, and because different faculty members have distinct views about improving morale and research productivity, we recommend a process for undertaking reform, rather than a specific set of reforms.

In the past, faculty have been surveyed and gathered into focus groups to assess UK's research infrastructure. However, there has been almost no sense that data collected through such Quality Assessment/Quality Improvement processes have truly influenced the structures, policies, and behaviors of UK's centralized research offices. We recommend that the Provost's Office lead a new effort to discover what the faculty need and desire to help them become more satisfied and productive, and to follow through on its findings and provide a more efficient administrative infrastructure and a stronger network of research incentives. We believe that the faculty will affirm that certain functions currently carried out centrally should probably be maintained, but it is very probable that there will be many who recommend more local, "close to the action" approaches to service design and delivery. We also anticipate that innovative and powerful approaches will be elicited by the faculty through a well-designed Quality Assessment/Quality Improvement evaluation process, one that might first be tested on a pilot basis. It will be critical to ensure that any such process be thoughtfully crafted, faculty-centered, transparent, and ultimately lead to meaningful reforms. If reform cannot be assured at the outset, then such an assessment should probably not be attempted, as the perception of another failed effort would deepen faculty dissatisfaction.

The virtue of seeking faculty guidance has been borne out in the current design of the Center for Clinical and Translational Science (CCTS). We note that Dr. William Balke and his team have successfully engaged a broad group of faculty to assist in their design efforts. The Center's success demonstrates the power of harnessing faculty ideas to enhance participation and catalyze research productivity. While it might be difficult to imagine similarly intensive faculty involvement in the examination and design of research structures across all colleges and departments, we should not assume this is impossible to achieve. Indeed, it is an experiment that is well worth trying even on quite a broad scale.

3. *The central administration should work closely with the colleges to enhance research support in ways that facilitate recruitment, retention, and satisfaction by signaling an institutional commitment to faculty research success.*

One reason that we believe a more decentralized research infrastructure will incentivize research faculty is the broadly perceived desirability of powerful internal funding streams for faculty. These initiatives return "indirects" to the local academic units and to specific faculty members to spend as they judge most effective. They are the seeding ground for innovation, creativity, and intellectual freedom. Moreover, the results of the *UK@Work* survey suggest that faculty satisfaction is likely to increase not only if salaries are made more competitive, but also if significant additional recurring investment is devoted to broadening internal funding for

scholarship and creative activities, not simply through the return of "indirects" but through other means, as well. Fifty-seven percent of faculty respondents concluded that there is currently "too little" of such internal funding. Where and how internal research support might best be enhanced are complicated questions, but ones that are well worth exploring not only with a view to enhancing research productivity, but also to enhancing recruitment and retention efforts and faculty members' satisfaction on the job. Even fairly modest additional recurring investments in research support can send a forceful signal to prospective and current faculty members that the institution is committed to fostering an environment that promotes faculty success. While enhanced research support is no substitute for better salaries, it purchases considerable good will among prospective, probationary, and tenured faculty members. We thus encourage the central administration to work closely with the colleges to make sure that UK's research incentives are competitive across the board – by inventorying and advertising best practices (some of which will be highly college-specific, but others more broadly adaptable), by pinpointing areas where even modest additional investments might give us a competitive advantage, and by pooling costs where appropriate.

4. ***The campus community should dedicate itself to providing more thoughtful, ongoing instructional support to faculty members.***

The UCAPP Undergraduate Subcommittee will presumably have much to say on the subject of instructional support. But we would be remiss if we did not mention it here, as it is a critically important dimension of faculty development, and one that tends to be taken for granted on this as on other research university campuses. What the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences' Task Force on Teaching and Career Development recently had to say about themselves and their colleagues equally applies to us: "We do not enmesh in our daily discourse among faculty and graduate students – nor in our institutional rewards and civic culture – the idea that teaching, like research, can be continually improving in exciting ways."[1] Teaching is the one thing that most UK faculty have in common, but, like their colleagues at similar institutions, it is something that they tend to talk about rather little. When they do talk about it, the conversation tends to focus on curricular requirements, not on what constitutes teaching excellence, and how this might be promoted.

With the launching of a Top Twenty Business Plan that will largely be funded by the tuition revenue generated by a substantially larger undergraduate student body, it is clearly the right time to foster at UK a climate of continuous reflection on teaching. A good way to start is to think about how a number of the Harvard task force's very sensible recommendations[2] might best be implemented here at UK:

- "[F]aculty should routinely share course materials and discuss the goals, methods, and effectiveness of instruction." Here we would add that a more holistic approach to instructional assessment – one that relies less on end-of-semester student evaluations, and more on classroom observation, the examination of course materials, etc. – will encourage faculty members to think of instruction as a shared responsibility and not one that they must (or even should) shoulder strictly on their own.

---

[1] *A Compact to Enhance Teaching and Learning at Harvard, proposed by the Task Force on Teaching and Career Development to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University*, January 2007. See http://www.fas.harvard.edu/home/news_and_events/releases/taskforce_01242007.pdf

[2] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

- Campus administrators should sponsor workshops, colloquia, and summer institutes "to develop and share pedagogical models and further collegial consideration of ways to design and enrich courses and improve major types of teaching and advising."

- Significant funds should be allocated to the promotion of "course development, pedagogical experimentation, and other contributions to the enrichment of student learning."

- Orientation of new faculty should include a weighty instructional component.

- Departments "should take a *developmental approach* to teaching by junior faculty," one that ensures they receive continuing instructional advice from senior mentors, and one that encourages *them* to share best practices and give advice to their senior mentors as well as to each other.

- "The training of PhD students should include a focus on pedagogy," including improved English language screening, clearly specified training requirements for all new instructors, and "opportunities for advanced pedagogical training."

How such goals might best be addressed at UK strikes us as an appropriate question for the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education to take up in conjunction with the Teaching and Academic Support Center (TASC), the Graduate School, and the new Chellgren Center for Undergraduate Excellence.

Finally, a culture of teaching excellence is, of course, one in which excellent teaching is properly recognized and rewarded. One might well ask whether the current structure and culture of American research universities, UK's included, adequately recognizes and rewards teaching excellence. We suspect it does not. While this is far too broad a problem to tackle in this brief report, it is one that merits a searching examination, and one that will require creative solutions.

II. Professional Development and Work-Life Issues

1. *The University should take concrete steps to ensure that probationary faculty members in all units operate within an institutional framework that helps them to succeed.*

Mentorship:
One approach to accomplishing this success is to establish mentoring programs. Robert Boice asserts that mentoring supports professional growth and renewal, which in turn empowers faculty as individuals and colleagues.[3] Boice further advocates that new faculty learn to utilize the *nihil nimus* (nothing in excess) approach to their development," which means "looking for simple, effective strategies that allow new faculty to work efficiently amid a seeming overload of demands for their time and energy."[4]

At a minimum, new faculty members are entitled to clear expectations for promotion and tenure, and to opportunities for organized mentoring. Mentoring programs are a useful way to help new faculty members adjust to their new environment. A mentor can offer a wealth of advice and

---

[3] Robert Boice, *The New Faculty Member: Supporting and Fostering Professional Development* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992).
[4] Robert Boice, *Advice for New Faculty Members: Nihil Nimus* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2000), p. 12.

assistance in a number of areas pertaining not only to a specific department, but to the broader culture (and institutional infrastructure) of a college and indeed of the campus as a whole. Mentoring relationships are an excellent way to enhance professional growth. Finally, mentoring helps to cultivate future academic leaders.

We recommend:

- **that all probationary faculty members be afforded the opportunity to take advantage of an organized mentoring scheme.** UK appears to be no different from most of its benchmarks in taking a hands-off approach to mentoring. There are plenty of departments on campus that have developed internal mentoring programs that seem to work well for probationary faculty (e.g. Psychology), as well as some programs that provide effective voluntary cohort mentoring (e.g. mentoring for women probationary faculty members through the Gender and Women's Studies Program). But anecdotal evidence suggests that there are plenty of units on campus in which a probationary faculty member who feels that s/he would profit from an organized mentoring scheme would not be able to find one. We feel there is a significant role for the UK central administration to play in rectifying this problem. Some research-intensive universities have developed mentoring schemes that are administered at the provost level. The University of California, San Diego goes so far as to mandate mentorship, obliging departments to assign mentors to incoming probationary faculty members even before they arrive on campus:

    (see http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/faculty/programs/fmp/default.htm).

    At Arizona State University, mentorship is also centrally administered, but it is optional, with mentors assigned from a different department by a steering committee of senior faculty members:

    (see http://www.asu.edu/facultydevelopment/).

    The mentoring program at the University of Illinois, Chicago was started to improve faculty morale, and evolved into a centralized program administered through the Office of the Provost:

    (see http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/newfac/facment.html).

    Elsewhere, there are centrally-administered mentoring programs that are designed for specific cohorts of faculty members, such as the well-established Women Faculty Mentoring Program at the University of Wisconsin, Madison,

    (see http://www.provost.wisc.edu/women/mentor.htm)

    and the model mentoring fellowship program for women and minorities in the sciences at Kansas State University, through which a select number of applicants are provided with seed money and a qualified senior mentor, with "graduation" from the program occurring when s/he is successful in obtaining substantial external funding.

    (see http://www.k-state.edu/provost/academic/mentor.htm).

    We cite these examples simply to indicate that there are several interesting models through which provost's offices are endeavoring to take a more systematic approach to mentorship on campus, rather than simply leaving it up to the whims of departments and/or colleges. We are not persuaded that a one-size-fits-all approach to mentoring is the best approach for UK, nor are we persuaded that formal mentoring must be required for all probationary faculty members. But we do feel that they should be encouraged to participate in some form of mentorship program, and that the provost should work with the deans to develop appropriate mentoring options and see that these are well-executed in practice.

We likewise recommend:

- **raising campus awareness of the importance of mentoring, and developing and adopting faculty mentoring guidelines that can be used to assist department chairs and mentors in their role.** A guidebook can help faculty members assess their mentoring needs and seek the assistance they may need in their professional development. It can also provide department chairs and mentors with a repertoire of mentoring strategies.

Tenure and Promotion Standards and Practices:
Probationary faculty members are most likely to succeed in an environment in which the measures of success are clearly articulated and understood. Thus we agree with the recent report, *Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation*, that clarity in standards for tenure evaluation and consistency in tenure decisions are of critical importance.[5] We recommend:

- **that the adoption of written tenure and promotion guidelines be made mandatory in every primary-appointment unit on campus.** This is the best way to demystify the tenure-and-promotion process at the outset of probationary faculty members' careers at UK. It will also help them to develop a suitably well-informed set of intermediate goals for research, teaching, and service.

- **that the University review the extant tenure-and-promotion orientations for faculty, department chairs, deans, and advisory-committee members, to determine how these might best be enhanced.** In addition to assisting faculty in preparing for the promotion/tenure process, workshops should be designed to encourage tenured evaluators to take a broadly uniform approach to the assessment of dossiers.

2. *The University should take concrete steps to ensure that tenured associate professors in all units operate within an institutional framework that facilitates their promotion on a timely basis.*
The most obvious mark of successful professional development at the rank of associate professor is timely promotion to the rank of full professor. We need to foster an environment at UK in which it is not only expected that associate professors will have been promoted to full professors within seven (or so) years of tenure, but one in which this is a reasonably attainable goal for all talented and hard-working tenured faculty members. The University has an obligation to do what it can to prevent associate professors from getting "stuck" indefinitely at this intermediate rank. Here are a few measures we encourage it to consider:

- **Take appropriate steps to see that the heaviest administrative and service labor is carried out by full rather than associate professors.** We need to think more creatively about how to help associate professors avoid the academic "service trap." The provost and the deans should champion the idea that particularly laborious departmental administrative positions, e.g. chair and director of graduate studies, are fit jobs for full professors, rather than associate professors who should properly be devoting most of their attention to getting promoted. The flipside of this is to challenge the assumption that full

---

[5] *Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators – A joint project of ACE, the AAUP, and United Educators Insurance Risk Prevention Group* (2000). Available in pdf format at: http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore.

professors are exempt from heavy service by dint of their seniority when and where this assumption is seen to have taken root.

- **Develop creative ways of facilitating the research programs of newly-minted associate professors.** Like most other research-intensive universities, UK has in place a range of programs designed to expedite the research progress of probationary faculty members, but scarcely any that are expressly designed to expedite the timely promotion of associate professors, a cohort who are generally left to shift almost entirely for themselves. We can think of several modest forms of recurring investment that would likely yield a significant institutional return in the form of timelier promotions: enhanced research support for new associate professors in conjunction with their first sabbatical; a Faculty Scholars program similar to the one in place at the University of Iowa, by which a select number of associate professors are granted multi-semester research assignments; one-course reductions (to be taken in the third post-tenure year or so) contingent on the submission of a research proposal that includes a timetable for promotion to professor; targeted bridge-funding schemes, and so on. We encourage the Provost's office to work with the deans to develop some pilot initiatives along these lines.

3. *The University should recognize and reward outstanding veteran faculty members who have chosen to stay at UK.*

Recent efforts by the Commonwealth and UK have focused on recruitment and recognition of faculty and administrators hired from outside the University. These efforts include the RCTF "Bucks for Brains" program and the "Look Who's Wearing Blue" campaign recognizing externally-grown faculty and administrators. At a time when institutional loyalty is eroding within the professoriate, we feel strongly that an aspiring top 20 university must find creative ways to grow, sustain, and *retain* outstanding faculty, administrators, and staff. The institutional value added by loyal, veteran faculty members is incalculable, but not always sufficiently acknowledged. We feel that if the suggestions contained in this document for young, beginning faculty are adopted, UK will become a preferred place to begin one's academic career. We also believe that there are policies available to help further nurture and sustain our faculty so that UK becomes a preferred place for advancing and ending one's career as well. We offer the following suggestions:

✓ RCTF-type funding to enhance long-term UK faculty researchers' programs.

✓ the encouragement of internal candidates for professorships, chairs, etc.

✓ the development of mid-career start-up packages (funding, reduced teaching) to reward long-term research excellence.

✓ staggered and cumulative sabbatical starting times (e.g., after the 6th year, after the 10th year, after the 14th year, after the 18th year, etc.) contingent on a rigorous process of review. The shorter the period between requested sabbaticals, the more scrutiny should be focused on past productivity.

✓ a "Look Who's Still Wearing Blue" campaign that recognizes the best and brightest faculty and administrators who have served a minimum of 15 years of service at UK.

We encourage the deans and the provost to contribute and pilot their own initiatives for such faculty.

4. *The University should develop programs to foster creativity among the senior faculty.*

In addition to optimizing the institutional conditions for successful promotion, the committee believes it is important to develop programs to stimulate creativity in more senior faculty. The committee viewpoint is one of a continuum of faculty development from the point of hire, through the tenure process, continuing through to post-retirement appointments. Senior faculty are invaluable members of the university community, but in many cases they become intellectually "tired" of teaching the same courses, conducting yearly outreach activities, or making incremental steps in a research program. Many senior faculty members would benefit from the sort of institutional flexibility that would give them the opportunity to re-energize their batteries, and subsequently to enhance their contributions to the university. Examples of the types of programs that go beyond the more traditional sabbaticals might include:

- ✓ A two-year University sponsored mentorship position for senior faculty so they can become actively engaged in the professional development of new faculty.

- ✓ Greater flexibility in descriptions of position responsibilities to facilitate the movement of senior faculty into new areas of research and teaching.

- ✓ The creation of a University Professor designation at UK, which would represent a promotional step beyond Full Professor.

- ✓ Programs that might specifically target senior faculty -- to provide mechanisms to stimulate their creativity.

- ✓ A comprehensive program to involve post-retirement faculty in the University. Many of these individuals wish to continue to contribute to UK and have much to offer. Creative programs need to be in place to allow these individuals to contribute to teaching, engagement, mentoring, administration and research.

- ✓ Programs that allow senior faculty to take on special administrative assignments within colleges and upper administration. Some faculty will wish to pursue such opportunities, and this would provide some leadership development for them.

5. *The University should adopt policies that help faculty members balance the often competing demands of work and personal/family responsibilities.*

The pressure of balancing work and personal responsibilities has become a truism of contemporary professional life. The results of the *UK@Work* survey suggest that UK faculty members are by no means immune to this pressure. Respondents report a high level of stress on the job, and in managing the challenges of balancing work and personal/family duties. Nearly half of all respondents feel that "too much time is required of my faculty position" (25 percent agree, and 23 percent strongly agree). Some 47 percent feel that "the stress I feel balancing work and personal/family responsibilities affects my health" (28 percent agree, 19 percent strongly agree). Some 61 percent of respondents "frequently feel physically or emotionally drained at the end of the work day" (35 percent agree, 26 percent strongly agree). Of course, faculty work *should* be demanding, and in a line of employment in which the separation between "work" and "life" is never very clear, balancing the two of them is bound to seem difficult from time to time. Still, we think it is significant that less than a third of respondents agree or strongly agree that "the University's policies are supportive of my personal/family responsibilities." There is likely a good deal more the University might do to signal to faculty members that it is interested in helping them succeed on the job by better accommodating the inevitable challenges that arise at

various points in the life cycle. Thus we welcome the news that the University has appointed a Childcare Committee to investigate how best to provide broader options for on-campus childcare to faculty members and staff alike. Such efforts should be complemented by the implementation of policies that help faculty members maintain their research programs while they navigate major changes in their life circumstances. It is for this reason that we propose the adoption of the following:

- *a Modified Duties/parental leave policy attendant to childbirth or adoption.*
      Two years ago, the College of Arts and Sciences was permitted to pilot a so-called modified duties program that is closely based on one that was established a decade ago at the University of Michigan **(see appendix 1)**. Under its terms, a faculty member who becomes a parent is entitled, upon request, to a period of modified duties, without a reduction in salary. This period is designed to permit the faculty member a period of adjustment to the parenting needs of a newly born or adopted child. Modified duties provide relief from direct teaching responsibilities for an academic semester. The faculty member is expected to fulfill her or his other responsibilities and to maintain research activity, and cannot be employed by another institution during the period of modified duties. This policy is considerably more generous and inclusive than the one that Arts and Sciences had previously administered as an approved variation on the University's maternity leave policy, which permitted a one-course reduction to mothers only in the semester of (or after) the birth or adoption of a child. While this variation worked much better for teaching faculty on nine-month appointments than did the standard six weeks of paid leave under the provisions for sick leave, it nevertheless had very significant drawbacks. In most cases, the expectant/new mother remained responsible for a course during the semester in question. What this meant in practice was that the woman faculty member ended up being obliged to ask colleagues to fill in for her for several weeks around the birth of her child, creating a situation in which the mother was made to feel guilty for thus imposing on her colleagues, in which it became more difficult for her to focus single-mindedly on bonding with her child in the first weeks of infancy, in which her colleagues were obliged to undertake additional work for no extra pay, and in which the quality of the course for which the faculty member in question remained responsible inevitably suffered, despite the good will and best efforts of all involved.

      The modified-duties pilot policy avoids all these problems, is also available to male faculty members and thus facilitates their role as parental caregivers, and is praised by the Arts and Sciences faculty as an enlightened policy that has made it significantly easier for new parents to sustain their research programs. Thus far, sixteen faculty members have applied for and been granted a period of Modified Duties under the program. Women account for a disproportionate number of the applicants, and untenured women account for a disproportionate number of the female applicants. They and their male colleagues express enthusiasm and appreciation for a policy that eases this exciting but challenging change in their circumstances.

      We recommend that the central administration adopt modified duties as a campus-wide policy. The virtues of doing so are many. It would enhance research productivity, and particularly the research productivity of probationary faculty members and recently-promoted associate professors. By adopting a very progressive policy, it would take UK from the middle to the head of the pack on this work-life issue of fundamental importance to a great many faculty members. It would provide a recruiting tool that is likely to be particularly appealing to women candidates for faculty positions, and thus would provide at least some modest support to UK's effort to achieve greater gender parity. It would provide a highly useful and popular benefit to faculty members at minimal cost. The experience in Arts and Sciences suggests that the instructional costs associated with Modified Duties are quite manageable, and of course would be much more so if they were pooled centrally. We can think of no obvious drawbacks to Modified

Duties, see many virtues in it, and urge the central administration to waste no time in considering it for campus-wide adoption. We likewise recommend that it quickly consider adopting the logical corollary to Modified Duties, i.e. a *flexible tenure clock attendant to childbirth or adoption*.

The large majority of research-extensive universities now offer a formal tenure-clock extension policy attendant to birth or adoption. UK does not, and yet providing competitive benefits is crucial to our efforts to recruit and retain a world-class faculty. It is for this reason that we endorse a tenure-clock extension proposal drafted by the Committee on Women Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, which is based on a policy that was implemented at Princeton University in the summer of 2005 **(see appendix 2)**. Under the terms of this policy,

> a probationary regular or special title series faculty member who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption will automatically be granted a one-year extension of term by the dean of the respective college, upon notification by the professor's department. The professor's service will be extended by one year for each child, including twins and other multiple births or adoptions for up to four births and/or adoptions. Tenure-clock extensions are available to … probationary faculty upon their official start date and up until September fifteenth in the year in which their tenure review is scheduled to occur.

What is notable about Princeton's policy is that the tenure clock is automatically extended upon the birth or adoption of a child – faculty members may opt out of this provision, but it is granted to them as a matter of course, rather than by request. This is an important distinction, as research indicates that most faculty members do not take advantage of request-only tenure-clock extension policies for fear that the additional time will be held against them during their tenure review. Take-up rates are particularly low among women probationary faculty members in disciplines in which they have been historically under-represented. Thus, as the draft proposal notes, "Princeton concluded that to make the policy as effective and universal as possible it must be granted automatically."

We are persuaded by the logic of this argument, and urge the central administration to act quickly to frame an automatic tenure-extension policy attendant to childbirth. As the draft proposal points out, were such a policy to be approved, UK "would move from being one of the least competitive to one of the most competitive Research I institutions" in the provision of what is increasingly seen as a very beneficial faculty entitlement. As a very low-cost entitlement that will enhance our faculty recruitment efforts, promote faculty morale, and lead to stronger tenure and promotion dossiers, we feel there is much to be gained from such a policy, and nothing to be lost.

III. Recruiting a Diverse Faculty

In response to the current Strategic Plan's challenge to "embrace and nurture diversity," we feel that:

1. *the University should make a more concerted effort to ensure that departments and colleges give proper weight to the value of diversity in assessing the relative merits of candidates for faculty positions at every point in the search process.*

We venture to guess that UK is at least a decade behind most if not all of its benchmarks in systematizing the faculty search process in ways that help to ensure that search committees factor

the value of diversity into each level of candidate review. At benchmark and aspiration institutions, this is typically undertaken through a centralized vetting process that is structured along the following lines. First, lists of proposed search committee members are vetted to ensure that (if circumstances render this feasible) they include women and/or minority faculty members, since diversity within the search committee sends an important signal to candidates that diversity is valued and represented in the department in question. Secondly, when chairs of search committees are ready to seek authorization for the campus visits of finalists, they are usually required to submit detailed narratives that explain the methods used to screen applicants for on-site interviews. Search committee chairs are asked to describe the issues that influenced the committee's decision to invite three (or so) of these candidates for on-campus interviews, and to be sure to include the issue of diversity among those issues. If the proposed short list includes women and/or minorities, it is usually approved without a conversation. If it does not, this triggers a conversation, and if the hiring officer does not find the explanation compelling, she or he may well elect to revise the search committee's proposed short list in order to ensure that qualified women and minorities are included in it. At the conclusion of the campus interviews, this vetting process is repeated before an offer is authorized.

We feel strongly that some such vetting mechanism is long overdue at UK. *Where* the vetting authority should reside is a more complicated question, however, and one that we counsel the central administration to handle with care. A number of subcommittee members felt that the authority to overturn the stated hiring preferences of a department in the interests of diversity should not be entrusted to a central agency (such as a Diversity Office, for instance), as this would rest final authority in the hands of central administrators who would lack the expert knowledge necessary to make properly informed judgments about the relative strength of candidates' qualifications in highly specialized academic fields. According to this logic, it is far better to entrust this potentially controversial authority to the college deans, who possess considerably more local knowledge and would thus be better positioned to weigh diversity as but one important factor among others that should properly be taken into account in faculty hiring decisions. While all subcommittee members see the virtues of college autonomy in faculty hiring decisions, however, some expressed concern that too much deference to autonomy would lead to fitful and uneven progress in the quest for greater faculty diversity. Some deans would value diversity more than others, and in the absence of strong central oversight, diversity gains in some colleges might well be offset by stagnation or erosion in others.

In the end, then, the subcommittee has not reached consensus on *who* should serve as the ultimate arbiter of diversity in hiring decisions. But we are in agreement that a strong vetting mechanism along the lines described above should *at the very least* be adopted across all of UK's colleges, and that the central administration should hold deans accountable for building a more diverse faculty while helping them to collect the applicant information necessary to take the measure of diversity within a given pool of applicants. There is clearly an important role for the new office of Vice President for Diversity to play in this process. Precisely what that role should be we properly leave for others to decide.

2. *The University should help to equip colleges and departments with the knowledge that will assist them in securing a diverse pool of qualified candidates.*
Search committees realize that it is usually not enough to wait for qualified minority candidates or qualified women candidates in under-represented areas to apply for an advertised position. They need to *look for* such candidates, craft the advertisement so as to make them more likely to apply, establish contact with them at an early point in the search, and so on. But good intentions cannot compensate for lack of knowledge, and search-committee chairs cannot be expected to have a strong intuitive sense of what is necessary to find qualified minority

candidates and to encourage them to apply. College dean's offices would benefit no less from expert guidance in such matters. We hope that the creation of the office of Vice President for Diversity will make such guidance more readily available than it currently is on campus.

It will be crucial for this new office to provide the analytical support to deans and faculty to improve the recruitment and retention process. For example, pools of qualified, diverse candidates for some disciplines and professions are difficult to identify and attract because of unfavorable doctoral graduation trends. Socioeconomic and demographic factors also affect decisions to enter academia in general (as opposed to other sectors such as industry or business) and selection of profession or discipline in particular. A successful approach to minority recruitment will acknowledge and take imaginative steps to address such complexities. Sophisticated analysis, strategic planning, and creativity (rather than punitive sanctions) will help search committee members do their jobs effectively. The Office of Vice President for Diversity will also face the broad challenge of helping Central Kentucky mobilize to become a more attractive place for prospective minority faculty members.

IV. *Shared Governance and the Cultivation of Faculty Leaders*

The results of the recent *UK@Work* survey indicate that the cultivation of trust and a stronger habit of shared governance need to be treated as vitally important faculty-development goals at this moment in UK's history. A number of the recommendations we make here focus on policy reforms that would rely on a more activist central administration. But central activism will likely generate little more than resentment and red tape if it is not accompanied by measures that help to engender a greater sense of common mission, common ownership, and collective endeavor among the UK faculty. Survey results make clear that they need to feel better understood and more systematically consulted by the University's leaders. Faculty respondents assigned UK leadership noticeably high negatives on issues of responsiveness and trust. Only 21 percent of faculty respondents agreed that "the senior leadership understands faculty's concerns," while some 33 percent disagreed and some 20 percent strongly disagreed with this statement. Only 10 percent agreed with the notion that "there is a high degree of trust within the University," while 38 percent disagreed with this notion and over 20 percent strongly disagreed with it. That faculty members often suspect the motives of presidents, provosts, and deans is one of the most obvious truisms of academic life. Still, negative opinion on these "trust" factors seems quite high on campus at the moment, and is thus cause for concern. We feel there is a broad perception among rank-and-file faculty that higher administrative levels and bureaucratic processes and mindsets are more of a hindrance than an aid to their success and to their sense of fulfillment on the job. This is of course a common attitude at large research universities, but it seems to be an especially broad and deep one at this particular moment in UK's history. Now is the time to acknowledge this problem and to seek solutions to it. How might we set about creating a more open campus culture, one that engenders trust, encourages good ideas, shares best practices, stimulates dynamic and responsive leadership at *all* levels, and generates a spirit of common endeavor while at the same time nurturing a robust federalism?

Here are a few ideas that we think merit serious consideration:

1. *Create a permanent advisory structure at Provost level in which there is broad faculty participation.*
Broad faculty consultation needs to become business as usual at UK in a way that it never has been in the past. The UCAPP and its subcommittees are still in their early days, so there remains considerable uncertainty as to how they might be used. But we are heartened by Provost

Subbaswamy's stated desire to see a set of standing committees evolve out of the UCAPP structure, as this would create an institutional channel through which faculty members might regularly advise the Provost on a broad range of issues, *including* issues that have significant budgetary implications. Such advisory committees would need to include a broad assortment of administrators, but regular faculty members ought to predominate, and strenuous efforts would need to be made to ensure that the committees never become top-heavy.

2. *Ensure that deans operate in partnership with permanent standing committees that advise on a similarly broad range of issues at college level.*
Ideally, these should be elected committees that are broadly representative of the various divisions housed within the college in question, with its members serving multi-year terms. Experience indicates that such committees help deans to stay better in touch with the concerns of regular faculty members, that they play a major role in shaping policy decisions, and that they facilitate faculty "buy-in" by ensuring that elected representatives play a prominent role in the college decision-making process.

3. *See to it that administrators regularly communicate and meet with their faculty constituents.*
Regular communication builds trust, just as regular consultation does. Thus the President and the Provost should be encouraged to sustain their recent efforts to keep faculty members well-informed about important campus initiatives. Provost Subbaswamy should be encouraged to visit each of the colleges every year, as he did in this, his inaugural year. Deans should be encouraged to share and to act on best practices for meeting and communicating regularly with college faculty (by sending out beginning-of-semester messages, for instance, and attending faculty meetings of each department each year, and delivering an annual state-of-the-college address, etc). "Management by walking around" is time-consuming, but it is also trust-building, and thus time well spent.

4. *Provide ample training opportunities for the rising generation of campus leaders.*
We feel this is a good time to take a more thoughtful and deliberate approach to the cultivation of administrative leadership on campus. As Harvard University's Linda Hill puts it, "the development of leadership talent throughout institutions of higher education is fast becoming a strategic imperative. Yet most institutions have never analyzed their organization's leadership supply and demand."[6] Since leadership development in higher education is a critical concern for the future of our institutions, we must furnish career-development opportunities to prepare promising faculty for campus leadership.

Several ideas occurred to us here:

- *Create an internal administrative fellowship program – a campus version of the American Council of Education fellowship.* The ACE Fellow program is designed for an individual to spend an extended period of time on another campus working with leaders. A similar program could be scaled down to the campus level to allow UK faculty to spend some time shadowing campus leaders to learn more about their roles and responsibilities. Such a program could also enable fellows to take on special assignments under the direction of a senior leader, and to become familiar with higher education decision-making, policies, and processes. The key to the success of these types of

---

[6] Linda Hill, *Leadership Development: A Strategic Imperative for Higher Education*, p. 1. http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/FFP0506S.pdf.

programs is to condense years of experience into a limited timeframe using an immersion strategy.[7]

- *Enhance leadership-development opportunities for women faculty members.* One sensible approach here is gradually to broaden the scope of UK's Circles of Power program. The program is administered by the President's Commission on Women and was initially established in 1998 for women faculty of the Medical Center. In 2002, the scope of the program was enhanced to include all women faculty at UK. Circles of Power is an eight-month, three-phase program designed to develop the leadership skills of women faculty. Participation is selective and currently limited to 20 women per year. In addition, UK should sponsor faculty members' participation in Higher Education Resources Services (HERS) institutes, which offer professional development programs for women in mid- and senior-level positions in higher-education administration. The programs are offered in month-long summer programs and in multiple weekend series during the academic year.   HERS institutes provide participants with opportunities to learn from senior women leaders and higher-education scholars. The curriculum prepares participants for institutional leadership roles with knowledge, skills and perspectives for achieving institutional priorities and maximizing institutional resources.[8]

- *Provide new department chairs with proper training.* An annual new chairs' orientation at the college level would seem a minimal requirement. It is also worth thinking about whether it might be worthwhile to establish a university-wide chairs' orientation. It is true that our academic units vary greatly in structure and function, but there may well be enough jobs that all chairs must do, and that their previous training has not really prepared them to do, to merit a *clearly focused* campus-wide orientation – e.g. what makes a good supervisor, how to manage a budget, how to manage work flow efficiently. Some of UK's benchmarks are beginning to develop fairly systematic approaches to the training of unit heads – the University of Arizona, for instance, through its HeadsUp program (http://utc.arizona.edu/headsup/), and the University of Minnesota, through its one-year leadership program to prepare new department chairs for their roles.[9] Moreover, the American Council on Education (ACE) offers workshops for department chairs that address budgeting, personnel management, resource management, conflict resolution and decision-making strategies. A series of programs such as these could be developed at UK.

* * * *

        In conclusion, we feel that now is the time for UK to take bold steps to promote the development of its faculty. It has been our privilege to suggest many such steps, and we exhort the campus leadership and the campus community to work together to see that they are carried out after due deliberation, but with all good speed.   We stand ready to assist in the implementation of these and any other recommendations that promote the well-being of UK's faculty.

---

[7] http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/Leadership/Leadership_ACE.htm

[8] https://hersnet.org/Institutes.asp

[9] http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/faculty/development.html

Appendix 1: *Pilot Policy on Modified Duties Attendant to Parental Leave for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Members*, UK College of Arts and Sciences

The policies described in this document apply to tenure-track and tenured faculty members of the College of Arts & Sciences who hold full-time appointments.

MODIFIED DUTIES

A faculty member who becomes a parent is entitled, upon request, to a period of modified duties, without a reduction in salary. This period is designed to permit the faculty member a period of adjustment to the parenting needs of a newly born or adopted child. Modified duties provide relief from direct teaching responsibilities for an academic semester. The faculty member is expected to fulfill his or her other responsibilities and to maintain research activity. The faculty member cannot be employed by another institution during the period of modified duties.

Terms/Eligibility: Modified duties are available to a member of the faculty (tenure-track or tenured) who becomes a parent and who has at least co-equal caregiving responsibilities for an infant or adopted child. The period of modified duties must be taken within 12 months of a child joining the family, whether by birth or adoption. Modified duties are available immediately upon employment in the College. If both parents are employed in the College at a rank eligible for this benefit, only one parent may take a period of modified duties for a particular child. A faculty member may take one term of modified duties for each child added to the family.

Procedure: A faculty member who wishes to take a period of modified duties should submit a written request to Associate Dean Harling, with a copy to the appropriate chair. The request should state the reason for a period of modified duties, the term for which modified duties is being requested, and the responsibilities the faculty member will continue to perform.

Funding: The College will provide the faculty member's department with reasonable resources to replace teaching that is lost through the granting of a term of modified duties.

This policy does not preclude the possibility, in circumstances involving a medically complicated pregnancy, of a faculty person on the advice of her physician requesting sick leave with pay for an extended period not to exceed six months. The University policy states:

> Sick leave may be granted to faculty by the Provost or Senior Vice President and Chancellor of the Medical Center. Eligible faculty who are totally disabled are entitled to six months' sick leave with pay after which the Long Term Disability Plan, for which the University pays the full cost, becomes operative. Sick leave with pay for more than six months requires approval by the Board of Trustees.

Sick leave is also requested of the dean through a faculty person's department chair.

12/3/04

Appendix 2. *Proposed Policy: Tenure-Clock Extension*
UK College of Arts and Sciences, Committee on Women Faculty

DRAFT   DRAFT   DRAFT

In fall 2005 the Sloan Foundation published a report on family-friendly policies in higher education. The report found that 86 percent of Research I institutions offer a formal tenure-clock extension policy upon the birth or adoption of a child. Currently, the University of Kentucky does not offer a tenure-clock extension policy, yet both the University's *Top 20 Business Plan* and the *Dream, Challenge, and Succeed Strategic Plan* state that UK must recruit and retain the most talented faculty. Providing competitive benefits to faculty is key to accomplishing the University's goals. UK is at a competitive disadvantage given how widespread tenure-clock extension policies are among Research I institutions. As a result we propose that the University adopt a tenure-clock extension policy for probationary Regular and Special Title Series faculty effective AY 07. The implementation costs are relatively low, and the potential benefits are significant: more competitive recruiting, higher faculty morale, and stronger tenure/promotion dossiers.

Proposed Policy
A probationary regular or special title series faculty member who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption will automatically be granted a one-year extension of term by the dean of the respective college, upon notification by the professor's department. The professor's service will be extended by one year for each child, including twins and other multiple births or adoptions for up to four births and/or adoptions. Tenure-clock extensions are available to all regular and special title series probationary faculty upon their official start date and up until September fifteenth in the year in which their tenure review is scheduled to occur. Notifications of all extensions should be made by the faculty member's department in writing to the dean of the respective college as soon as possible after the childbirth and/or adoption, but in no case later than September fifteenth of the year in which a recommendation on the faculty member's promotion to tenure must be made.

Special Note
During summer 2005 Princeton University announced that it was implementing a new tenure-clock extension policy: one that would automatically extend the tenure-clock for probationary faculty upon the birth or adoption of a child. Princeton's policy prior had functioned as all other policies do: on a request-only basis. An institutional study revealed that most faculty do not take advantage of the policy, fearing that the extension of time will be held against them during their tenure and promotion review. Other internal studies performed by Research I institutions (University of California System, University of Michigan) reveal similar findings. Thus, Princeton concluded that to make the policy as effective and universal as possible it must be granted automatically.

Given that institutional data suggest that faculty will not use this policy unless it is automatically granted, we have written the above policy to grant tenure-clock extensions automatically. In doing so and if approved, the University of Kentucky's would move from being one of the least competitive to one of the most competitive Research I institutions in regards to extending the tenure-clock.