# STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

## FACULTY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

### FINAL REPORT

#### OF THE

### PROVOST'S ADVISORY TASK FORCE ON
### FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

**December 29, 2004**

# CONTENTS

# REPORT OF THE
## PROVOST'S ADVISORY TASK FORCE ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

### *Executive Summary*

In Fall 2002, the Provost established the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Faculty Development as a broadly representative committee comprised of faculty, administration and staff from across the University, and charged it with the responsibility to:

- Examine and discuss the broad range of issues related to the ongoing intellectual, scholarly and professional development of State University faculty, including support for:

  - ➢ the development and improvement of teaching skills;
  - ➢ scholarship and research;
  - ➢ community and professional service;
  - ➢ further pursuit of advanced credentials;
  - ➢ opportunities to develop leadership, administrative and governance skills and additional responsibilities; and
  - ➢ appropriate and meaningful recognition and reward, including ways of enriching the State University through greater involvement of its distinguished professors in its ongoing academic enterprise.

- Examine and propose a set of best practices—appropriate to each sector of the University—that will provide candidates for reappointment, promotion and tenure with clear guidance regarding campus process, expectations, standards, and flexibility, as well as mentoring, support and timely feedback regarding their progress;

- Discuss strategies that might successfully address the need to secure and allocate sufficient additional resources in support of these important aspects of faculty development;

and to make recommendations:

- Regarding policy, guidelines and best practices, as appropriate, that would address these issues and contribute to a strengthening of the academic environment and the ongoing retention and development of State University faculty and future academic leadership.

The Task Force began its work in Fall 2002 and met during the 2002-03 and 2003-04 academic years in order to reach a comprehensive understanding of existing faculty development practices and needs across the State University. The Task Force also relied heavily in its deliberations on recent literature and research findings related to faculty development in higher education, and the group administered two inclusive surveys to campuses in order to clarify further the status of faculty development activity on SUNY campuses. Throughout the process, the Task Force has endeavored to keep the University community informed, by consulting regularly with groups such as the University Faculty Senate and the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, and sharing progress reports with those groups as well as campus presidents, academic vice presidents, and others. It has been the Task Force's goal to provide a solid framework for campuses from which to develop and implement a comprehensive faculty development program appropriate to faculty from all sectors of the University. In addition, it is hoped that through this effort—the Faculty Development Initiative—the State University will commit itself anew to creating and maintaining an environment that ensures the optimal intellectual, scholarly, and professional development of its talented and dedicated faculty.

### *Faculty Development Activity Across the State University*

Whether in improving the mastery of teaching, in creating new knowledge or expanded applications, in enhancing and fostering the intellectual growth of students, in bringing the breadth of disciplinary expertise to bear on issues of public good, in contributing to economic vitality, or in self-renewal and rededication to the principles of one's profession, the State University of New York always has been—and continues to be—committed to excellence. In its review of existing faculty development activities at both the system and campus levels, the Task Force discovered many laudable examples of this commitment to excellence, some of which rival or exceed best faculty development practices across the nation. The Task Force also determined that there are great variations in faculty development activity across sectors of the University—some of which appropriately reflect differences in institutional mission—and identified areas for improvement, leading the group to offer recommendations as to how faculty development practices can be strengthened and shared more widely for the benefit of the University, its faculty, and its students. The Task Force does not intend that these recommendations serve as a "one size fits all" approach to faculty development on all 64 SUNY campuses, but instead encourages campuses to select those recommendations that fit best within their own culture and implement them in ways most consistent with their existing faculty development practices and needs.

### *Campus Support and Organizational Structure for Faculty Development*

The Task Force agreed that most if not all campuses would benefit from having faculty development activities— especially those related to teaching and learning—organized by someone specifically assigned that responsibility and associated with a formal center or office in order to centralize functions on a campus and enhance coordination of and communication about those functions. Ideally, these efforts should be headed by a full-time director with faculty status who reports directly to the chief academic officer, and the central office should coordinate and publicize the range of ongoing faculty development activities, including faculty seminars, hands-on workshops and presentations on topics such as the development of teaching portfolios, the infusion of technology into the classroom, peer mentoring, and the promotion of active learning. These ideas are directly reflected in the following Task Force recommendations:

- Faculty development efforts should be led by a distinguished and respected faculty member clearly charged with the responsibility for providing vision, leadership and coordination to these efforts.
- Each campus should establish a Teaching and Learning Center to coordinate activities that support the enhancement of effective pedagogy and student learning.

### *Strategies for Enhancing Scholarship, Creative Activity and Service*

It became clear to the Task Force during its deliberations that, while most SUNY campuses communicate clearly and often to faculty regarding expectations for engagement in research and creative activity and provide assistance in these areas, wide variations exist among campuses in these practices, both between and within sectors. Further, although virtually all campuses "expect" faculty members to provide service to the institution and community, the Task Force concluded that this activity is relatively poorly-defined and less valued in most instances. The Task Force therefore recommends that each campus:

- Establish clear institutional expectations for faculty research and creative activity based on institutional mission and provide appropriate support, mentoring and feedback.
- Establish clear institutional expectations, definitions, and incentives for faculty service, especially at institutions in which this activity plays a significant role in faculty personnel decisions.

### *Improving Communication Regarding Faculty Development Activities and Opportunities*

In its review of system and campus practices the Task Force identified some highly innovative and creative approaches to promoting and acknowledging an institution's faculty development program, most of which involved the creation of Web sites that serve to inform the campus community and elevate the importance of faculty development. Given the relative ease at this point in time of creating and maintaining Web sites, the Task Force agreed that more campuses could benefit from this approach. In addition, it would seem appropriate for SUNY

System Administration to assume more responsibility for ensuring that campuses across the University are aware of the plethora of faculty development opportunities at sister institutions. As such, the Task Force recommends that:

- Each SUNY campus should post information about professional development activities on its Web site.
- SUNY System Administration should develop a SUNY-wide teaching and learning resource electronic portal (E-portal) system.

### *Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures Across the State University*

While there are numerous good reasons to provide for and support the professional development of faculty members, the ultimate objective for colleges and universities is to retain a high percentage of their best professors. Since the career milestones of reappointment, promotion and tenure provide the 'control gates' that help to regulate this retention, the Task Force was interested in assessing the status of these processes across SUNY. In its review, the Task Force found that virtually all campuses do a good job conveying information to faculty regarding their reappointment, promotion, and tenure procedures, and some have developed highly innovative strategies for assisting faculty members in these efforts, with peer mentoring a notable best practice. As was the case for faculty development activities generally, however, there is considerable unevenness across institutions, both between and within sectors. In addition, some strategies that have been demonstrated on a national level to be highly effective in assisting faculty members in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion processes (e.g., the use of teaching portfolios) have not been widely adopted across SUNY.

The Task Force therefore offers the following six recommendations, intended to constitute a set of best practices around which every campus can tailor its reappointment, tenure and promotion processes.

- Each campus should ensure that every new faculty hire is given, at the earliest opportunity, a complete understanding of the reappointment, promotion and tenure process.
- Campuses should provide periodic follow-up sessions on the reappointment, promotion and tenure process on a regular basis, especially for more junior faculty members, and make every effort to provide them with the necessary tools and resources for professional success.
- Campuses should establish a peer mentoring culture to ensure that every junior faculty member has an informal, easily accessible and confidential advisor/counselor.
- From the onset of employment, junior faculty should be provided with timely, specific and detailed formative feedback regarding their performance.
- Junior faculty should be informed of the importance of developing, and regularly updating, a teaching portfolio, the expected contents of which should be clearly specified.
- Reappointment, promotion and tenure committees should consist only of tenured faculty, unless campus circumstances require otherwise.

### *Recognizing and Rewarding Excellence Across the State University*

It was most impressive to the Task Force based on its review of system and campus initiatives the extent to which programs exist to acknowledge and celebrate faculty and staff accomplishments and honors, related to teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service. Virtually from its very beginnings, the SUNY system understood the importance of such programs and, compared to other systems canvassed by the Task Force, SUNY offers reward and recognition programs that are far more comprehensive in scope and impact.

In conducting its deliberations on these topics, the Task Force focused primarily on how existing reward and recognition programs could be strengthened, noting that, as one example, some SUNY-wide honors (e.g., the awarding of distinguished faculty rank) are not available to faculty at community colleges. In addition, despite the proliferation of programs on many individual campuses, it was clear that some institutions can benefit from bolstering existing activities and that, with improved communication on campuses and across the State University, the impact of existing recognition and reward programs can grow significantly. It is also desirable that both System

Administration and campuses receive maximum attention for honored faculty and staff, and that they benefit from these individuals' considerable expertise.

Toward these ends, the Task Force makes the following recommendations

- Distinguished faculty rank should be expanded to include faculty at the community colleges.
- Local faculty and staff recognition programs should be implemented on campuses where none currently exist.
- University-wide and local campus recognition and reward programs should be available online and easily accessible.
- Campuses should recognize and honor those faculty who have received significant honors or awards.
- SUNY System Administration should establish an honors database in order to inform the SUNY community of the availability of prestigious national and international awards and to identify SUNY faculty who have received significant honors or awards.
- Campuses should actively promote faculty award winners as campus leaders, utilizing them as appropriate to serve as mentors for junior faculty, participate in professional development workshops and presentations, serve on presidential advisory councils, serve on committees that select distinguished faculty and excellence award winners, and enhance the visibility of the campus in the community.
- SUNY System Administration should actively promote faculty award winners as system leaders, promoting them as visiting lecturers to other campuses, involving them in SUNY endeavors in national and international initiatives, and using their expertise in important SUNY-wide initiatives (e.g., general education assessment, teacher education).

## *Introduction and Objectives*

More than any other feature, the quality of a university's faculty determines the quality of education it provides to its students.  In its short 56-year history, the State University of New York—the nation's youngest state university system—has employed countless faculty members of the highest distinction, individuals who have contributed significantly to their profession through superior scholarship, creative activity, teaching, and service to the community.  The SUNY network of teachers and scholars is recruited from the finest graduate schools and universities, and includes nationally and internationally recognized figures in all major disciplines.  Faculty accomplishments have been acknowledged through the receipt of numerous prestigious awards and honors, including the Nobel Prize, Pulitzer Prize, Guggenheim grants, MacArthur "genius" awards, and Sloan, Danforth, and Fulbright fellowships.

Like other higher education institutions and systems across the nation, the State University of New York must continuously strive to promote and support its faculty and their professional growth.  Such actions are especially critical at the beginning of the 21$^{st}$ century, when many colleges and universities have a faculty work force that is comprised almost entirely of individuals who are nearing the end of their academic careers and those who are just entering the profession.

The central intention of the present report is to establish a firm rationale and to provide clear direction for faculty development efforts to be implemented across SUNY's 64 campuses.  The report is based primarily on information obtained from the campuses on existing faculty development practices and needs, but also includes a review of faculty development activities in higher education, with a focus on best practice strategies.  Our hope is that this report will provide a solid framework and guidance for campuses from which to develop and implement a comprehensive faculty development program appropriate to faculty from all sectors of the University.  In addition, it is hoped that through this effort— the Faculty Development Initiative—the State University will commit itself anew to creating and maintaining an environment that ensures the optimal intellectual, scholarly, and professional development of its talented and dedicated faculty.

### *Provost's Charge*

In Fall 2002, the Provost established the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Faculty Development as a broadly representative committee comprised of faculty, administration and staff from across the University, and charged it with the responsibility to:

- Examine and discuss the broad range of issues related to the ongoing intellectual, scholarly and professional development of State University faculty, including support for:

  - the development and improvement of teaching skills;
  - scholarship and research;
  - community and professional service;
  - further pursuit of advanced credentials;
  - opportunities to develop leadership, administrative and governance skills and additional responsibilities; and
  - appropriate and meaningful recognition and reward, including ways of enriching the State University through greater involvement of its distinguished professors in its ongoing academic enterprise.

- Examine and propose a set of best practices—appropriate to each sector of the University—that will provide candidates for reappointment, promotion and tenure with clear guidance regarding campus process, expectations, standards, and flexibility, as well as mentoring, support and timely feedback regarding their progress;

- Discuss strategies that might successfully address the need to secure and allocate sufficient additional resources in support of these important aspects of faculty development;

and to make recommendations:

- Regarding policy, guidelines and best practices, as appropriate, that would address these issues and contribute to a strengthening of the academic environment and the ongoing retention and development of State University faculty and future academic leadership.

Appendix A includes a listing of Task Force members.

## *Background Information and Task Force Activities*

Prior to the formation of the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Faculty Development, a group of System Administration staff members worked at the Provost's direction to develop a background paper on faculty development practices, both nationally and within the State University. The current report draws heavily on this paper, entitled *The SUNY Faculty Development Initiative: Establishing a Rationale and Direction*, for its contextual information and review of the literature, and a summary of relevant literature and research findings on faculty development in higher education is found in Appendix B.

During Summer 2002 the Office of Academic Affairs administered a survey to the 59 non-statutory SUNY campuses, and the Task Force conducted two surveys in Spring 2003 and Spring 2004 to clarify further the status of faculty development activity across the State University. These surveys are included in Appendix C, while a summary of the results from the most recent survey administered in Spring 2004 is found in Appendix D.

During its deliberations the Task Force relied significantly on the background paper as well as the results of the three surveys to reach its conclusions and make the recommendations offered immediately below in the present report. Appendix E contains a listing of all Task Force recommendations.

### *Faculty Development Activity Across the State University*

Whether in improving the mastery of teaching, in creating new knowledge or expanded applications, in enhancing and fostering the intellectual growth of students, in bringing the breadth of disciplinary expertise to bear on issues of public good, in contributing to economic vitality, or in self-renewal and rededication to the principles of one's profession, the State University of New York always has been—and continues to be—committed to excellence. In particular, SUNY, both as a system and individually on our campuses, values the contributions of its faculty members and enthusiastically acknowledges them for their pivotal role in the system's pursuit of distinction. The current section describes faculty development practices already in place across the University, at both the campus and system levels. This section also offers a series of recommendations, based on existing practices and the literature summarized in Appendix B, as to how faculty development activity can be strengthened and shared more widely as well as how new, innovative approaches may be developed for the benefit of the University, its faculty, and its

students. Of course, these recommendations are not intended to serve as a "one size fits all" approach to faculty development on all 64 SUNY campuses. Rather, each institution is encouraged to select those recommendations that fit best within its own culture and implement them in ways most consistent with its existing faculty development practices and needs. Task Force recommendations are presented below, organized around the following broad topic areas: Campus support and leadership for faculty development activities; mechanisms for improving teaching and learning, including mentoring, and organizational structure; strategies for enhancing scholarship and creative activity; expectations and incentives for faculty service; and, improving communication regarding faculty development activities and opportunities.

### *Campus Support and Leadership for Faculty Development Activities*

---

### *Task Force Recommendation 1*

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS SHOULD BE LED BY A DISTINGUISHED AND RESPECTED FACULTY MEMBER CLEARLY CHARGED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROVIDING VISION, LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION TO THESE EFFORTS.

---

Of the 32 campuses responding to the Spring 2004 survey, all indicated that they provide some degree of support as well as incentives for their faculty members' professional development, with most of this support focusing on teaching and scholarship/creative activity. Interestingly, only twelve institutions— three comprehensive colleges, three colleges of technology, and six community colleges—reported that faculty development activities were the responsibility of a specific designated individual. In most cases, these individuals were faculty members serving in this capacity on a part-time basis in exchange for either released time and/or a stipend.

Campuses that reported not having a designated individual with responsibility for coordinating faculty development activities indicated that these duties are generally spread across campus, with different units conducting different kinds of activities, often with an associate vice president providing some overall coordination and leadership. As one example, Genesee Community College refers to its faculty development program as "highly distributed and decentralized," with academic deans, an assistant dean for assessment, and a dean of learning technologies contributing to this effort. Of course, it is not surprising that, when faculty development activities are diffused in such a way across a campus, institutions typically do not have funds specially designated for faculty development. In fact, most institutions responding to the Spring 2004 survey reported they did not have such budgets in place. Still, a majority of institutions indicate that their presidents or vice presidents for academic affairs have discretionary funds that they use to support faculty development.

Despite the absence of full-time directors to guide various faculty development efforts across SUNY as well as centralized budgets to support these efforts, many campuses have managed to establish a relatively unique, "homegrown" faculty development program that might be of interest to other institutions. As examples, SUNY Potsdam offers "Teaching Circles" to share best practices, Dutchess Community College has a tuition remission program for credit and non-credit courses, Jefferson Community College has a Center for Community Studies which focuses on economic development in the region, and SUNY Oswego and SUNY Cortland feature a day that is devoted to presentations of student and faculty research. In addition, Westchester Community College has an endowed chairs program in place and SUNY Canton sponsors teaching effectiveness conferences.

Clearly, specific responsibilities for this position as called for in this Task Force recommendation—as well as its place in the institution's organizational structure—would vary depending on the campus' culture and its specific faculty development needs and resources. Ideally, faculty development efforts should be headed by a full-time director who reports directly to the chief academic officer. Given the many demands on limited resources, it is also important to charge this person to be, at least in part, responsible for identifying and attracting the resources required to sustain this effort.

*Mechanisms for Improving Teaching and Learning and Organizational Structure*

---

### *Task Force Recommendation 2*

EACH CAMPUS SHOULD ESTABLISH A TEACHING AND LEARNING CENTER TO COORDINATE ACTIVITIES THAT SUPPORT THE ENHANCEMENT OF EFFECTIVE PEDAGOGY AND STUDENT LEARNING.

---

Based on the various survey results, there is strong evidence that all sectors of the University offer some support to faculty to improve their teaching effectiveness. In the Spring 2004 survey, 29 of 32 responding institutions reported they provided incentives to help faculty become better teachers, with this support taking the form of leaves, grants, stipends, course load reductions, and travel to professional conferences. Also revealed in this survey was that 28 of these institutions have some type of mentoring program in place, although only 16 indicated that these programs were formal in nature. Mentoring programs were especially characteristic of the community colleges that responded, with 14 of 15 institutions reporting such programs. In most cases, mentoring relationships are developed by assigning new faculty to more senior faculty in the same discipline or department.

The Spring 2004 survey also showed that only sixteen institutions reported the existence on campus of an actual organizational structure with responsibility for coordinating these kinds of activities. Common names for these structures included "Center for Teaching and Learning," "Faculty Resource Center," "Faculty Development Center," and "Professional Development Center." Based on descriptions provided in the surveys, these centers offer a variety of services to assist faculty in the design, implementation, and evaluation of teaching and curriculum planning, for the ultimate goal of improving teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes. Descriptions of these centers from the Spring 2004 survey suggest that there is considerable emphasis on instructional technology (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT), although these centers also sponsor a variety of other activities such as new faculty orientation sessions, social gatherings, book chats, guest speakers from off campus, and workshops on pedagogy.

For campuses electing to implement this particular Task Force recommendation, these centers— ideally headed by the faculty member described in Task Force Recommendation 1— would have responsibility for providing a variety of activities as appropriate to the particular campus, including faculty seminars, hands-on workshops and presentations on topics such as the development of teaching portfolios, the infusion of technology into the classroom, peer mentoring, and the promotion of active learning. In addition, these centers would also provide faculty members with individual consultation as needed to assist them in areas in which they seek improvement.

---

**Task Force Recommendation 3**

ESTABLISH CLEAR INSTITUTIONAL EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY BASED ON INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND PROVIDE APPROPRIATE SUPPORT, MENTORING AND FEEDBACK.

---

Differences in institutional mission and objectives across sectors of the State University are clear and significant, an impression that was corroborated by the faculty development surveys. Consistent with the fact that research is central to the mission of SUNY's doctoral degree-granting institutions, all four responding institutions in the Spring 2004 survey reported that faculty were expected to engage in scholarship and that these expectations were clearly conveyed to faculty. It is interesting to note that all eight comprehensive colleges that participated in this survey responded similarly, and two of the five technology colleges and ten of the 15 community college respondents said they expected faculty members to do research. Still, it is clear there are differences across SUNY sectors in the quantity and quality of research that is expected, as described below in the discussion of reappointment/promotion/tenure processes and the extent to which scholarship and creative activity are weighted in these processes.

Despite these differences, all 32 institutions responding to the Spring 2004 survey indicated that they provide incentives to faculty for engaging in research and creative activity. The range of incentives was quite wide at both doctoral degree-granting institutions and the comprehensive colleges, and included travel grants, course load reductions, stipends, provision of teaching assistants, seminars, mentoring by senior faculty, and assistance with publications and grant-writing. For the most part, incentives at community colleges occur in the form of travel grants, seminars, and mentoring by senior faculty, with incentives at the technology colleges much more limited.

By far, the incentive most frequently cited on the surveys to support research and creative activity was the use of sabbatical leaves. In some cases, these leaves are conditional, tied to contractual arrangements, and at most of our campuses their availability depends on budget considerations in any given year. At the community colleges, Perkins (VATEA) funding frequently has a professional development component, and in many institutions the faculty bargaining unit (UUP or community college unions) provides some support for this objective. In addition, several campuses reported making effective use of grants to support research and creative activity by faculty, with examples including funding from the National Science Foundation, FIPSE and Title III.

To conclude, the relative emphasis on research and creative activity in the scope of a faculty member's responsibilities varies considerably, not only by sector type, but also by campus. Therefore, it is important to establish clear institutional expectations for faculty research and scholarship based on institutional mission.

*Expectations and Incentives for Faculty Service*

---

### Task Force Recommendation 4

ESTABLISH CLEAR INSTITUTIONAL EXPECTATIONS, DEFINITIONS, AND INCENTIVES FOR FACULTY SERVICE, ESPECIALLY AT INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THIS ACTIVITY PLAYS A SIGNIFICANT ROLE IN FACULTY PERSONNEL DECISIONS.

---

Great variability was demonstrated both between and within sectors in institutional responses to survey questions pertaining to faculty service. Virtually all campuses stated that service was "expected," but there was little agreement on–or few definitions of–the forms those expectations could take. At the doctoral institutions, service expectations tended to focus upon the institution and the faculty member's discipline, while at the comprehensive, technology, and community colleges most survey responses also made reference to the importance of community service. Several comprehensive colleges wrote that service to faculty governance was valued especially, carrying with it the benefit of a stipend or released time, and SUNY Cortland reported that its president had in the past used participation on faculty senate as a special consideration in awarding discretionary salary increases. The survey responses also indicated that service is valued differentially depending on faculty rank. For instance, one doctoral institution said that faculty members, once tenured, were expected to take to significant service responsibilities, and a comprehensive college stated that service is especially important in promotion and tenure decisions. By far, the most frequently mentioned incentive for service activity was discretionary salary increases.

Community colleges were most likely to have strong and explicit service expectations for faculty members, an emphasis that was also evidenced when institutions rated the relative weight assigned to service in faculty personnel decisions. For instance, several community colleges indicated that service was the second most important criterion in these decisions, behind teaching effectiveness but ahead of scholarship. In contrast, both doctoral institutions and comprehensive colleges stated overwhelmingly that service received the least weight in personnel decisions.

Perhaps reflecting this low prioritization, faculty service contributions appear to receive the most uneven evaluation of all evaluative criteria, even at community colleges where these contributions play a significant role in personnel decisions. Overall, the Spring 2004 survey revealed that few institutions had specific, objective criteria in place for assessing the quality of a faculty member's service to the institution, community, or field of study. In fact, many institutions responded that service was "not evaluated" or was evaluated "through self-declaration by the faculty."

*Improving Communication Regarding Faculty Development Activities and Opportunities*

---

### Task Force Recommendation 5

EACH SUNY CAMPUS SHOULD POST INFORMATION ABOUT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES ON ITS WEB SITE.

---

As demonstrated through the various surveys administered to campuses, there are numerous and significant activities dedicated to the professional development of faculty and staff members across the State University, and many incentives in place for encouraging excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Any criticism of these various efforts is likely to focus on the fact that, in many instances, they suffer from lack of strong coordination or do not fall under a formalized campus structure. In addition, in some cases, campuses are not adequately explicit with respect to the extent to which they value or define certain activities.

Perhaps equally important is the need to share information regarding professional development activities widely on campus and across the SUNY system. Several campuses indicated on their survey responses that they had successfully developed Web sites that served to inform the community of such activities, and this approach would seem to be an effective and relatively easy means of ensuring awareness of and access to local faculty development opportunities.

Further, to assist in sharing the wealth of campus-based information and faculty development opportunities efficiently across the University, the development of a SUNY-wide teaching and learning resource electronic portal (E-portal) system is recommended. By using existing campus-based teaching learning resource centers and the expertise of their respective directors, SUNY could establish an E-portal by which faculty and staff on all sixty-four campuses could access information regarding teaching, learning, scholarship, and other topics related to professional and career advancement.

Through this system, faculty and staff members could easily enter unlimited amounts of information, both synchronous and asynchronous, that would provide insight in areas such as pedagogy, curriculum, alternative learning strategies, student learning outcomes, technology in the classroom, and cooperative learning. The portal could also include a calendar of events to upcoming conferences, workshops or seminars of local or national interest, offer opportunities for faculty to host or join interactive Web-casted events, and provide linkages to other learning networks (e.g., SUNY Learning Network, SUNY*Connect*, MERLOT, American Association of Higher Education).

## *Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Procedures Across The State University*

While there are numerous good reasons to provide for and support the professional development of faculty members, the ultimate objective for colleges and universities is to retain a high percentage of their best professors. Since the career milestones of reappointment, promotion and tenure provide the 'control gates' that help to regulate this retention—and also ensure the State University's continued commitment to quality, student-centered, higher education—the Task Force was interested in assessing the status of these processes across SUNY. As such, its Spring 2004 survey explicitly questioned campuses regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure procedures and practices as well as the weighting of various criteria in these processes. Based on campus responses as well as relevant literature on faculty development summarized in Appendix B, the Task Force offers six recommendations, intended to constitute a set of

best practices around which every campus can tailor its reappointment, tenure and promotion processes. These recommendations are presented below, organized around the following broad topic areas: Communicating expectations to new faculty; strategies for supporting faculty members; peer mentoring; the importance of periodic, specific feedback; developing and maintaining teaching portfolios; and, composition of campus personnel committees.

*Communicating Expectations Regarding Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure*

---

### *Task Force Recommendation 7*

ENSURE THAT EVERY NEW FACULTY HIRE IS GIVEN, AT THE EARLIEST OPPORTUNITY, A COMPLETE UNDERSTANDING OF THE REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS.

---

Of the 32 institutions responding to the Spring 2004 survey, 31 stated that clear, written guidelines existed for faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Further, in all cases these guidelines are communicated to faculty, most frequently through their inclusion in a college handbook. For some institutions, this information is made explicit for each department, school or college within the institution. Other resources mentioned on the survey include a handbook for faculty mentors, Web pages, annual or periodic circulation of faculty bylaws, and a memorandum from the office of the campus chief academic officer that summarizes evaluative criteria for faculty, updated and reissued each year.

Closely related to reappointment, promotion, and tenure procedures is the matter of standards and criteria utilized across campuses, in particular the relative weighting of teaching, research and creative activity, and service in these decisions. Not surprisingly, the Spring 2004 survey demonstrated clear variations across sectors in this regard, with doctoral institutions reporting a strong emphasis on scholarship, followed by teaching, then service. In contrast, comprehensive colleges reported a much more "balanced" assessment, maintaining that all three areas of evaluation were taken into consideration when making personnel decisions. Overall, however, comprehensive colleges appear to place more emphasis on excellence in teaching as the primary criterion, although several institutions stated that tenure and promotion to full professor required demonstrated achievements in research and scholarly activity.

Colleges of technology and community colleges responding to the Spring 2004 survey were basically unanimous in their view that teaching effectiveness is the most important factor in faculty advancement. There was variability among community colleges with respect to the relative importance of scholarship and service, with many indicating that service was more important than scholarship and others saying these two criteria were weighted equally after teaching.

A final topic for consideration involves the mechanisms in place for evaluating faculty members in the areas of research and creative activity, teaching effectiveness, and service. At both doctoral institutions and comprehensive colleges, the most common method of assessing scholarship is through an institution-wide Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, with additional layers of evaluation being conducted by department chairpersons and deans. The four doctoral institutions responding to the Spring 2004 survey indicated they also required external review of research and creative activity, with only one comprehensive college and one community college reporting an external review requirement.

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness is much more standardized across SUNY, with all 32 institutions responding to the Spring 2004 survey reporting that they utilize course-teacher evaluations (CTE's) for this purpose. Other, less common forms of assessing teaching include observation by a college-wide

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, observation by a chairperson or dean, and review of students' work. Perhaps reflecting the importance of teaching effectiveness at the technology and community colleges, 18 of the 20 institutions in these categories reported on the Spring 2004 survey that observation of faculty teaching by a chairperson or dean was required as part of the personnel process.

In summary, across the various sectors of the University, there are real and consistent differences in the criteria and standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure, with research and creative activity stressed more on doctoral sector campuses and teaching effectiveness emphasized more heavily at comprehensive, technology, and community colleges. Still, differences are found within sectors as well, reinforcing the need for each SUNY institution to have mechanisms in place ensuring faculty members have a full understanding of the reappointment, promotion and tenure processes as well as the criteria for successfully negotiating these processes.

*Strategies for Supporting Faculty With Respect to Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure*

---

### *Task Force Recommendation 8*

PROVIDE PERIODIC FOLLOW-UP SESSIONS ON THE REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS ON A REGULAR BASIS, ESPECIALLY FOR MORE JUNIOR FACULTY MEMBERS AND MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO PROVIDE THEM WITH THE NECESSARY TOOLS AND RESOURCES FOR PROFESSIONAL SUCCESS.

---

It is important to note that 28 campus respondents to the Spring 2004 survey indicated that they provided assistance to faculty members with respect to the reappointment, promotion and tenure processes. Most frequently this assistance takes the form of orientation sessions led by the chief academic officer (or designee) or by the chair of the campus-wide promotion and tenure committee. At some community colleges, this information is included in the faculty association contract. Frequently, follow-up to these general discussions is provided individually by the new faculty member's dean or department chair or by an institution's promotion and tenure committee. On some campuses, new faculty members receive a development plan drafted in consultation with the new faculty member. This plan addresses all areas in which the new faculty member will be evaluated as part of the reappointment, promotion and tenure processes.

As another form of assistance, some campuses report conducting workshops dedicated to reappointment, promotion, and tenure. At some institutions the office of the chief academic officer or the college-wide promotion and tenure committee sponsors these workshops, and the campus' UUP chapter may offer these workshops as well. These workshops provide faculty with an opportunity to ask questions and to model portfolios, and are often supplemented by an annual mailing from campus academic leadership reminding faculty of campus procedures and the personnel process timelines.

The provision of such assistance should begin in pre-employment interviews and in specific contractual language as appropriate, with a full explanation of campus expectations and procedures offered at new faculty orientation seminar and elaborated upon at follow-up sessions. Ideally, this orientation should include presentations by the promotion and tenure committee, deans, chief academic officers and faculty development staff. The aim should be to present a clear and detailed introduction to the teaching environment and the local customs of tenure and promotion. Junior faculty should also be made aware of the *Policies of the Board of Trustees* and the criteria of teaching effectiveness as interpreted at their campus. Orientation should also strive to acquaint new hires with faculty development opportunities, as well as local opportunities for college and community service. Further, new faculty should be informed

regarding the importance of developing a teaching portfolio and the appropriate documentation of their teaching activities. To the extent that college budgets permit, junior faculty should be empowered in their quest to develop professionally by having real support for professional development opportunities and access to some form of teaching and learning center that would provide a wide range of resources and services.

*Peer Mentoring*

---

### Task Force Recommendation 9

ESTABLISH A PEER MENTORING CULTURE TO ENSURE THAT EVERY JUNIOR FACULTY MEMBER HAS AN INFORMAL, EASILY ACCESSIBLE AND CONFIDENTIAL ADVISOR/COUNSELOR.

---

As described earlier, the Task Force's survey results revealed that few campuses currently have a formalized mentoring program in place. While some form of mentoring probably occurs in most instances at an informal level, a formalized system of mentoring by department peers would seem to have advantages that go beyond mere familiarization with reappointment, promotion and tenure processes. Peer mentoring could also provide the junior faculty member with guidance in such crucial areas as pedagogy, student advisement, and the development of a teaching portfolio.

Teaching mentors, selected from the upper academic ranks, would provide valuable guidance and support for the new faculty member and might also help to improve departmental communication and continuity. In such a culture it should be understood that mentoring is an obligation of experienced faculty and, as such, it should be recognized and rewarded as a component in the criteria used to evaluate faculty performance. In addition, a comprehensive mentoring system might prove particularly effective in assimilating adjunct faculty within the academic community.

*The Importance of Periodic and Specific Feedback*

---

### Task Force Recommendation 10

FROM THE ONSET OF EMPLOYMENT, JUNIOR FACULTY SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITH TIMELY, SPECIFIC AND DETAILED FORMATIVE FEEDBACK REGARDING THEIR PERFORMANCE.

---

It is imperative that junior faculty regularly receive feedback on their performance, above and beyond the formal, summative reviews that are part of the annual reappointment process. This feedback should be in as many forms and from as many sources as possible. A key component of this should be a yearly meeting with the departmental chair and/or dean focused on a discussion of the candidate's progress to date.

*Developing and Maintaining Teaching Portfolios*

---

**Task Force Recommendation 11**

JUNIOR FACULTY SHOULD BE INFORMED OF THE IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING, AND REGULARLY UPDATING, A TEACHING PORTFOLIO, THE EXPECTED CONTENTS OF WHICH SHOULD BE CLEARLY SPECIFIED.

---

As described in the literature review in Appendix B, increasingly over the past ten years faculty evaluation procedures have relied heavily on teaching portfolios. According to the results of the various Task Force surveys, however, few SUNY campuses are utilizing these portfolios in any systematic fashion. While there are now many variations in the structure and organization of teaching portfolios, generally they will include a statement of teaching philosophy, course materials, evidence of teaching effectiveness, and a narrative by the candidate reflecting on that evidence. In addition, the portfolio typically includes appendices containing supporting documentation for the conclusions reached by the candidate regarding teaching effectiveness.

Given the demonstrated benefits of teaching portfolios in the evaluation of faculty, it would seem desirable for SUNY campuses to adopt this "best practice" in their reappointment, tenure, and promotion processes. In particular, a Teaching and Learning Center would be an ideal site to provide new faculty with information and assistance in formulating a comprehensive portfolio of teaching accomplishments.

*Composition of Campus Personnel Committees*

---

**Task Force Recommendation 12**

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEES SHOULD CONSIST ONLY OF TENURED FACULTY, UNLESS CAMPUS CIRCUMSTANCES REQUIRE OTHERWISE.

---

The Task Force surveys to campuses demonstrated that the role and make-up of reappointment, promotion and tenure committees are notably different among SUNY institutions. In some cases there is no campus-wide reappointment, promotion and tenure committee, with these schools relying on a departmental review committee to make final recommendations. As one relatively common feature, almost all campuses rely on tenured or senior faculty to review reappointment, promotion and tenure candidates, which seems logical in light of the great importance of a final reappointment, promotion and tenure committee recommendation to the candidate's career.

*Recognizing and Rewarding Excellence Across The State University*

One prominent theme in the faculty development literature, as summarized in Appendix B, is the importance of providing "clear and visible measures of recognition and reward" as an incentive for faculty performance and achievement. It was therefore of interest to the Task Force the extent to which State University engages in such recognition and reward programs, at both the campus and system levels.

As described earlier, most campuses responding to the various surveys administered in preparation for this report indicated that they have "built-in" reward systems to encourage teaching excellence as well as to stimulate scholarship. These incentives include released time, stipends course load reductions, travel grants, seminars and institutes, and assistance with publishing and grant-writing. Indeed, it is readily evident through such programs that SUNY values its faculty and invests in encouraging ongoing commitment to professional excellence.

It is impressive and noteworthy that, early in its history, SUNY as a system understood the importance of creating structures to recognize achievement and success, and to reward effort and encourage its continuity. Over three decades ago SUNY established programs, many originating from the suggestions of faculty governance and other groups, to acknowledge and reward faculty and to contribute to ongoing scholarly development, a tradition that continues today. It is also notable that the SUNY system compares very favorably with other public systems nationwide in this regard, offering reward and recognition programs that are far more comprehensive than those of most of the 30 systems canvassed by the Task Force.

In its further review of this area, the Task Force focused on two questions: 1) How do the system and the campuses reward and recognize those among its ranks; and, 2) How do they move forward to make such tributes meaningful to recipients and enriching of the University's academic agenda? Based on this review the Task Force offers the following recommendations, organized around the issues of meaningful reward structures, building awareness, and enhancing academic engagement.

***Meaningful Reward Structures***

---

***Task Force Recommendation 13***

EXPAND DISTINGUISHED FACULTY RANK TO INCLUDE FACULTY AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

---

***Task Force Recommendation 14***

IMPLEMENT LOCAL FACULTY AND STAFF RECOGNITION PROGRAMS ON CAMPUSES WHERE NONE CURRENTLY EXIST.

---

At the system level, the SUNY Board of Trustees and the Chancellor have created rewards for faculty accomplishment as a tribute for extraordinary attainment in the profession as well as to stimulate intellectual vitality and dedication to the pursuit of personal and professional excellence. These rewards take two forms, promotions through appointment to Distinguished Faculty Rank and recognition through selection for the Chancellor's Awards for Excellence. Distinguished Faculty Rank is a tenured academic rank above that of full professor, and can be conferred only by the SUNY Board of Trustees to faculty on state-operated campuses (i.e., not at the community colleges). Appointment constitutes a promotion to the State University's highest academic rank, one beyond that available on the campuses. There are four designations of Distinguished Faculty rank:

- Distinguished Professor, recognizing national pre-eminence in scholarship, research or artistic performance or creativity;

- Distinguished Teaching Professor recognizing mastery of teaching; outstanding service to students and to their ongoing intellectual growth; sound scholarship and adherence to the highest academic standards;

- Distinguished Service Professor, recognizing long-standing and extraordinary service drawing from the scholar's expertise to issues of public concern and extending far beyond the campus and University to the community, the region, and the State; and,
- Distinguished Librarian, recognizing nationally acclaimed transformational contributions to librarianship.

The Chancellor's Awards for Excellence are bestowed on faculty and professional service staff of the State University to provide system-wide recognition for superior performance and personal achievement. The awards recognize achievement in five specific areas:

- Excellence in Teaching, created to recognize superior teaching and thereby fostering the State University's commitment to providing its students with the highest quality instruction. Candidates must demonstrate mastery of teaching, involvement in scholarship and professional growth, superior student services and adherence to the highest academic standards and requirements and evaluation of student performance.

- Excellence in Scholarship and Creative Activities, created to recognize a sustained record of discipline-specific scholarship (research for the sciences and humanities and creative activities for the fine and performing arts) by faculty at all academic ranks.

- Excellence in Faculty Service, created to recognize consistently superior service sustained over a multiple-year period to the local campus, the State University, the community, or the nominee's service contributions to discipline-related professional organizations or to faculty governance. The Excellence in Faculty Service Award also recognizes faculty having outstanding service contributions at the statewide, national or international levels.

- Excellence in Librarianship, created to recognize extraordinary professional achievement for skill in librarianship, service to the University and to the profession and for scholarship and professional growth.

- Excellence in Professional Service, created to recognize extraordinary professional achievement and to encourage the continuation of excellence by the University's professional service (as opposed to classified) staff within and beyond the candidate's position.

At the campus level, the Task Force found that individual colleges and universities within SUNY are equally dedicated to recognizing and rewarding excellence. Specifically, information yielded through the various surveys demonstrate that most campuses add to the rewards and recognition available at the system level through ongoing acknowledgement of the accomplishments of their faculty, professional staff, support staff, adjuncts, students, and alumni. Although these programs vary widely across campuses, they share common elements. For instance, the majority of survey respondents describe their recognition of teaching, research, service, creativity and innovation, with many of these awards bestowed by the highest level of campus leadership, including the president and the chief academic officer. The concrete rewards associated with selection vary, but generally include a mix of the following:

Recognition at academic convocations, special events hosted to honor recipients, public acknowledgement in campus and area media, travel or research grants, assistance with publications, institutional "showcases" of honorees, monetary awards and salary increments. Regardless of the form these rewards take, it is clear that SUNY's campuses actively invest in acknowledging achievement, service and ongoing intellectual vibrancy.

Through the implementation of these two recommendations, faculty members on all 64 SUNY campuses could potentially benefit from recognition and reward programs now only available on some campuses, thereby instituting comparable reward structures across the system. As readily demonstrated in the literature and from information yielded through the Task Force surveys, these programs are vital to stimulating intellectual curiosity and scholarly productivity, creating new knowledge, developing innovative teaching techniques, and providing quality service to students, the discipline and the institution. Further, they elevate morale and build pride in the campus community.

It is also important to commend those campuses that have such programs in place and suggest that they be continued and expanded as appropriate to the institution's needs and its faculty characteristics. Indeed, these existing programs could be used as models for other institutions interested in developing their own local reward and recognition structures.

*Building Awareness*

---

### Task Force Recommendation 15

ENSURE THAT UNIVERSITY-WIDE AND LOCAL CAMPUS RECOGNITION AND REWARD PROGRAMS ARE AVAILABLE ONLINE AND EASILY ACCESSIBLE.

---

### Task Force Recommendation 16

RECOGNIZE AND HONOR AT THE CAMPUS LEVEL THOSE FACULTY WHO HAVE RECEIVED SIGNIFICANT HONORS OR AWARDS.

---

### Task Force Recommendation 17

SUNY SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION SHOULD ESTABLISH AN HONORS DATABASE IN ORDER TO INFORM THE SUNY COMMUNITY OF THE AVAILABILITY OF PRESTIGIOUS NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL AWARDS AND TO IDENTIFY SUNY FACULTY WHO HAVE RECEIVED SIGNIFICANT HONORS OR AWARDS.

---

Clearly, for recognition and reward structures to fulfill their intended goals, faculty and campuses must be attuned to the programs' availability and they must be aware of the programs open to them. At the same time, there needs to be an appreciation for what the programs confer, a heightened awareness of the prestige the awards bring, and an understanding of their implications for productive and seminal

scholarship, grantsmanship, and superior instruction and for their potential as a catalyst for intellectual vitality on the campus, across the system and beyond. Yet, based on campus survey responses received by the Task Force, there appears to be limited recognition extended to award recipients and honorees beyond the borders of their immediate environment—throughout the system, at the State level or by the public.

This problem could be solved through implementation of the three recommendations listed above, increasing awareness of and accessibility to existing award programs and bringing greater visibility and prestige to those who are honored by these programs. Local recognition could take any number of forms, including a "Wall of Honor" located in a central campus location, special name plaques for recipients' offices, recognition at commencement and other academic convocations, and including this information in a specific location on the campus Web site. The system honors database could be especially effective at recognizing faculty and staff and would include, at a minimum, names and home campus, the honor or reward received (e.g., selection as Nobel Laureate, receipt of Guggenheim Fellowships, Fulbright Awards, Guggenheim Fellowships, appointment to national academies), and the year of designation.

### *Meaningful Rewards and Academic Engagement*

---

#### *Task Force Recommendation 18*

CAMPUSES SHOULD ACTIVELY PROMOTE FACULTY AWARD WINNERS AS CAMPUS LEADERS, UTILIZING THEM AS APPROPRIATE TO SERVE AS MENTORS FOR JUNIOR FACULTY, PARTICIPATE IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS AND PRESENTATIONS, SERVE ON PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY COUNCILS, SERVE ON COMMITTEES THAT SELECT DISTINGUISHED FACULTY AND EXCELLENCE AWARD WINNERS, AND ENHANCE THE VISIBILITY OF THE CAMPUS IN THE COMMUNITY.

---

#### *Task Force Recommendation 19*

SUNY SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION SHOULD ACTIVELY PROMOTE FACULTY AWARD WINNERS AS SYSTEM LEADERS, PROMOTING THEM AS VISITING LECTURERS TO OTHER CAMPUSES, INVOLVING THEM IN SUNY ENDEAVORS IN NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVES, AND USING THEIR EXPERTISE IN IMPORTANT SUNY-WIDE INITIATIVES (E.G., GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT, TEACHER EDUCATION).

---

Recipients of campus and system honors are selected on the basis of their outstanding achievements, superior scholarship and research, extraordinary service, and mastery of teaching. They are held in high regard by their colleagues, their students and their campus leadership. It therefore would serve the State University and individual campuses well to view and promote these individuals as leaders and to encourage them to play an important role in enriching the academic agenda of the University. Information received and reviewed by the Task Force, however, indicates that few campuses have systematic mechanisms in place for ensuring that faculty award winners are acknowledged as or have the opportunity to serve in leadership roles, and led to these two recommendations. These recommendations are also derived from the work of the Faculty Senate Committee on University Programs and Awards, as presented by committee co-chair Marvin LaHood to the Faculty Senate in January 2004.

## *Summary*

As stated earlier, the purpose of this report is to provide a rationale and direction for implementing a comprehensive Faculty Development Initiative across the State University of New York, through a concise review of prevalent faculty development practices, both nationwide and within SUNY. Based on this review, it is clear that the University, both at the system and campus levels, has kept pace with many of the trends that characterize best faculty development practices in higher education. It is especially apparent that SUNY System Administration places a high value on recognizing and rewarding faculty accomplishments, as evidenced through programs like the Distinguished Faculty designations and Chancellor's Awards for Excellence. These kinds of programs serve many important purposes, including the fostering of morale, particularly in times of tight financial constraints. In addition, recipients and their campuses take enormous pride in being recognized in these ways, and these programs also bring campuses greater visibility, bolster their stature in the teaching and research arenas, and support faculty recruitment and retention efforts.

Still, the State University of New York would be well served to examine the issue of faculty development more closely, in light of the difficulties it is likely to face in coming years. As detailed in Appendix B, the University directly reflects national demographics, including a "bimodal" distribution of faculty characterized by relatively large groups younger than 40 and 61 years and older and, as a result, will inevitably experience a wave of faculty retirements in the next ten to fifteen years. Further, there is no reason to believe that the State University will escape the challenges confronting colleges and universities across the nation, including the need to incorporate innovative technology into teaching and scholarship, the heightened call for accountability, an increasingly more diverse student population, and the unceasing pressure to hire and retain the best and brightest faculty members possible.

As the foundation for a Faculty Development Initiative is established, a number of issues deserve consideration. First and perhaps foremost is the need to retain junior faculty members, given the considerable effort and expense that go into recruiting and hiring them. Further, there is some evidence that the State University needs to improve in this regard, based on a longitudinal analysis of full-time tenure-track faculty hired in 1994, which showed that 44% had left SUNY seven years later (see Appendix B). Possible avenues for exploration might include a comparison of salaries at affected institutions, using both SUNY data and a national database (e.g., the *National Faculty Salary Survey* provided by the College and University Professional Association). In addition, the campus surveys administered by the Task Force indicated that few campuses have formal mentoring programs in place for new faculty. Finally, to the greatest extent possible mechanisms should exist at the campus level for determining why faculty members leave a position, since such information can provide considerable insight into improving work conditions as needed.

A second issue follows directly from the advice of faculty development experts who emphasize the importance of institutions implementing faculty development programs that reflect their unique mission and characteristics. These conclusions suggest it might be useful to encourage individual SUNY units to conduct a thorough needs analysis regarding faculty members' professional development, an activity that would integrate well with Mission Review II, which was initiated during Spring 2004 by System Administration.

Additionally, while there are obviously many programs in place across the State University for enhancing professional development, at both the system and campus levels, there is little systematic information available regarding the impact of these activities, which highlights the need for strategies that assess program effectiveness. A related concern specifically involves the level of resources currently being allocated for the purpose of enhancing faculty development and rewarding faculty accomplishments by System Administration and individual campuses. It may be reasonable to suggest that institutional

budgets commit a certain percentage of funding each year to professional development activities, using both SUNY and national benchmarks to determine appropriate funding levels.  Of course, given the fact that significant new monies are not likely to be coming into the University in the near term, it is important that a faculty development agenda be implemented in as cost-effective a manner as possible.  For example, while it is important for campuses to offer faculty development activities that meet the needs of all faculty, it would make sense for institutions to emphasize those activities that most closely match their faculty members' needs.  In addition, the structure of the University as well as the proximity that exists among many of its 64 institutions is conducive to the use of a consortium model in offering a faculty development program.  Finally, it would seem wise to use technology as much as possible in these endeavors, with the SUNY Learning Network an obvious place to start.

To conclude, the State University of New York has a long and rich tradition of acknowledging and rewarding faculty accomplishments, as well as promoting the professional and career development of its faculty.  It is highly appropriate at this point in time that representatives from System Administration, the University Faculty Senate, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, and campuses across SUNY work together to develop and implement a Faculty Development Initiative that will set the course in this critical area for the immediate future.   The creation and implementation of an effective and comprehensive faculty development plan, building on existing system and campus strengths and incorporating innovative practices, will necessarily strengthen the academic environment across the University as well as the ongoing development of its faculty and future academic leadership.

<div align="center">===</div>

*Appendices*

## APPENDIX A:  Provost's Advisory Task Force on Faculty Development

**CO-CHAIRS**

Robert Axelrod        Associate Professor of Speech, Rockland Community College; President, Faculty Council of Community Colleges (2002-03)

Joseph Hildreth       Professor of Art, College at Potsdam; President, University Faculty Senate

Anne Huot             Associate Provost, Doctoral Degree-granting Institutions, System Administration (2003-04)

Kimberley Reiser      Professor of Biology, Nassau Community College; Vice-President, Faculty Council of Community Colleges (2003-04)

Donald A. Steven      Executive Vice Provost, Office of Academic Affairs, System Administration (2002-03)

**MEMBERS**

Vincent Aceto         Distinguished Service Professor, School of Information Science, University at Albany; Chair, Committee on Faculty Development, University Faculty Senate

John Anderson         Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Alfred State College (2002-03)

Susan Bastable        Associate Professor of Nursing; Chair of the Undergraduate Program, Health Science Center at Syracuse

Ginette Chambers      Director of Faculty Awards and Development, Office of Academic Affairs, System Administration

Iris Cook            Professor and Chair of Biology, Westchester Community College

Carolyn Curtis        Vice President for Academic Affairs, Hudson Valley Community College; President of the SUNY Chief Academic Officers,

Lois DeFleur          President, Binghamton University

Jake Holden           Instructor of English, Fulton-Montgomery Community College

Jeffrey Johnston      Assistant Professor of Architectural Technology, Alfred State College

Carole Berotte Joseph   Dean of Academic Affairs, Dutchess Community College

Robert Jubenville     Professor of Life Science, Mohawk Valley Community College

Marvin LaHood         Distinguished Teaching Professor of English, Buffalo State College; Co-chair, Undergraduate Committee, University Faculty Senate

Gary Marotta          Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Buffalo State College

Catherine Regan       Research Associate, Institutional Research, System Administration

Theodore P. Skotnicki   Professor of Criminal Justice, Niagara County Community College (2003-04)

Debbie Sydow          President, Onondaga Community College

*The Need for Faculty Development Programs in Colleges and Universities*

There is much information to suggest that faculty development activity at colleges and universities across the nation has increased significantly in recent years. In part, this trend reflects changing faculty demographics, with Bland and Bergquist (1997) projecting that 50 percent of full-time faculty would be over the age of 55 by the year 2000, and 68 percent over 50. In addition, the tenure process can result in a relatively unchanging work force over time, bringing challenges with respect to keeping faculty enthused about their work. According to the United States Department of Education, a national study of postsecondary faculty in 1993 found that 92.8% of all institutional types award tenure and that 51.3% of all faculty members were tenured or in tenure track positions (National Center for Education Statistics; 1993). By 2000 the proportion of faculty who had received tenure had increased to 62.4% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). Faculty development is also necessary for younger faculty, as reported in a longitudinal study by Walker and Hale (1999), who found that even within three years all new faculty showed early signs of diminished vitality, a condition that would clearly not bode well for retention and advancement at their institutions.

The need for faculty development has also been stimulated to a great extent by changing conditions in higher education, including increasingly diverse student populations, heightened demands for accountability, the greater cost of human resources, increased utilization of new and part-time faculty, and the information/technology explosion (Kapp, Healy, Nellisen, Mihevc, deWinter Hebron, & Watt, 1996). In a recent survey conducted by UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) of a national sample of 33,785 faculty members at 378 colleges, universities, and community colleges, major findings included the fact that 67% reported that "keeping up with information technology" had proved to be a major source of stress within the past two years, with stress levels higher for female faculty and older faculty (The American College Teacher, 1999). Other commonly cited sources of stress included teaching load (62%), publishing demands (50%), and the review and promotion process (46%).

An examination of some of these issue—in particular faculty age, tenure status, academic rank, and retention—within SUNY is instructive. Table 1 provides age distributions for faculty at state-operated institutions for Fall 2003. As that table demonstrates, 8.3% of full-time instructional faculty members at those institutions were 65 years of age or older, meaning that these individuals will likely consider retirement in the near future. This percentage was higher at the doctoral degree-granting institutions (i.e., 10%), and lower at the comprehensive colleges (i.e., 7%) and the colleges of technology (i.e., 4.1%).

**Table 1**

**Faculty Age Distributions at All State-Operated Institutions and by Sector, Fall 2003**

| Sector | Percentage of Faculty by Age Group | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Under 30 | 31 – 40 | 41 - 50 | 51 - 60 | 61 - 64 | 65 - 70 | over 71 |
| **All State-Operated Institutions** | 2.2 | 19.1 | 28.6 | 32.9 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 2.3 |
| **Doctoral Institutions** | 2.3 | 19.8 | 29.0 | 30.6 | 8.2 | 7.0 | 3.0 |
| **Comprehensive Colleges** | 2.0 | 19.1 | 27.8 | 34.0 | 10.0 | 5.4 | 1.6 |
| **Technology Colleges** | 2.8 | 15.6 | 29.2 | 40.1 | 8.2 | 3.4 | 0.7 |

Over the next five years, however, 10% of the faculty at the comprehensive colleges will move into the 65+ age group, as will 8.2% of those at both the doctoral degree-granting institutions and the colleges of technology. Overall, within the next ten to fifteen years, the technology sector faces the largest potential loss of faculty to retirement, with 40.1% of their faculty in the 51 to 60 age group. By comparison, doctoral degree-granting institutions face the potential loss of 30.6% of their faculty to retirement within the next ten to fifteen years, while this percentage for the comprehensive sector is 34%.

At the other end of the continuum, it is also important to observe that in Fall 2003 over 21% of all full-time instructional faculty at the state-operated institutions were 40 years of age or younger, with these numbers not varying appreciably across sectors. Unfortunately, official data on faculty age at SUNY's community colleges are not available. Community college colleagues on the Task Force, however, expressed the strong belief that these institutions face the same challenges as their state-operated counterparts with respect to faculty age, an impression that is supported by national statistics for community colleges (e.g., National Center for Education Statistics, 1997; Palmer, 1999).

The issues of tenure status and faculty rank within SUNY at the present time also merit attention. As depicted below in Table 2, the percentage of tenured full-time faculty for Fall 2002 across all SUNY institutions was almost identical to the national average of 62.4% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002), with tenure rates significantly lower at the comprehensive and technology colleges compared to the doctoral institutions and community colleges. With respect to faculty rank, in Fall 2002 about a third of all full-time faculty held the rank of full professor, more than 25% were associate and assistant professors, around 8% were instructors, and almost 5% were classified as lecturers. Again, there were sector differences, with fewer full professors and more assistant professors at the comprehensive colleges and much more reliance on instructors at the community colleges. Collectively, this information indicates that there will be a continued need in the near future to provide support to assist faculty members as they strive to achieve tenure and be promoted, especially at comprehensive and technology colleges. It is also appropriate to suggest that faculty development strategies focusing on more established, senior faculty might be particularly useful at doctoral institutions and community colleges.

**Table 2**

**Tenure and Academic Rank Status at All SUNY Institutions and by Sector, Fall 2002**

| Sector | Percentage of Full-Time Faculty With Tenure and by Rank | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | With Tenure | Professor | Associate Professor | Assistant Professor | Instructors | Lecturers |
| **All Institutions** | 62.3 | 33.2 | 25.8 | 28.1 | 7.9 | 4.9 |
| **Doctoral Institutions** | 61.5 | 37.5 | 28.3 | 25.1 | 1.7 | 7.3 |
| **Comprehensive Colleges** | 54.8 | 26.9 | 29.6 | 33.5 | 1.5 | 8.5 |
| **Technology Colleges** | 54.6 | 31.2 | 28.2 | 30.8 | 7.6 | 2.2 |
| **Community Colleges** | 70.2 | 34.3 | 20.2 | 26.2 | 18.8 | .05 |

Finally, information exists to suggest that, overall, the SUNY system may not be faring well in its attempts to retain new faculty. Specifically, a comprehensive study of 370 tenure-track faculty who were hired at a state-operated campus in Fall 1994 revealed that, in 2001, 44% had not earned tenure and were no longer employed within SUNY. Although this quantitative analysis provides no insight into why these individuals had left their institutions, campuses expend significant resources in recruiting and hiring new

faculty, making improvement in these retention rates imperative and a major objective of a SUNY-wide Faculty Development Initiative.

## *Definitions and Historical Perspectives*

Alfano (1994) has offered a history of faculty development activity in higher education that, though specific to community colleges, appears also to reflect more general trends. According to Alfano, faculty development efforts prior to the 1970's focused little on professional growth, in fact resembling in-service training sessions such as those used in the K-12 systems. In the 1970's and 1980's, faculty development programs changed, to emphasize ways of improving student outcomes and maintaining institutional integrity. It was not until the 1990's that the purpose of these programs began to primarily reflect faculty needs and was seen as a way to transform these needs into growth opportunities, particularly in four areas: leadership, database management, diversified instruction and student services, and formalized faculty development.

Other changes in faculty development programs have taken place over time, with Gray, Diamond and Adam (1996) reporting that increasingly these programs were paying more attention to teaching and teaching-related activities, especially in research universities. Corresponding to this finding, Diamond (2002) noted the steady increase in resources being devoted by colleges and universities to faculty development endeavors as well as the growing tendency for responsibility for these endeavors to be located in offices higher in the institution's administrative structure, most often that of the chief academic officer.

The meaning of faculty development has also changed over time. In an early definition, Eble and McKeachie (1985) emphasized the role of faculty development in helping faculty members improve their competence as teachers and scholars, and Alstete (2000) offers a broad definition, stating that faculty development covers a wide range of activities that have as their overall goal the improvement of student learning.

For the most part today, however, definitions of faculty development are much more comprehensive and specific. In a common approach, Diamond (2002) identifies three components of faculty development that focus on very different areas. The first component is faculty-centered, which emphasizes the improvement of teaching skills, with the practice of peer review of teaching effectiveness a good example. A second component is instructional, or student-centered, with a focus on improving courses or curriculum: sample activities include course and syllabus design, evaluation of instruction and incorporation of technology. A third component, referred to as organizational, centers on the institutional structure of a campus and the way that structure serves to enhance teaching and learning: sample activities include workshops, seminars, and individual consultations between faculty and staff who are trained to assist in the instructional process. Diamond also expands upon the organizational component to include activities that serve to maximize institutional effectiveness, based on the reasoning that such maximization will naturally result in enhancement of the teaching and learning process. Sample activities include those that might normally be perceived as relating to faculty service to the institution, such as program implementation, other administrative duties, and participation in faculty governance.

Although the three components identified by Diamond (2002) focus on faculty development as it relates to maximizing teaching and learning, Alstete (2000) offers a fourth dimension which emphasizes faculty members' professional development, and involves enabling faculty members to obtain and enhance other job-related skills, such as in the areas of research and scholarship. Finally, Graf, Albright, and Wheeler (1992) discuss a personal dimension of faculty development activity; this dimension involves a more holistic approach, assisting faculty members in the enhancement of interpersonal skills and career planning and in the promotion of wellness.

*Mitigating Factors*

Diamond (2002) has observed that the particular form a faculty development program takes at a given institution will likely depend on characteristics of the institution, notably institution type and mission. Similarly, Wright (2002) points out that a seminal principle emerging from the earliest writings on faculty and instructional development is that these programs must match the culture and characteristics of a particular institution. One important variable is institution type, with much of the available literature focusing on community colleges. According to Alfano (1994), the focus of faculty development endeavors at community colleges is much more likely to reflect the changing needs of students compared to those in other institutional sectors. Foote (1996), in a review of faculty development programs at eight community colleges, found that these programs largely served the purpose of allowing professors to improve instructional material, keep abreast of new technology and methods, and network with colleagues. While faculty at research universities have historically been expected to demonstrate substantial scholarly productivity, Gray et al. (1996) found that increasingly these institutions are paying more attention to teaching in their faculty development programs, largely in response to the public's growing concern regarding the quality of instruction in such institutions.

More important than institution type, faculty characteristics are likely to shape a college's faculty development agenda. In particular, as noted by Sorcinelli (2002), faculty members have different needs at different stages of their careers and most of the activity related to this issue has focused on more senior faculty. According to Alstete (2000), post-tenure faculty development strategies can be classified as optional or required, with the former more likely to have positive outcomes. Examples of optional strategies include award programs specifically designed to encourage and motivate tenured faculty, fellowship programs, teaching projects, writing projects, teaching partnerships, and workshops and seminars. As reported by Alstete, optional programs have been linked to several positive outcomes, such as increased faculty productivity and student retention, at several institutions. In contrast, required post-tenure faculty development is usually part of a formal post-tenure review system consisting of the creation of a faculty development plan containing specific objectives for teaching, research, and service as well as a follow-up mechanism to ensure performance. In his review, Alstete warns against linking post-tenure faculty development systems to the post-tenure review process, since doing so inevitably links professional growth with the process of faculty evaluation.

Hornum (2002) provides an example of a highly successful post-tenure faculty development program at Drexel University, which sought to reinvigorate long-term senior faculty members by having them teach undergraduates in the context of learner-centered education. Faculty took part on a voluntary basis and received modest incentives including a small increase to their base salary, the opportunity to participate in workshops on revising syllabi and constructing teaching portfolios, subscriptions to publications like *The Teaching Professor* and travel to conferences.

*Characteristics of a Quality Faculty Development Program*

In recent years, the literature on faculty development strategies in higher education has yielded a number of specific recommendations institutions should follow if they intend to provide a faculty development program of high quality. Reflecting the fact that faculty members vary so much among themselves in terms of need, Sorcinelli (2002) suggests that faculty development strategies must address a range of needs and encompass as many faculty members as possible. Along these lines, Lees (2002) warns against conceptualizing faculty development programs that target less productive faculty or those who are having difficulties. According to this author, "Faculty development programs must be designed to help faculty—all faculty—improve performance. The notion that faculty development is only for poor performers will doom efforts for global improvement and will stigmatize faculty who seek to enhance performance" (p. 103).

Successful implementation of a comprehensive faculty development program will be enhanced if institutions seek out participation and input from a variety of faculty members, including tenured professors, and consult them in planning decisions (Sorcinelli, 1988). Alstete (2000) emphasizes the importance of involving chairpersons in planning faculty development programs because they are on the front line, handling travel approvals, course evaluations, sabbaticals and student complaints.

Sorcinelli (2002) has identified a set of activities that would be included in the ideal faculty development program, including: 1) Campus-wide workshops or informal seminars on teaching and learning; 2) Individual, confidential consultation services to allow faculty to assess what is going well in terms of teaching and what needs improvement; 3) Special programs for new and pre-tenure faculty, including orientations and mentoring, opportunities to get early, formative feedback on teaching, and ongoing seminars; 4) Special programs to encourage the engagement of senior faculty, including mentoring programs, and "master teacher" workshops; and 5) Targeted programs for disciplines and departments such as course and program assessment, teaching evaluation (by students, peers and supervisors), support for adjunct faculty, and leadership development programs for chairs. Sorcinelli also identified ten principles, highlighted below, to guide the development of faculty development programs in colleges in universities, based on his review of faculty development centers across the country:

---

### PRINCIPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE IN DEVELOPING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS (SORCINELLI, 2002)

- BUILD STAKEHOLDERS BY LISTENING TO ALL PERSPECTIVES, INCLUDING FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION, STAFF, AND STUDENTS.

- ENSURE EFFECTIVE PROGRAM LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT, IDEALLY BY HAVING A FULL-TIME DIRECTOR IN PLACE.

- EMPHASIZE FACULTY OWNERSHIP, ESPECIALLY BY RESPECTED FACULTY.

- CULTIVATE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITMENT, THROUGH BOTH BUDGET SUPPORT AND PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.

- DEVELOP GUIDING PRINCIPLES, CLEAR GOALS, AND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.

- STRATEGICALLY PLACE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM CENTRALLY WITHIN THE INSTITUTION'S ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, PREFERABLY WITH THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR REPORTING DIRECTLY TO THE CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER.

- OFFER A RANGE OF OPPORTUNITIES, BUT LEAD WITH STRENGTHS.

- ENCOURAGE COLLEGIALITY AND COMMUNITY.

- CREATE COLLABORATIVE SYSTEMS OF SUPPORT, JOINING FORCES WITH OTHER LIKELY UNITS (E.G., INFORMATION RESOURCES).

- PROVIDE CLEAR AND VISIBLE MEASURES OF RECOGNITION AND REWARD.

Finally, in recent years faculty development specialists have promoted the creation and maintenance of teaching portfolios in evaluating faculty members' performance in the classroom.  As the individual who deserves the most credit for introducing and elaborating upon this concept–especially in the faculty promotion and tenure processes–Seldin (1991) describes teaching portfolios as a means for faculty members to document teaching effectiveness in a self-reflective way.  Since that time, the utilization of teaching portfolios has grown exponentially in colleges and universities across the nation, and many authors have written on the multiple advantages of this approach.  For example, Zubizarreta (1994) argues that beginning teachers are likely to benefit, if only because the portfolio provides an opportunity for them to reflect on their teaching and clarify their philosophy, practices, and preferences.  Zubizarreta also maintains that the process of developing a portfolio is associated with a greater tendency to read about teaching, attend instructional development activities, and seek a mentor.

## REFERENCES

Alfano, K.  (1994). Recent strategies for faculty development.  ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, Los Angeles, CA.  Retrieved July 9, 2002, from the World Wide Web. http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed371807.html

Alstete, J.  (2000).  Post tenure faculty development: Building a system of faculty improvement and appreciation.  Eric Digests.  ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.  Retrieved June 5, 2002, from the World Wide Web. http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed440603.html

The American College Teacher.  National norms 1998-1999:  HERI faculty survey report.  Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Bland, C. J., & Bergquist, W. H.  (1997).  The vitality of senior faculty members. Snow on the roof-fire in the furnace.  Eric Digests.  ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, George Washington University, Washington, D.C. Retrieved July 10, 2002, from the World Wide Web. http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed415733.html

Diamond, R. M.  (2002).  Faculty, instructional, and organizational development: Options and choices.  In Gillespie, K. H., Hilsen, L. R., & Wadsworth, E. C.  (Eds.),  A guide to faculty development (pp. 2-8).  Bolton, MA:  Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Eble, K.E., & McKeachie, W. J.  (1985).  Improving undergraduate education through faculty development: An analysis of effective programs and practices.  San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Foote, E. (1996).  Faculty development in community colleges.  Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 20 (1), 89-93.

Graf, D. L., Albright, M. J., & Wheeler, D. W.  (1992).  Faculty development's role in improving undergraduate education. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 51,  101-109.

Gray, P. J., Diamond, R.M. , & Adam, B. E.  (1996).  A national study on the relative importance of research and undergraduate teaching at colleges and universities.  Syracuse:  Syracuse University Center for Instructional Development.

Hornum, B.  (2002).    Transforming post-tenure review into faculty, department head, and departmental renewal.  In Licata, C. M., & Morreale, J. C.  (Eds.),  Post-tenure review and renewal (pp. 155-163). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Kapp, C., Healy, M., Nellisen, C., Mihevc, B., deWinter Hebron, C. & Watt, H. (1996). Developing faculty developers: Some issues when recruiting new faculty developers and ensuring the professional growth of current faculty developers. The Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development, 13 (4), 229-239.

Lees, N. D. (2002). The evolution of post-tenure review at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. In Licata, C. M., & Morreale, J. C. (Eds.), Post-tenure review and renewal (pp. 97-110). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1993). National study of postsecondary faculty. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). National study of postsecondary faculty. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). National study of postsecondary faculty. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Palmer, J. C. (1999). Part-time faculty at community colleges: A national profile. NEA 1999 Almanac of Higher Education, 45-53.

Seldin, P. (1991). The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1988). Encouraging excellence: Long-range planning for faculty development. In E. C. Wadsworth (Ed.), A handbook for new practitioners (pp.27-34). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (2002). Ten principles of good practice in creating and sustaining teaching and learning centers. In Gillespie, K. H., Hilsen, L. R., & Wadsworth, E. C. (Eds.). A guide to faculty development (pp. 9-23). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Walker, C. J., & Hale, N. (1999). Faculty well-being and vitality. In Menges, R. (Ed.), Faculty in new jobs (pp. 216-239). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wright, D. L. (2002). Program types and prototypes. In Gillespie, K. H., Hilsen, L. R., & Wadsworth, E. C. (Eds.). A guide to faculty development (pp. 24-34). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Zubizarreta, J. (1994). Teaching portfolios and the beginning teacher. Phi Delta Kappan, 323-326.

**APPENDIX C:  Faculty Development Surveys Administered To Campuses**

*Faculty Development Survey, Summer 2002*

During the Fall 2002 semester the Provost's Office, working with the University Faculty Senate and the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, will establish a task force for the purposes of examining the broad range of activities related to faculty development across the State University and making recommendations for supporting those activities.  It is hoped that this initiative will provide insight into those factors that are key to keeping faculty engaged in teaching and learning and, ultimately, to retaining the best qualified and most highly motivated faculty possible.

In preparation, a research group is compiling and synthesizing information on issues relevant to faculty development across and synthesizing information on issues relevant to faculty development across the State University.  We are especially interested in identifying best practices that have been implemented on campuses in order to support faculty and their professional growth.  You can assist this effort significantly by answering the following questions and sending your response directly to me via e-mail, **no later than Monday, July 8**.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation in this important matter.

1.  How does your campus support scholarship, research, teaching, and other professional development opportunities for your faculty?

2.  Describe initiatives your campus has implemented in an attempt to promote the ongoing intellectual, scholarly, and professional development of your faculty.

3.  Do you have formal mentoring programs in place for junior faculty?  If so, please Describe.

4.  Do you have programs in place for recognizing and rewarding faculty accomplishments?  If so, please describe.

5.  Does your campus provide opportunities that allow your faculty to pursue advanced credentials?  If so, please describe.  Also, if your campus provides actual financial support for these activities, please describe as specifically as possible (e.g., dollar amount, percentage of tuition).

6.  Describe any mechanisms you have in place for providing faculty with guidance regarding the reappointment, tenure, and promotion processes.

*Faculty Development Survey, Spring 2003*

As you know, the University Faculty Senate, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, and the Office of the Provost have jointly established a task force for the purposes of examining the broad range of activities related to faculty development across the State University and making recommendations for supporting those activities. It is hoped that this initiative will provide insight into those factors that are key to keeping faculty engaged in teaching and learning and, ultimately, to retaining the best qualified and most highly motivated faculty possible.

The Task Force has now met twice and is in the process of discussing these issues in greater detail. We are especially interested in identifying best practices that have been implemented on campuses in order to support faculty and their professional growth.

**You can assist this effort significantly by answering the following questions and sending your response directly to me by fax at (518) 443-5657, no later than Monday, March 17.**

Thanks so much.

Donald Steven
Associate Provost
Head, Office of Academic Affairs

on behalf of the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Faculty Development:

Robert Axelrod, President, Faculty Council of Community Colleges (co-chair)
Joseph Hildreth, President, University Faculty Senate (co-chair)

*Faculty Development Questionnaire, Spring 2003*

*Type of Institution*

**doctoral degree-granting** ————

**comprehensive college** ————

**college of technology or specialized college** ————

**community college** ————

**I.** **Teaching**

1. What programs, activities, methods and tools are available to help faculty develop a repertoire of teaching skills?

2. How are opportunities to improve teaching skills communicated to the faculty on your campus?

3. What incentives are offered by your campus to encourage faculty to take advantage of opportunities to improve their teaching effectiveness?

4. What criteria exist at your institution for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching?

5. What source of support is available to assist faculty in developing and enhancing pedagogical skills via the use, management and integration of the newest technologies?

**II.** **Scholarship and Research**

1. Does your campus have a clear institutional goal regarding scholarship/research and is it tied in to faculty development process? How?

2. Does your campus have a process by which faculty could be guided for the evaluation of scholarship and research as part of faculty development? If so, explain.

3. How does each academic unit on your campus develop and disseminate to faculty the criteria for evaluating scholarship and creative research?

4. How are faculty scholarship and research tied to the mission and goals of your campus?

5. Is the scholarship and research component of faculty development viewed as an instrument for institutional change? In what way?

6. What opportunities, resources and incentives are available for scholarship and research as part of the faculty development process on your campus?

7. To what extent does your campus recognize faculty involvement in such activities as curriculum development, pedagogy, assessment, learning theory, and program review as scholarly endeavors? (Specifically for community colleges)

*III.* *Service*

1. What expectations does your campus have of faculty for service on campus and in the community?

2. What resources does your campus have available to allow for service opportunities on campus and in the community?

3. What leadership opportunities does your campus encourage and support for faculty?

4. In what ways are faculty given the opportunity and encouragement for community outreach activities by which their expertise and leadership talents can be used?

5. What opportunities do faculty have to coordinate special projects and events on your campus?

6. In what ways and to what extent do faculty get involved with student organizations?

7. Are faculty encouraged or required to assume a mentorship role of other faculty? If so, in what capacity?

*IV.* *Governance*

1. In what ways are faculty encouraged to developing an understanding of the structure, policy, and procedures of faculty governance, and to develop their governance skills?

*V.* *Intellectual Climate on Campus*

1. In what ways does your campus endeavor to improve the intellectual climate of the institution?

*VI.* *Leadership and management-related skills*

1. In what ways does your campus support the development of leadership skills for faculty?

2. In what ways does your campus support the development of management skills for faculty, including strategic and budgetary skills and conflict management?

*VII.* *General Awareness of Opportunities*

1a. Which of the following professional opportunities are you aware that your campus offers?

- ☐ Sabbatical leaves
- ☐ Title F leaves
- ☐ Research Capital Equipment Support Program (doctoral degree granting institutions)
- ☐ Non-doctoral research support programs (comprehensive colleges/colleges of technology)
- ☐ Employee tuition waiver programs (state-ops)
- ☐ Employee tuition support (community colleges)

- Conversation in the Disciplines programs
- Faculty mentoring programs on your campus
- Leadership development programs on your campus
- National Institute for Leadership Development Programs
- Great Teachers Conferences
- Workshops/conferences sponsored by the Institute for Community College Development
- Faculty development conferences and workshops

1b. Which of the programs listed above have you been directly involved with?

- Sabbatical leaves
- Title F leaves
- Research Capital Equipment Support Program (doctoral degree granting institutions)
- Non-doctoral research support programs (comprehensive colleges/colleges of technology)
- Employee tuition waiver programs (state-ops)
- Employee tuition support (community colleges)
- Conversation in the Disciplines programs
- Faculty mentoring programs on your campus
- Leadership development programs on your campus
- National Institute for Leadership Development Programs
- Great Teachers Conferences
- Workshops/conferences sponsored by the Institute for Community College Development
- Faculty development conferences and workshops

2a. Approximately how many faculty on your campus are pursuing an advanced degree or further professional credential?

2b. How many full-time faculty in your estimation would like to pursue an advanced degree or professional credential given greater opportunity to do so?

3. Does you campus actively and substantively support faculty wishing to pursue advanced academic and/or professional credentials? What form does this support take? Is the support offered through informal arrangements or addressed in formal policy? Please indicate the nature and extent of tuition support, leave, released time, flexible scheduling, etc.

4. What impediments have you experienced or do you perceive in supporting faculty development in this way? Both on your campus and in the participant's program?

5.  What flexibility and/or accommodation on the part of senior SUNY institutions do you think would be required to support faculty pursuing advanced credentials?

## VIII.  *Recognition and Reward*

*Campus-level programs*

The Chancellor's Awards for Excellence (Librarianship, Professional Service, Scholarship and Creative Activities and Teaching) and the Distinguished Faculty ranks (Distinguished Librarianship, Distinguished Professorship, Distinguished Service Professorship and Distinguished Teaching Professorship) were created to provide system-wide recognition and reward.

1.  Does your campus have programs in place for recognizing and rewarding faculty accomplishment besides those described above?  If so, please describe them.

### Other areas of meriting recognition

2.  The programs noted above describe system-wide recognition and rewards in several areas. Are there other areas of faculty involvement that merit such system-wide recognition (for example, nominating faculty for national honors, greater involvement of faculty in peer review and policy-making panels at the national level, etc.)?

### Faculty roles in enhancing the academic agenda

The contributions of individuals holding Distinguished Faculty rank and other noted scholars are integral to sustaining intellectual vibrancy on our campuses.

3.  In what capacities are these individuals called upon to contribute to your campus's academic enterprise?

4.  In your opinion, how could these individuals be further involved in enhancing SUNY's and the campus's academic agenda? (for instance, presentations on teaching, scholarship and service; involvement as mentors to new or junior faculty; and sharing of faculty expertise on other SUNY campuses, etc.)

### National awards

5.  Would the creation and dissemination of a listing of national awards, their nomination deadlines, and their selection and eligibility criteria be helpful?

## IX.  *Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Process*

1.  Does your campus have a clear set of policies and procedures for faculty reappointment, tenure and promotion?

2.  Does your campus have a faculty reappointment, tenure and promotion committee to review the process on a periodic basis? If so, who comprises this committee? How often do they conduct their review?

3.  Are your campus reappointment, tenure and promotion policy and procedure guidelines contractual?

4. Are all new faculty apprised of these policies and procedures? How are they made aware of them?

5. Do your campus reappointment, tenure and promotion policy and procedure guidelines include a provision for mentoring new faculty?

6. Is there a person(s) in each department or division who reviews the progress of faculty on an annual basis? Who would that be?

7. Does your campus provide opportunities and resources to assist faculty in meeting requirements for reappointment, tenure and promotion?

8. What percentage of faculty does not receive tenure at the time of their eligibility (assuming they submit their application)? Why?

9. What percentage of faculty does not receive promotion at the time of their eligibility (assuming they submit their application)? Why?

10. In general, most reappointment, tenure and promotion policy and procedure guidelines are broken down into the rubrics: "Teaching Effectiveness," "Scholarship and Research," and "Service" to the campus and/or community. How are each of these criteria weighted at your campus?

11. How is "Teaching Effectiveness" determined?

☐ Direct observation of the candidate's teaching by the reappointment, tenure and promotion review committee?

☐ Direct observation of the candidate's teaching by the candidate's department chair or dean?

☐ A review of the candidate's students' work?

☐ Course Evaluation Forms

☐ Other

12. How is "Scholarship and Research" determined?

☐ Direct review of the candidate's scholarship and research by the reappointment, tenure and promotion review committee?

☐ Direct review of the candidate's scholarship and research by the candidate's department chair or dean?

☐ External review of the candidate's scholarship and research by experts in the discipline?

☐ Letters of support from external experts in the discipline solicited by the reappointment, tenure and promotion review committee?

☐ Other

13. How is "Service" determined?

14. Are untenured faculty included on your campus' reappointment, tenure and promotion review committee?

15. Are students included on your campus' reappointment, tenure and promotion review committee?

16. In addition to the departmental reappointment, tenure and promotion review committee, do you have a campus-wide reappointment, tenure and promotion review committee? If so, what is its relationship to the departmental committee and what is its responsibility?

*Faculty Development Survey, Spring 2004*

To:     Chief Academic Officers
        Campus Governance Leaders

From:   Co-Chairs, Provost's Advisory Task Force on Faculty Development
        Anne Huot
        Joseph Hildreth
        Kimberly Rieser

---

As you know, the University Faculty Senate, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges and the Office of the Provost are working together through an Advisory Task Force on Faculty Development for the purposes of examining the broad range of activities related to faculty development across the State University and making recommendations for supporting those activities.

On behalf of the Task Force Members, we write to ask your help in gathering additional data. Last Spring we distributed a survey with a number of questions aimed at identifying best practices that have been implemented on campuses in order to support faculty and their professional growth. Since that time, the Task Force has met twice to review the responses that will form the basis of our report. Although several campuses responded to the survey, the rate of response was not optimal and varied across the University Sectors.

In order to insure that the Task Force's recommendations are based on a broad cross-section of our campuses, we have developed a shorter survey focused on those areas where we believe a greater response rate is needed. We ask that the Chief Academic Officers and the Campus Governance Leaders work together and submit a single response. We would greatly appreciate receiving a response to this condensed survey from every campus. You are encouraged to complete the survey and submit it electronically to Anne Huot at huotan@sysadm.suny.edu

We are appreciative of the many pulls on your time and thank you in advance for helping us insure that our report reflects the broadest possible data. We would appreciate hearing from you by March 1st.

Attachment

Faculty Development Initiative
Follow up Survey

**I.      Type of Institution**
     doctoral degree-granting                                     ——

     comprehensive college                                         ——

     college of technology or specialized college        ——

     community college                                             ——

**II.      Teaching**

The data gathered from the original survey suggest that there is evidence that all sectors offer some degree of support to learn how to develop and implement instructional technology to enhance teaching and learning.

Do you have program in place for the mentoring of faculty and for the development of pedagogical skills?

□ Yes            □ No

Is the program formal or informal?

Please provide a brief description.

What incentives are in place to encourage faculty to take advantage of opportunities to improve their teaching effectiveness? – Check all that apply.
□ Course load reductions                     □ Grants
□ Leaves – sabbaticals or other study leaves     □ Extra compensation/stipends
□ Other – Please describe briefly below:

**III.      Scholarship and Research**

Nearly all of the responding campuses to the original survey indicated that there are stated goals and cultural expectations that faculty will engage in scholarship and research.

Do you have stated goals and cultural expectations for faculty to engage in scholarship and research?
     □      Yes                    □ No

What opportunities exist, resources and incentives, as part of the faculty development process on your campus?   Check all that apply

□ Grants (study/travel)        □ Course load reductions
□ Extra compensation/stipends   □ Teaching Assistants
Assistance with:  □ publications         □ grant writing/submission
□ Seminars/Institutes                 □ Mentoring/partnerships with senior faculty
□ Other **-** Please provide a brief description.

*IV.*     *Community and Professional Service*

Please provide a brief over-view of the service expectations for faculty on your campus.  Also, describe any incentives your institution offers faculty for fulfilling service obligations.

*V.*     *Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure*

Do you have a clearly defined set of guidelines in place that define the College's expectations and requirements, as well as a synopsis of the processes and measures used by departmental and college-wide promotion and tenure and other review committees?

How are these expectations communicated to the faculty member?  Check all that apply.
□ Faculty Handbooks            □Written departmental guidelines          □ Web Pages

□ As part of faculty orientation            □ Other – Please describe below:

At what intervals do such communications occur?

Does your campus provide opportunities and resources to assist faculty in meeting requirements for reappointment, tenure and promotion?  Please describe.

Relatively, how are "Teaching Effectiveness", "Scholarship and Research", and "Service" weighted in the evaluation process?

How is "Teaching Effectiveness" evaluated? (Check all that apply)

- ☐   Direct observation of the candidate's teaching by the reappointment, tenure and promotion review committee.

- ☐   Direct observation of the candidate's teaching by the candidate's department chair or dean.

- ☐   A review of the candidate's students' work.

- ☐   Course Evaluation Forms

- ☐   Other – please describe below.

How is "Scholarship and Research" evaluated? (Check all that apply)

- ☐   Direct review of the candidate's scholarship and research by the reappointment, tenure and promotion review committee.

- ☐   Direct review of the candidate's scholarship and research by the candidate's department chair or dean.

- ☐   External review of the candidate's scholarship and research by experts in the discipline.

- ☐   Letters of support from external experts in the discipline solicited by the reappointment, tenure and promotion review committee.

- ☐   Other – please describe below

How is "Service" performance evaluated?

Regarding the formal reappointment, promotion and tenure process, please describe the various levels of review (i.e. departmental, external, etc.).

## VI.    *Administrative Support and Structure*

Do you have a designated person(s) who is responsible for the faculty development program on your campus?  If so, please indicate their title.

Does this individual fulfill these responsibilities on a full- or part-time basis?

Is the individual a faculty member?

Does the individual receive a stipend and/or released time?

How is this function supported (i.e. staff, budget, etc.)?

What is the nature of the responsibility?

# APPENDIX D: Summary of Campus Responses – Spring 2004 Survey

| Sector | Teaching | Scholarship/Research | R/P/T | Faculty Evaluation | Administrative Support |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Doctoral Institutions** <br><br> **(4/8 institutions responding)** | *Mentoring program*: <br> Yes – 4   No – 0 <br> Formal – 2    Informal – 2 <br><br> *Incentives*: Yes – 4   No – 0 <br> Course load reductions – 2 <br> Leaves – 1 <br> Grants – 2 <br> Compensation/stipends – 1 | *Research expectations*: <br> Yes – 4    No – 0 <br><br><br> *Incentives*: Yes – 4        No – 0 <br> Grants (study/travel) – 3 <br> Course load reductions – 3 <br> Compensation/stipends – 2 <br> Teaching assistants – 3 <br> Seminars/institutes – 1 <br> Mentoring by senior faculty – 3 <br> Assistance with: <br>     Publications – 2 <br>     Grants – 4 | *Clear guidelines*: <br> Yes – 4   No – 0 <br><br> *How communicated*: <br> Faculty handbook – 4 <br> Written guidelines – 3 <br> Web pages – 3 <br> Faculty orientation – 3 <br><br> *Frequency of communication*: <br> Annual – 1 <br> Each semester – 1 <br><br> *Assistance provided*: <br> Yes – 4    No – 0 | *Teaching effectiveness*: <br> Observation by RTP committee – 2 <br> Observation by chair/dean – 2 <br> Review of students' work – 2 <br> CTE's – 4 <br><br> *Scholarship/research*: <br> Review by RTP committee – 4 <br> Review by chair/dean – 4 <br> External review – 4 <br> External letters of support – 3 | *Designated person*: <br> Yes – 0   No – 4 <br><br> Full-time – <br> Part-time – <br> Faculty: <br>     Yes –   No – <br> Stipend: <br>     Yes –   No – <br> Released time: <br>     Yes –    No – |
| **Comprehensive Colleges** <br><br> **(8/13 institutions responding)** | *Mentoring program*: <br> Yes – 7   No – 1 <br> Formal – 5    Informal – 2 <br><br> *Incentives*: Yes – 7   No – 0 <br> Course load reductions – 0 <br> Leaves – 7 <br> Grants – 6 <br> Compensation/stipends – 2 | *Research expectations*: <br> Yes – 8    No – 0 <br><br><br> *Incentives*: Yes – 8        No – 0 <br> Grants (study/travel) – 8 <br> Course load reductions – 3 <br> Compensation/stipends – 3 <br> Teaching assistants – 2 <br> Seminars/institutes – 6 <br> Mentoring by senior faculty – 4 <br> Assistance with: <br>     Publications – 2 <br>     Grants – 7 | *Clear guidelines*: <br> Yes – 7   No – 1 <br><br> *How communicated*: <br> Faculty handbook – 6 <br> Written guidelines – 2 <br> Web pages – 4 <br> Faculty orientation – 7 <br><br> *Frequency of communication*: <br> Annual – 3 <br><br> *Assistance provided*: <br> Yes – 7    No – 1 | *Teaching effectiveness*: <br> Observation by RTP committee – 3 <br> Observation by chair/dean – 6 <br> Review of students' work – 3 <br> CTE's – 8 <br><br> *Scholarship/research*: <br> Review by RTP committee – 6 <br> Review by chair/dean – 8 <br> External review – 1 <br> External letters of support – 1 | *Designated person*: <br> Yes – 3   No – 5 <br><br> Full-time – 1 <br> Part-time – 2 <br> Faculty: <br>     Yes – 3  No – 0 <br> Stipend: <br>     Yes – 3  No – 0 <br> Released time: <br>     Yes - 3   No – 0 |

| Sector | Teaching | Scholarship/Research | R/P/T | Faculty Evaluation | Administrative Support |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Technology Colleges** <br><br> **(5/8 institutions responding)** | *Mentoring program*: <br> Yes – 3   No – 2 <br> Formal – 1   Informal – 2 <br><br> *Incentives*:  Yes – 4   No – 1 <br> Course load reductions – 3 <br> Leaves – 4 <br> Grants – 4 <br> Compensation/stipends – 0 | *Research expectations*: <br> Yes – 2     No – 3 <br><br><br> *Incentives*:  Yes – 5       No – 0 <br> Grants (study/travel) – 5 <br> Course load reductions – 3 <br> Compensation/stipends – 0 <br> Teaching assistants – 0 <br> Seminars/institutes – 2 <br> Mentoring by senior faculty – 1 <br> Assistance with: <br>     Publications – 1 <br>     Grants – 4 | *Clear guidelines*: <br> Yes – 5     No – 0 <br><br> *How communicated*: <br> Faculty handbook – 5 <br> Written guidelines – 2 <br> Web pages – 2 <br> Faculty orientation – 4 <br><br> *Frequency of communication*: <br> Annual – 3 <br><br> *Assistance provided*: <br> Yes – 4   No – 1 | *Teaching effectiveness*: <br> Observation by RTP committee – 2 <br> Observation by chair/dean – 5 <br> Review of students' work – 4 <br> CTE's – 5 <br><br> *Scholarship/research*: <br> Review by RTP committee – 3 <br> Review by chair/dean – 3 <br> External review – 0 <br> External letters of support – 0 | *Designated person*: <br> Yes – 3   No – 2 <br><br> Full-time – 0 <br> Part-time – 3 <br> Faculty: <br>     Yes – 1   No – 2 <br> Stipend: <br>     Yes - 0   No – 3 <br> Released time: <br>     Yes – 0   No – 3 |
| **Community Colleges** <br><br> **(15/30 institutions responding)** | *Mentoring program*: <br> Yes – 14   No – 1 <br> Formal – 8   Informal – 6 <br><br> *Incentives*:  Yes – 14  No – 1 <br> Course load reductions – 6 <br> Leaves – 10 <br> Grants – 6 <br> Compensation/stipends – 8 | *Research expectations*: <br> Yes – 10    No – 5 <br><br> *Incentives*:  Yes – 15     No – 0 <br> Grants (study/travel) – 11 <br> Course load reductions – 4 <br> Compensation/stipends – 6 <br> Teaching assistants –  0 <br> Seminars/institutes – 9 <br> Mentoring by senior faculty – 9 <br> Assistance with: <br>     Publications – 1 <br>     Grants – 9 | *Clear guidelines*: <br> Yes – 15    No – 0 <br><br> *How communicated*: <br> Faculty handbook – 9 <br> Written guidelines – 4 <br> Web pages – 1 <br> Faculty orientation – 7 <br><br> *Frequency of communication*: <br> Annual – 7 <br><br> *Assistance provided*: <br> Yes – 13     No – 2 | *Teaching effectiveness*: <br> Observation by RTP committee – 7 <br> Observation by chair/dean – 13 <br> Review of students' work – 4 <br> CTE's – 15 <br><br> *Scholarship/research*: <br> Review by RTP committee – 5 <br> Review by chair/dean – 5 <br> External review – 1 <br> External letters of support – 2 | *Designated person*: <br> Yes – 6   No – 9 <br><br> Full-time – 2 <br> Part-time – 4 <br> Faculty: <br>     Yes – 5   No – 1 <br> Stipend: <br>     Yes – 0   No – 4 <br> Released time: <br>     Yes – 3   No – 3 |

**APPENDIX E: Task Force Recommendations**

1. Faculty development efforts should be led by a distinguished and respected faculty member clearly charged with the responsibility for providing vision, leadership and coordination to these efforts.

2. Each campus should establish a Teaching and Learning Center to coordinate activities that support the enhancement of effective pedagogy and student learning.

3. Establish clear institutional expectations for faculty research and creative activity based on institutional mission and provide appropriate support, mentoring and feedback.

4. Establish clear institutional expectations, definitions, and incentives for faculty service, especially at institutions in which this activity plays a significant role in faculty personnel decisions.

5. Each SUNY campus should post information about professional development activities on its Web site.

6. SUNY System Administration should develop a SUNY-wide teaching and learning resource electronic portal (E-portal) system.

7. Ensure that every new faculty hire is given, at the earliest opportunity, a complete understanding of the reappointment, promotion and tenure process.

8. Provide periodic follow-up sessions on the reappointment, promotion and tenure process on a regular basis, especially for more junior faculty members and make every effort to provide them with the necessary tools and resources for professional success.

9. Establish a peer mentoring culture to ensure that every junior faculty member has an informal, easily accessible and confidential advisor/counselor.

10. From the onset of employment, junior faculty should be provided with timely, specific and detailed formative feedback regarding their performance.

11. Junior faculty should be informed of the importance of developing, and regularly updating, a teaching portfolio, the expected contents of which should be clearly specified.

12. Reappointment, promotion and tenure committees should consist only of tenured faculty, unless campus circumstances require otherwise.

13. Expand distinguished faculty rank to include faculty at the community colleges.

14. Implement local faculty and staff recognition programs on campuses where none currently exist.

15. Ensure that university-wide and local campus recognition and reward programs are available online and easily accessible.

16. Recognize and honor at the campus level those faculty who have received significant honors or awards.

17. SUNY System Administration should establish an honors database in order to inform the suny community of the availability of prestigious national and international awards and to identify SUNY faculty who have received significant honors or awards.

18. Campuses should actively promote faculty award winners as campus leaders, utilizing them as appropriate to serve as mentors for junior faculty, participate in professional development workshops and presentations, serve on presidential advisory councils, serve on committees that select distinguished faculty and excellence award winners, and enhance the visibility of the campus in the community.

19. SUNY System Administration should actively promote faculty award winners as system leaders, promoting them as visiting lectureres to other campuses, involving them in SUNY endeavors in national and international initiatives, and using their expertise in important SUNY-wide initiatives (e.g., general education assessment, teacher education).