

Report of the Steering Committee
to Facilitate the Scholarly Activities
of the Faculty

Carl R. Adams
Elizabeth S. Blake
Mario F. Bognanno
Richard S. Caldecott
Jack C. Merwin, chair
Anne D. Pick
Ann M. Pflaum, ex officio
Richard E. Poppele
Donald C. Rasmusson
Betty W. Robinett
John E. Turner
John R. Wallace

December, 1983

University of Minnesota

Enhancing the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Part I: Structuring the Charge	3
Part II: Relevant Existing Policies	6
Part III: Survey of Faculty Views	12
Part IV: Recommendations	17
Endnotes	23
Appendices:	
A: The Faculty Survey	24
A-1: Faculty Survey--Statistical Overview	29
A-2: Proposals from the Survey	32
B: Selected Sources	36
C: Evaluation of the Joint Administration/Senate Study Mechanism	43

INTRODUCTION

Nurturing a scholarly environment that is conducive to the intellectual satisfaction and professional growth of the faculty is always a challenge, particularly so in these uncertain times. A scholarly environment requires that an institution be able to attract and retain superior scholars and provide the facilities, support, resources, and working conditions needed for intellectual stimulation and sustained productivity. Faculty members do their most imaginative teaching, innovative research, and useful service when they feel valued and have confidence in the future. Moreover, it is clear that a favorable environment for scholarship usually translates into excellence for the educational experiences of students.

A decade of limited resources generated by external events has impaired that environment at the University of Minnesota and has had a serious effect on faculty morale. The faculty has not only experienced a decline in research facilities and support services but also has suffered an erosion of about 20 percent in their real income while the real income dollars of other workers in the state has increased. These setbacks have had a serious impact at the University. The respect, trust, appreciation, and recognition which helps bolster the spirit of members of the scholarly community is affected. These vital elements must be restored and nurtured if the University expects to retain the kind of faculty that should be associated with a major teaching and research university.

This study of ways to enhance scholarly activities originated in the spring of 1981 when the Steering Committee to Facilitate the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty was established by the joint actions of President C. Peter Magrath

and Professor Marcia Eaton, representing the Senate Consultative Committee. The rationale for the appointment of such a committee was the conviction that specific kinds of policy issues are more likely to be addressed, implemented, and monitored if the faculty and the administration jointly accept responsibility for any actions that are recommended. The charge to the Steering Committee was fourfold: 1) to analyze the demography of the current University faculty; 2) to determine what specific studies should be undertaken; 3) to examine barriers to utilizing sabbatical opportunities, and 4) to identify impediments that prevent accomplishment of personal goals for scholarly activities and propose methods for removing them.

The recommendations of the Committee were developed on the basis of a review of existing University policies and practices; a review of policies and practices at other institutions; a review of relevant scholarly research by faculty at this institution and elsewhere; and the results of two surveys of the University faculty--one on the subject of leaves and sabbaticals and one on the general question of how to facilitate scholarly activity.

The report which follows is in four parts. The first describes how the Committee structured its charge; the second discusses relevant existing policies and procedures; the third describes the views of University faculty obtained through its survey; and the fourth contains specific recommendations. Three appendices accompany the report. Appendix A consists of a copy of the faculty survey as well as tables based on the results of the survey and specific suggestions made by University faculty members; Appendix B consists of a guide to sources useful to the Committee in preparing its report; and Appendix C contains an evaluation of the concept of a study jointly sponsored by the Senate and the administration.¹

PART I

STRUCTURING THE CHARGE

A Definition of Faculty Vitality

One of the first tasks facing the Steering Committee was to come to a working definition of its charge: enhancing the scholarly activities of the faculty. A number of points were apparent to the Steering Committee as it addressed this task.

First, the subject must be considered from a number of perspectives because it is influenced by a broad spectrum of University policies. For example, there are relevant policies related to salary, recognition and reward, communication, time for research and reflection, academic freedom, tenure and adequate support.

A second dimension of the complex subject of enhancing scholarly activity relates to the fact that different disciplines have different needs at any given point in time. For example, in some disciplines, travel, research, and support funds are more readily available and provide incentives to the pursuit of scholarly research and teaching while in other departments and disciplines the relative lack of such funds provides a serious impediment to scholarly activity.

A third factor relates to age and academic status. Young faculty members may need support and guidance that can be provided by senior colleagues. Mid-career faculty may benefit more from opportunities for travel and interaction with colleagues at other institutions. The more mature among the faculty may find that opportunities for consulting and interactions beyond the academy are particularly salutary.

In spite of the complexity of the subject, the Steering Committee found that it was possible to come to a working understanding of the issues related to the topic and to agree to a definition of it. A useful definition of faculty vitality appears in a Planning Council paper which was prepared to suggest the pursuit of this topic as a legitimate focus of institutional research--research that would be carried out jointly on behalf of the University administration and the Senate. That definition of faculty vitality is:

The faculty is vital if it exhibits sustained productivity in its teaching, its research, and its service activities. Productivity is characterized not by quantity of output, but by the quality of these outputs as judged by faculty peers. A faculty is vital if it is continually creating important, new knowledge, and expanding our understanding of the world in which we live. A faculty is vital if the instructional programs of the University are continually being monitored and being developed. A faculty is vital if there is balance between innovation and traditional approaches to teaching and research. The University faculty is vital if it is responding to the needs of the state, the nation, and the world for new knowledge. On occasion, this vitality is recognized through awards and prizes for scholarship. Perhaps most important, a faculty is vital if its members find their work stimulating, enjoyable, and satisfying.²

Structuring the Task

In seeking to determine direction and priorities for its work, the Committee consulted with a number of individuals in the University of Minnesota. Meetings were held with Professor Marcia Eaton, then chair of the Senate Consultative Committee; Professor Arthur Williams, then chair of the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs; and Vice President Nils Hasselmo, who had been designated as the administrative contact person for the project. In addition, interviews with Harold Bernard (director, Employee Benefits); David J. Berg (director, Management Planning and Information Services); and Ann M. Bailly (Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs) provided information regarding existing policies and practices related to the subject of enhancing

scholarly activities

In structuring its approach to this assignment, the Committee came to a number of conclusions.

1) Recommendations from this Steering Committee should consider policy needs at all administrative levels. If construed in a narrow sense, the Committee might have attempted to focus only on issues directly related to the University Senate or the administration. Such a perspective was rejected as inappropriately limiting and one which would not do justice to the complexities of the subject under investigation.

2) While this report puts forward some broad recommendations, they must be interpreted in a flexible manner and it is critical that those responsible for implementing a recommendation must consider its appropriateness for the existing circumstances. Thus a recommendation which might fit quite appropriately the circumstances of one department, might be inappropriate for the circumstances of another.

3) If a subject related to the Committee's charge was being taken up through some other University study or inquiry, this Committee would not attempt to duplicate that work. Two such issues that were thus treated cursorily by this Committee were faculty salaries and the University faculty retirement plan.

4) In addition to the Committee informing itself on recent research into the subject of scholarly vitality and organizational development, it would be important to ascertain faculty views directly. Accordingly, a survey of the faculty was conducted by the Committee.

PART II

RELEVANT EXISTING POLICIES

One of the first challenges to the Committee in its review of existing University of Minnesota policies was to develop a sense of which policies most directly affect scholarly activity. In one sense, that list could legitimately include virtually any institutional policy from those dealing with salaries, leaves and travel funds, to indirect contributors such as architectural design, admissions policies, or availability of outside funds for research.

Identification of those University policies and practices that should receive the Committee's attention proved to be one of its most difficult tasks. As has been noted, two areas of possible relevance--faculty salaries and retirement benefits--were not studied in detail because these have been addressed by other University committees operating at the same time as this one. It is important, however, to make one observation about the importance of salary and benefits to a study of faculty vitality: The relationship between the level of a faculty member's explicit financial reward and that faculty member's professional vitality is complex. It is characteristic that the scholarly life has carried with it traditions of devotion to and satisfaction from the world of the academy that are independent of financial rewards.

Accordingly, it became clear to the Committee that a conceptual framework for analyzing and understanding factors affecting faculty activities was a first priority. A survey of our faculty and general literature about other faculties bear out the extraordinary importance to faculty of intrinsic factors in their professional life. These are freedom to pursue ideas in select areas of research, the presence of challenging students and colleagues, and a sense of

altruism stemming from a life committed to the academic goals of teaching, research, and service.

However, a number of changes have occurred within the academic world and outside of it which have diminished some of the intrinsic aspects of the academic milieu and also some of its extrinsic rewards, such as salaries and benefits. Using 1970 as a base year, salary losses experienced in the academic profession during the 1970s meant that the faculty lost ground when compared to persons in other fields. As has already been pointed out, the University of Minnesota faculty suffered an erosion of approximately 20 percent of their real income while the real income of other workers increased.

Setting aside, for reasons already noted, the important matters of salary and retirement benefits, the Committee identified five areas directly pertinent to its inquiry. They include the sabbatical leave, the single quarter leave, summer research appointments, teaching and research awards, and consulting. It is significant to note that each of these policy areas relates directly to the heart of scholarly inquiry by providing time and support for research and scholarly writing, and that lack of resources for such pursuits represented one of the major dissatisfactions for faculty.

The Sabbatical Leave Program

The sabbatical leave program in America dates from the nineteenth century and grew out of recognition of the special needs of faculty members for time to reflect, to write, and to gain perspective from experiences in another setting. The sabbatical program at the University of Minnesota was approved in 1909.

A study of the University of Minnesota sabbatical leave policy completed in 1983 by Darwin Hendel and Jean Solberg pointed out that nationally sabbatical

leave programs are widespread among academic institutions. They noted that the structure of such programs, while following a similar general pattern, varies in one crucial dimension--the amount of funding which a faculty member may receive when he or she takes the sabbatical leave. At the University of Minnesota, sabbatical furloughs are available to regular faculty members after six years of service. Up to three quarters of sabbatical leave can be taken once every seven years upon recommendation of the faculty member's department head and dean and approval from the Regents. Faculty holding full-time appointments (nine- and twelve-month appointments predominant) are eligible to receive one-half their base salary during a sabbatical leave which can run up to the duration of their regular appointments (e.g., up to nine-months for a nine-month faculty member or twelve months for a twelve-month faculty member).

The Hendel/Solberg study, as well as the survey conducted by this Committee, has pointed out, however, a major institutional issue with respect to the sabbatical leave: the number taking sabbaticals in a given year is far less than the total number of faculty eligible. The Hendel/Solberg report suggests that considerably less than a third of the faculty who are eligible actually take a sabbatical during a given year. In a recent five-year period, the numbers who took sabbaticals varied from a high of 101 to a low of 88. The principal perceived barrier to greater use of the sabbatical leave was the financial burden of living on half salary. Other difficulties identified were inconvenience for children (29.7%); too busy to make arrangements (25.9%); and inconvenience for spouse (28.8%).³

Assuming that the sabbatical is indeed a critical ingredient in the provision of the opportunity for intellectual growth and continued development, it is

a legitimate institutional concern therefore to ask whether or not there are ways to increase the use of such an opportunity. This Committee has noted with approval the receipt by the University of Minnesota of a \$900,000 award from the Bush Foundation to provide supplementary funds for faculty members with an interest in undergraduate education to supplement the half salary currently available. While this program represents a helpful first step, two points should be kept in mind. First, the grant is for a five-year period to allow the University time to develop longer term solutions to the funding question. Second, the grant is focused on faculty with an interest in undergraduate education. Thus, there may be faculty not eligible for this grant and unable to afford a sabbatical in absence of additional funds. Mechanisms to make sabbaticals affordable clearly remain a significant planning issue.

Single Quarter Leaves

A second kind of leave available to University faculty is the single-quarter leave. Single-quarter leaves are open to both tenured and probationary faculty members who have completed two years of service. Single-quarter leaves provide a short break from the normal academic schedule to allow the faculty member to pursue specified projects while remaining on full salary. Selection for a single-quarter leave is made by a screening committee in a competitive review of statements of purpose submitted by the applicants. Current policy allows for up to four percent (roughly 120) of the faculty to be on single quarter leaves each year. Applicants must return to the University of Minnesota for at least one year following a single-quarter leave. The Hendel/Solberg study and the results of this Committee's survey of the faculty have suggested that having the option of the single-quarter leave is viewed as a highly

favorable institutional policy. However, a major deterrent to single quarter leaves for faculty in some small departments has been the resources to cover the work of a faculty member on such a leave.

Summer Research Appointments, Awards, and Consulting

A third institutional policy which affects faculty vitality is the faculty summer research appointment, which has been made available since 1946 to provide resources to cover a research project which might reasonably be completed during the five weeks of a summer session term. All regular, nine-month faculty may apply for the summer research stipend award. In 1983, the number of such awards was increased from 30 to 60--the amount of these awards in 1983 was \$3,300.

Alongside of the two leave policies--the sabbatical and the single quarter--and the faculty research appointment, are other benefits which also relate uniquely to the academic enterprise and to the support of scholarly activities. These are institutional awards for academic excellence. At the pinnacle of such awards in the University of Minnesota are the Regents' professorships, established in 1965, carrying with them an annual supplementary stipend of \$5,000. The University of Minnesota has other academic awards. One such award is the Horace T. Morse Amoco Foundation Award for contributions to undergraduate education. In addition to awards made at the all-University level are awards which vary in purpose and amount from college to college.

Scholarly research and public service are encouraged not only through awards and leave policies but also by the University of Minnesota's consulting policy. This policy makes it possible for faculty to engage in recurring professional consulting to impart their knowledge and skills to groups and persons outside of the University. The University consulting policy allows such

recurring commitments up to a limit of one day per seven-day week, provided that they do not interfere with the faculty member's teaching, research, and service, or administrative responsibilities, and that the activities of the consulting are related and will enhance their professional responsibilities.⁴

All of the aforementioned policies relate to the University of Minnesota's role as a major research institution. The opportunities such policies provide grow clearly from the recognition, which has evolved over time, that the world of research and writing requires a combination of nurturing support, freedom, and time and space to allow an academic to pursue interests and ideas which he or she deems worthy of attention. They are based on a strong tradition of academic freedom anchored to a strong University commitment to tenure. In such a milieu, it is not only the formal structures which support such research and inquiry, but also more informal structures. Through our survey of faculty members, the importance of stimulating colleagues and challenging students became apparent. Likewise, the importance of opportunities for faculty to travel to professional meetings, to interact with colleagues at other institutions, and to have access to library materials and materials through electronic media became apparent. While the specifics of creating and maintaining such an academic milieu are elusive, the Committee has come to realize that their maintenance is of critical importance. The faculty survey conducted by the Committee which helped to illuminate the current situation at the University is discussed in Part III.

PART III

FACULTY SURVEY

Deliberations based on information gathered from other sources led the Committee to the conclusion that it needed observations and suggestions directly from the faculty. It was determined that two types of information would be helpful: Faculty views on those aspects of their current positions that enhance or impede personal satisfaction and productivity and actions that could be taken by the University to facilitate scholarly activities and help enrich professional life during the next five to ten years.

The questionnaire designed for the survey included questions structured to 1) identify degree of satisfaction-dissatisfaction with professional careers at the University of Minnesota, 2) locate sources of satisfactions and dissatisfactions and 3) generate ideas for relieving dissatisfactions and removing barriers to scholarly productivity. It was considered important to have information as comparable as possible with that of earlier surveys seeking similar information (Stecklein and Eckert, 1958, Stecklein, 1982). Thus, where appropriate, questions used in those studies were used again in this survey.

In the spring of 1982 the questionnaire (Appendix A) was mailed to all faculty members holding a rank of assistant professor or above on the Twin Cities campus, UMC, UMM, and the medical faculty at UMD.⁵ The 974 useable questionnaires returned represented a 35 percent return rate. When the returns were compared to the total makeup of the faculty, no over- or underrepresentation of practical significance was found as it relates to sex, professorial rank, or collegiate affiliation.

Major findings will be summarized here. More detailed information on the

survey procedures and results can be found in Appendix A-1.6

Nearly two-thirds (64.6%) of the respondents reported satisfaction with their professional careers at the University of Minnesota; 16.6 percent indicating they are "very satisfied." On the one hand, this can be interpreted as very encouraging. On the other hand, other perspectives argue for a more cautious interpretation. First, approximately one in five (21.1%) report dissatisfaction; females (27%) reporting dissatisfaction more frequently than males (19.8%). Second, while differences in sampling procedures argue for caution in interpretation, comparisons using the results from earlier studies that used the identical questions shows that the percentage of faculty satisfied with their scholarly life declined from 91 percent in 1956 to 80 percent in 1980 to 64.6 percent in 1982.

Each faculty member surveyed was asked to list two or three major satisfactions and two or three major dissatisfactions with being a faculty member at the University. The responses indicate that in many instances it is fairly specific situational conditions that explain why faculty members are satisfied or dissatisfied with their professional lives.

Nearly half of the satisfactions listed by the respondents fall into one of two categories: 25.8 percent referred to working conditions (e.g., flexible schedules, ability to set one's own time, intellectual freedom, independence to pursue one's own interests, etc.) and 23.8 percent referred to preference for this work (e.g., like to teach, like to research, variety, research opportunities, consulting, scholarly activity, etc.). The only other categories garnering more than 10 percent of the responses were students (e.g., helping students, seeing returning successful students, etc.) and faculty (e.g., colleg-

iality, stimulating people to work with, etc.); 17.4 percent for the former and 13.5 percent for the latter.

It is interesting to note that while the category of working conditions accounted for one in four of the comments regarding satisfactions, it also accounted for almost the same portion (23.7%) of the comments regarding dissatisfactions. Here factors such as not enough time, too many students, lack of autonomy, unclear expectations, and too much paperwork were mentioned frequently. The second most frequently cited dissatisfaction related to lack of support. Factors appearing most prominently here were student and civil service support, SEE budgets and equipment. The third most frequently cited impediment was bureaucratic red tape which was perceived as taking faculty away from teaching and research.

The percent of responses indicating "working conditions" as a source of dissatisfaction in 1982 (23.7%) was similar to that reported in the 1956 study. Just two years prior to the current study, however, over one-third of the responses (34.6%) fell in this category. Inadequate support is now viewed as a much greater source of dissatisfaction (17.5%) than was reported in the surveys of 1980 (4.3%) and 1956 (6.7%).

A point of significant agreement found among faculty in the survey was the desire, expressed by 83 percent, for more time for research and writing. Also, a majority (59.2%) feel that they are spending too much time on administrative and committee activities.

Responses related to teaching presents a less clear message. While 20.1 percent of the respondents indicated that they desire more time for teaching, a similar percentage (21.5%) indicated that they would like to spend less time

teaching.

The results of the survey indicate that discontent and frustration does not arise from a desire to work less. Rather, it stems from lack of enough available hours to work on activities considered of high professional importance due to assignments and other expectations about how they will spend their time.

Attempts to increase the professional vitality and productivity of the individual faculty member must be adapted to the individual's unique capabilities and the characteristics of that person's assignment. As noted above, however, there are some general areas where more, or less, time is desired by a sizeable number of faculty members. A large fraction want to spend more time in research and scholarly writing and many express the need for more time to prepare for their teaching and out-of-class work with students. A considerable number feel frustrated in finding time to keep up with their field--to read, study, and communicate with their peers here and at other institutions. General areas of activities seen as reducing the amount of time available for scholarly production are those that do not involve teaching and research directly. Many mention as impediments to scholarship and teaching the intrusion of committee and administrative work and fund raising. A related aspect is simply organization of assignments. Leaves or other opportunities for sustained efforts on scholarly production and self-improvement were seen as extremely desirable.

The survey request for suggestions of things the University can do to remove barriers and enhance professional vitality prompted a wide variety of responses. Appendix A-2 presents specific suggestions made by faculty members under six general categories. These general categories include time management, recognition, communication, assistance, group involvement, and special support

at critical points over a career. These suggestions served as a primary source for the framing of the Committee's recommendations which appear in the next and final section of this report.

PART IV
RECOMMENDATIONS

In the process of wrestling with what the University can do to enhance the scholarly activities of the faculty, the Committee has studied the literature on the subject, investigated the findings of recent studies of faculty vitality both at the University and elsewhere, examined relevant existing policies, and has conducted a survey of the faculty in order to determine their views on the changes needed to remove barriers to scholarly productivity and to improve the academic environment. It is on the basis of findings from these activities that we make our recommendations.

The Committee did not deal directly with salary problems in these recommendations because it assumes that the current high level of awareness of them and actions being taken by the faculty, the administration, and the Regents will provide for appropriate consideration of these issues.

Instead, the recommendations have focused on working conditions and more explicit structures for recognition and rewards. These aspects of faculty life are of crucial importance in the enhancement of scholarly activity. It should be noted, however, that even when these are adequate they cannot become substitutes for a satisfactory salary level.

This Steering Committee has no illusions that our academic environment can be converted from the status quo to near utopia within a matter of months or even in two or three years. We hasten to point out, however, that some of the changes being proposed can be initiated quickly and with little expenditure of resources. Some of the problems have as much to do with esprit and morale as with resources.

Three important background factors should be kept in mind as these recommendations are considered. First, scholarly vitality is extremely complex and efforts to enhance it must be flexible. Second, faculty vitality and institutional vitality are highly interdependent. Third, policies which affect scholarly activity need not be university-wide. In some cases, sources of policy are departmental; in some cases they are collegiate; and in other cases they are University-wide.

The following recommendations concern four broad areas: institutional support, which covers a number of critical, if somewhat mundane, aspects of scholarly activity; recognition and rewards, which contain both tangible and intangible dimensions; aspects of organizational life which support intellectual enrichment; and the communication patterns of the University through which its policies and practices are understood both by those on the inside and those on the outside.

Institutional Support

1. Department chairs, with the support of central administration and collegiate officers, should initiate plans to restore and enhance support for the faculty (teaching and research assistance, civil service assistance, technical aids, including word processing and microcomputers, etc.).

2. The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs, working with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, should pursue alternatives to the current policy on sabbatical leaves so as to make them more economically feasible from the standpoint of both the faculty members and the department. Such alternatives might well stem from a study of the extent to which people most needing leaves are able to take them. Options that would evolve from alternative personal financing for leaves should be considered as well as those that would involve additional University or outside funding. The Bush Supplementary Sabbatical Leave Program provides a helpful, though limited, interim device. The institution will need a longer term solution to the identified need for support during sabbatical leaves.

3. The single quarter leave appears to offer a necessary and important opportunity for faculty. In order that the opportunity may be made available to all faculty, the Vice President for Academic Affairs should provide a measure of assistance to units that are unable to allow faculty to take single quarter

leaves because of the absolute need of the services they provide and the unavailability of resources to replace them.

4. Administrators at all levels should seek ways to decrease the nonvoluntary involvement of faculty in administrative activities, while minimizing the loss of opportunity for faculty members who wish to participate in such activities.

5. Department chairs should seek ways to build flexibility into the scheduling of faculty members' assignments which would allow for increased teaching loads at certain times in order to free up other times for sustained research and writing efforts or for updating and preparation of courses.

6. The Vice President for Academic Affairs should ensure that deans and department chairs are knowledgeable about the many factors that affect faculty vitality and that they are also aware of the resources that are available to them for helping to enhance faculty vitality. Administrative seminars, workshops, or informal discussions could be used to emphasize an institutional priority in this matter. Deans and department chairs should also be encouraged to utilize a consultative process within their departments to foster an environment that nurtures scholarship and productivity.

Comment: The faculty regards time as one of its most prized resources.

Studies consistently show that faculty members at the University spend many hours each week on professional activities--evidence of their high level of professional commitment. This same commitment, however, can become a basis for frustration and discontent when expectations and assignments force them to devote time to less important activities which do not make use of their unique talents. Such feelings of frustration can sap faculty vitality and should be recognized as a serious source of dissatisfaction.

An overwhelming majority of the faculty members believe that they should be spending more time on research and scholarly writing and on preparation for their teaching and out-of-class work with students. The faculty perceives that activities not directly involving teaching and research (e.g., committee and administrative work, pursuit of external funding, etc.) cut damagingly into time available for scholarly production. For some the organization of their assign-

ments precludes leaves and other opportunities for sustained scholarly production and self-improvement.

All too frequently, faculty members are called upon to do routine typing, filing, running of copy machines, etc. The category "working conditions" is mentioned more frequently than any other category as a source of dissatisfaction for faculty members.

Recognition and Rewards

7. The Regents and the administration should continue, as often as possible, to recognize meritorious performance in research, teaching, and service. Particularly appropriate are not only existing awards and recognitions, but also special merit increases in salary that reflect outstanding teaching and research.

8. Administrators at all levels should seek to identify and publicize significant work of faculty members (e.g., new publications, new courses developed, grants received, etc.).

9. Department chairs should establish procedures to provide faculty members, and especially young scholars, with frequent and regular feedback on their work from chairs and trusted colleagues, using informal approaches and seminars where appropriate.

Comment: Faculty members, like professionals in all fields, desire and deserve to have their accomplishments recognized and rewarded. In the eyes of the faculty the current situation has some major deficiencies in this regard. Systematic consideration of both financial rewards and intrinsic reward structure is needed. An integrated recognition and reward structure can strengthen the professional vitality of individual faculty members and enhance the image of the professoriate outside the academy.

Intellectual Enrichment

10. Department chairs should provide opportunities for faculty members to discuss their research, research interests, and ideas with departmental colleagues and students.

11. Administrators at all levels should encourage appropriate interdisciplinary and interdepartmental research, seminars, and teaching.

12. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs should provide retraining/retooling opportunities to accommodate shifts in interests and in careers as well as for improving teaching and research skills.

13. Administrators and faculty should continue to seek ways of increasing interaction between faculty and representatives from business, industry, government, and other organizations. Such interactions are not only important from the point of view of bringing vitality to an academic institution, but also of enriching the society of which it is a part.

14. Administrators should assist faculty members in finding and taking advantage of research and teaching opportunities abroad in accord with international education as one of the five major themes in institutional planning.

15. The Senate Committee on Educational Policy assisted by the administration should explore interuniversity exchanges for the opportunities which they may provide as a cost-effective vehicle for faculty enrichment.

Comment: Faculty members need and deserve opportunities to share and discuss their work with colleagues and able students within the University, at other institutions, and within organizations outside the academic world. We at the University are challenged to find additional ways to secure this intellectual interaction.

Communication

16. Administrators at all levels should make the broadest possible effort to make faculty members aware of existing policies, programs, benefits, and services. There is evidence that a number of faculty are not aware of them.

17. The unique communication problems of those faculty and staff whose place of research, teaching, and service is outside the Twin Cities should be addressed and means of easing them sought. Here, the factor of isolation from the metropolitan area, the distance from the Twin Cities libraries, and the smaller scale of operation all require special consideration.

Comment: Although some problems of communication due to the size and geographic spread of the University will always be with us, it is important to address the issue of communication as it relates to scholarly activities. Some faculty are simply not as well informed about existing programs and services as they ought to be. In addition, it is important that processes that enhance

scholarly activity pursued in some departments be considered for use in others.

Concluding Observations

While there are points in these recommendations where resources will be required (e.g., supplementary funds for sabbatical leaves, minimal levels of graduate assistant and SEE support, and institutional commitment to faculty salaries), many of the recommendations can be pursued at relatively minimal institutional cost. Specific examples might include exploring ways in which established faculty members can serve as mentors; sharing of research papers with colleagues not able to attend out-of-state conferences; informal seminars and talks for both faculty and students to broaden intellectual contacts; and the encouragement of interdisciplinary research, seminars, and teaching. Still other examples, while not implying a major expenditure of resources, may require only a modest amount of institutional resources to implement. Examples here include the provision of retraining and retooling seminars or workshops; use of undergraduates to provide basic assistance to faculty; use of WATS lines; and assistance to faculty members to allow them to participate in exchange programs in other institutions as well as to allow them opportunities for research and study abroad.

This report will be useful to the extent to which it leads to institutional commitment on a number of levels to address the issue of sustaining and enhancing scholarly activities of the faculty.

Endnotes

1. The Committee wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Professors Mary Corcoran and Shirley Clark in providing a perspective for its work by sharing the early findings of their important research on faculty vitality and that of Professor John Stecklein whose earlier studies served as a basis for parts of its survey.
2. Planning Council, University of Minnesota, February 11, 1980, p. 4.
3. Darwin Hendel and Jeanne Solberg. "Faculty Members Views About the Sabbatical and Single Quarter Leave Programs at the University of Minnesota." University of Minnesota: May 15, 1983, p. 2.
4. Faculty Information Bulletin. University of Minnesota (1980), p. 8.
5. On the advice of the University General Counsel non-medical school faculty at UMD and faculty at UMW did not receive the questionnaire due to collective bargaining going on at the time.
6. Due to an error in mailing, faculty at UMM did not have an opportunity to respond to the questionnaire until February 1983, after the original analyses were completed. A separate analysis of the responses from Morris showed them to be consistent with the findings reported here.



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

April 13, 1982

Dear Colleague:

Most of us have accepted projections that the size of the University faculty will remain relatively stable in the foreseeable future, with fewer new faculty members coming to the University. This prompts some concern about how to maintain intellectual vigor and excitement among the faculty during this period. In response to this concern, we have been asked jointly by the Senate Consultative Committee and President Magrath to suggest policies that will help to preserve and to stimulate vitality. We need your help.

Available evidence suggests that the University of Minnesota, like other institutions of higher education, has entered a new era--one that is characterized by diminished resources. In preparing for this change, it will be helpful if we can anticipate potential problems and take steps, as much as possible, to meet them in advance. What can we do, for example, to offset the possibility that faculty members may find it more difficult to attend professional meetings, to secure funding for sabbaticals and research, to develop new courses, and to have new colleagues with whom to exchange ideas? In other words, we need to devise innovative ways to facilitate the scholarly activities of the faculty.

Because the Committee is studying this potential problem with a view toward suggesting to the Senate and administration some imaginative policies designed to meet the challenge, we want to tap the views of the faculty as a rich source of ideas. We seek your input at this time through completion of the enclosed questionnaire.

The key question to be answered is Question 9: At the present stage of your career, what can the University do, in specific ways, to facilitate your scholarly activities (teaching and research) and help you to enrich your professional life during the next five or ten years? We suggest that you first answer Questions 1 through 8 and then work on Question 9. Although it will take time to give us your thoughtful consideration, we have kept the questionnaire brief, and we sincerely hope that you will take the time needed to complete it and return it to us.

We hope you share our belief that it is very important for each of us to have opportunities to maximize our professional contributions in the years ahead, and we invite you to join us in helping to secure the enactment of policies designed to reach this objective.

The Committee for Facilitating the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty

Jack C. Merwin, Chair

Carl R. Adams
Elizabeth S. Blake
Mario F. Bognanno
Richard S. Caldecott
Edward L. Cussler, Jr.
Ann M. Pflaum

Anne D. Pick
Richard E. Poppele
Donald C. Rasmusson
Betty W. Robinett
John E. Turner
John R. Wallace

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What percentage of your total professional activities do you estimate that you ordinarily devote to each of the following:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
-1- Teaching (including preparation, grading, thesis advising, oral examinations)	_____ %
-2- Research and scholarly writing	_____ %
-3- Counseling (personal and academic)	_____ %
-4- Other service to student groups/organizations	_____ %
-5- Committee assignments and administrative duties	_____ %
-6- Off-campus services (professional meetings, community talks, consulting services, etc.)	_____ %
	100 %

2. To which of the above activities would you prefer to devote more time if you could? (Circle the number or numbers that correspond to the activities.)

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. To which of the above activities would you prefer to devote less time if you could? (Circle the number or numbers that correspond to the activities.)

1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Please circle the expression below that best describes your present attitude toward your professional career at the University of Minnesota.

Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

5. Please indicate your faculty rank:

- ___ (1) Assistant Professor
- ___ (2) Associate Professor
- ___ (3) Professor
- ___ (4) Other. Please indicate: _____

6. How long have you been tenured?

- ___ (1) I do not have a tenure-track position
- ___ (2) I have a tenure-track position, but am not tenured
- ___ (3) Two years or less
- ___ (4) More than two years but less than five years
- ___ (5) Between five and ten years
- ___ (6) Ten years or more

7. Please list the two or three major satisfactions that you derive from being a faculty member at the University:

-a- _____

-b- _____

-c- _____

Comments (You are invited to expand on your response to this question; if you need additional space, please use the back of this page):

8. Please list the two or three major dissatisfactions with being a faculty member at the University:

-a- _____

-b- _____

-c- _____

Comments (You are invited to expand on your response to this question; if you need additional space, please use the back of this page):

9. Given the reality of diminished resources, what are ways in which your present dissatisfactions can be turned into satisfactions? We look upon this survey as an opportunity for the faculty to have an input into policy-making. For this reason, we are asking all faculty members to give serious thought to this question:

At the present stage of your career, what can the University do, in specific ways, to facilitate your scholarly activities (teaching and research) and help you to enrich your professional life during the next five or ten years? For example, do you have ideas on innovative funding? Are you aware of policies and practices from other universities or other countries that might be applicable? Do you know of ongoing systems (e.g., systems of sponsorship, feedback, performance evaluation, rewards or recognition) that foster professional development? (If you need additional space, please use the back of this page.)

10. Please indicate the college/program/campus in which you are appointed:

Twin Cities Campus:

- (1) College of Biological Sciences
- (2) College of Education
- (3) College of Liberal Arts:
 - Humanities and Fine Arts
 - Social Sciences
- (4) College of Veterinary Medicine
- (5) Continuing Educ. & Extension
- (6) General College
- (7) Graduate School
- (8) Health Sciences:
 - Dentistry
 - Medical School
 - Mortuary Science
 - Nursing
 - Pharmacy
 - Public Health
- (9) Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs

- Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics:
 - (16) Agriculture
 - (17) Forestry
 - (18) Home Economics
 - (19) Agricultural Experiment Station
 - (20) Agricultural Extension Service
 - (21) Institute of Technology
 - (22) Law School
 - (23) School of Management
 - (24) University College
 - (25) Other. Please indicate: _____

Crookston Campus:

(26)

Morris Campus:

(27)

UMD-Medical School:

(28)

11. For how many years have you been on the faculty at the University of Minnesota?
_____ years

12. Was your appointment as a faculty member at the University of Minnesota your first professional employment after you received your highest degree?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

If "No", how many years of job experience did you have before you came to the University of Minnesota?

Number of Years

- a. In teaching at other colleges or universities? _____
- b. In teaching at other types of educational institutions? _____
- c. In industry, government, etc.? _____

13. Sex:

- (1) Female
- (2) Male

-- Thank you for your time and cooperation --

If you have questions about this questionnaire, please call Faye Powe, Assistant to the Committee for Facilitating the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty, 376-8446.

Please fold, staple, and return your completed questionnaire to the address on the back of this page. We would appreciate receiving your response by April 30, 1982. Respondents from the Twin Cities Campus may use the campus mail service.

APPENDIX A-1

Overview of Results of Survey
of University of Minnesota Faculty

1982

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

<u>Rank</u>				
<u>Professor</u>	<u>Associate Professor</u>	<u>Assistant Professor</u>	<u>Other</u>	
49.0	25.5	25.1	0.4	
<u>Years at University</u>				
<u>1</u>	<u>1<Y<10</u>	<u>10≤Y<20</u>	<u>20≤Y<30</u>	<u>≥30</u>
3.2	33.0	41.9	15.7	6.2

<u>Sex</u>	
<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>
17.0	83.0

<u>Rank</u>						
<u>Not Tenure Track</u>	<u>Not Yet Tenured</u>	<u>0-2 Yrs</u>	<u>2<Yrs<5</u>	<u>Tenured</u>	<u>5≤Yrs<10</u>	<u>Yrs≥10</u>
8.3	13.9	5.8	9.8	18.1	44.2	

<u>First Appointment</u>	
<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
45.7	54.3

RESULTS

(Percent of Those Reporting)

<u>% Time Spent</u>	<u>Distribution of Time</u>					
	<u>Instruction</u>	<u>Research & Scholarly Writ</u>	<u>Counseling Students</u>	<u>Other Services</u>	<u>Committee & Admin</u>	<u>Off-Campus Services</u>
80-100	3.4	1.9	0.1	0.3	1.3	1.0
60-79	14.8	5.0	0.4	0.6	3.5	1.8
40-59	36.6	21.6	1.4	0.8	6.2	1.3
20-39	33.5	41.1	7.6	3.4	20.9	6.6
10-19	6.8	18.7	32.0	10.4	32.9	25.4
0-9	4.9	11.6	58.5	84.5	35.2	65.2

Desired Changes in Distribution of Time

<u>Percent Desiring</u>	<u>Instruction</u>	<u>Research & Writing</u>	<u>Counseling</u>	<u>Other Services</u>	<u>Committee & Admin</u>	<u>Off-Campus Services</u>
More	20.1	83.0	3.4	1.5	0.9	12.5
Less	21.5	1.6	8.5	5.4	59.2	4.2

Present Attitude towards Professional Career at the University of Minnesota

<u>Very Satisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Very Dissatisfied</u>
16.6	48.0	14.3	16.5	4.6

Sources of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

<u>Source of Satisfaction</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1956</u>
Students	17.4	27.6	31.0
Faculty	13.5	9.1	11.4
Administration	1.0	0.1	0.0
Intellectual Environment	8.4	10.2	11.9
Working Conditions	25.8	17.9	21.4
Preference for This Kind of Work	23.8	21.4	17.0
Personal Development	2.1	3.4	1.7
Recognition	3.8	2.0	3.5
Other	4.1	8.3	2.0

<u>Source of Dissatisfaction</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1956</u>
Students	2.5	3.2	6.4
Faculty	4.3	1.5	4.4
Administration	16.1	12.1	13.7
Intrinsic Rewards	2.9	4.6	5.2
Poor Working Conditions	23.7	34.6	21.6
Support Inadequate	17.5	4.3	6.7
Salary	14.8	22.9	32.5
Lack of Extrinsic Rewards	6.8	4.9	2.1
Other	11.5	11.6	7.5

APPENDIX A-2

Survey of University of Minnesota Faculty

1982

Specific Suggestions
for Enhancing Scholarly Activities

The request for suggestions of things the University can do to remove barriers and enhance professional vitality prompted a wide variety of responses. Some were very specific to the functioning of individual departments or programs. Some were well developed proposals, a number of which included new or seldom identified ideas. The majority can be grouped readily into six general categories: time management, recognition, communication, assistance, group involvement, and special support at critical points in one's career at the University. The more frequently mentioned proposals follow.

Time Management

Need more opportunity (through sabbaticals and forms of released time) for research and retooling.

Change the sabbatical process so as to relieve both the work load arrangements that do not allow time for leaves and the financial burden of taking leaves on half pay; add flexibility to the sabbatical leave program.

Redistribute/reduce committee work.

Reduce administrative duties; supply more staff for administrative work.

Let people do what they excel at--reduce teaching for those who do research and increase the teaching load for those who do not.

Double load teaching in some quarters so as to leave one quarter free for research.

Develop more flexible arrangements to combine a faculty career with a career outside the University.

Recognition

Increase salaries.

Provide more non-monetary recognition.

Reward excellence and improvement in teaching.

Match rewards with accomplishments.

Communication

Increase the amount of sharing of ideas and work within and across departments; more interdisciplinary seminars.

Have senior faculty take on a mentoring role for junior faculty.

Increase opportunities to attend professional meetings.

Strengthen interuniversity exchange programs.

Decrease administrative response time to ideas and proposals.

Assistance

Provide more teaching assistance and civil service support.

Improve the libraries.

Reduce enrollment; curtail class sizes; emphasize quality more in admissions; reduce teaching burdens.

Develop programs to foster professional growth and development including tuition scholarships for faculty.

Provide tuition scholarships for faculty spouses and children.

Increase the role of administration in helping professors seek funding.

Seek more assistance from business and industry.

Provide more travel money for travel to attend professional meetings, to visit other institutions and for fundraising.

Make advanced technology (e.g., microcomputers and word processors) available in offices.

Group Involvement

Provide more opportunities for sharing and discussing work with others in one's department and in other departments.

Encourage and reward interdepartmental teaching and research.

Strengthen interuniversity faculty exchange programs.

Develop more international opportunities for faculty.

Provide opportunities to interact with the private sector; short-term leaves to work in the private sector; provide opportunities for private sector researchers to spend time at the University; joint appointments with the private sector.

Special Support at Critical Points in One's Career

Provide research funds for the new assistant professor until a research agenda is externally funded.

Provide leaves and support for those interested in retooling or mid-career changes.

Provide research support for senior researchers who are between external grants.

Provide programs for those who wish to improve their teaching.

Give senior faculty nearing retirement special support so they can end their careers with a "bang."

Selected sources related to the University of Minnesota:

Berg, David J. "Sources of Information." Letter to Professor Jack Merwin (Management Planning and Information Services, December 1, 1981).

This letter lists both external and internal sources of information: 1) external--American Universities Data Exchange, Big Ten Business Officers, and Minnesota Finance Department, etc.; 2) internal--Basic Data Reference, enrollment projection models, and Faculty Flow Models, etc.

Brown, Jeff, A Five Part Series on College Teaching and the University of Minnesota. Minneapolis Star, June 4, June 5, June 6, June 7, and June 8, 1979.

This local journalist portrayed a number of challenges facing the University and its faculty: relatively low salaries, inducements from other universities, declining enrollments.

Clark, Shirley and Mary Corcoran. "Individual and Organizational Contributions to Faculty Vitality: An Institutional Case Study." In Lyceum, College of Education, University of Minnesota: June 1983.

Faculty Handbook. University of Minnesota. Published every two years.

A useful source of basic information about University policies of interest to faculty.

Hendel, Darwin D. and Jeanne D. Solberg. "Faculty members view about the Sabbatical and Single Quarter Leave Programs at the University of Minnesota." Study conducted as part of the Evaluation of the Bush Sabbatical Program, March 15, 1983.

Holt, Robert T. (Dean of the Graduate School). "Faculty Summer Research Appointments for 1983." January 24, 1983. University of Minnesota, the Graduate School.

Keller, Kenneth H. (Academic Vice President). "Academic Salary Data--1980-81. Comparative Salary UM with Big Ten." June 18, 1981.

Planning Data--1979--Basic Data Reference. Management, Planning, and Information Services. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Research Administration (Office of). Levels and Trends in Sponsored Programs at the University of Minnesota. Prepared annually since 1974. A. R. Potami, director.

Useful guide to sponsored research.

Roesch, James R. "Benefit Comparisons Big Ten Universities." Ohio State University, June 9, 1983.

Compares UM benefits to other Big Ten schools.

Senate Committee on Educational Policy. "Report of the Senate Task Force on Developing and Encouraging Excellence in Teaching." University of Minnesota Senate Minutes, May 25, 1978:69-85.

Stecklein, John. "Changes in Faculty Characteristics, Activities, and Attitudes Over 25 years at a Major United States University." Proceedings Fourth European AIR Forum, Association for Institutional Research, Uppsala University, Sweden, August 1982.

Stecklein, John E. and Eckert, R. E. An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the Choice of College Teaching as a Career. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota, 1958.

Stecklein, John E. and Robert Lathrop. Faculty Attraction and Retention: Factors Affecting Faculty Mobility at the University of Minnesota. University of Minnesota: Bureau of Institutional Research, 1960.

Task Force on Faculty Retirement Plan. "Progress Report." March 1980. University of Minnesota. C. Arthur Williams, chair. Task force appointed by Vice President for Administration and Planning Robert A. Stein.

This report was presented to the University Senate. Its suggested changes were not endorsed by the Senate.

Other sources:

Atelsek, Frank J. and Irene L. Gomberg. "Selected Characteristics of Full Time Humanities Faculty, Fall 1979." Higher Education Panel Report #51. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, August 1981.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Irene L. Gomberg. "Young Doctoral Faculty in Science and Engineering: Trends in Composition and Research Activity." Higher Education Panel Report #43. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, February 1979.

Bach, Marilyn and Ray Thornton. "Academic Industrial Partnerships on Biomedical Research: Inevitability and Desirability." In Educational Record, Vol. 64, No. 2, Spring 1983:26-33.

Baldwin, Robert G. and Robert T. Blackburn. "The Academic Career as a Developmental Process: Implications for Higher Education." In Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 52, No. 6, 1981:598-614.

Bess, James L., ed. Motivating Professors to Teach Effectively. New Directions for Teaching and Learning #10. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Blackburn, Robert J. "Academic Careers Patterns and Possibilities." In Current Issues in Higher Education, 2(1979):3-12.

Blackburn, Robert T. "Career Phases and their Effect on Faculty Motivation." In Motivating Professors to Teach Effectively. James L. Bess, ed. New

Directions for Teaching and Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982: 94-98.

Blau, Peter M. The Organization of Academic Work. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

Bok, Derek. "Balancing Responsibility and Innovation." In Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982. Also in Change Magazine, September 1982: 16-29.

Brookes, Michael C. T. and Katherine L. German. "Meeting the Challenges Developing Faculty Careers." ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1983.

Bruss, Edward A. and Kenneth L. Kuhna. "Faculty Vitality Given Retrenchments: A Policy Analysis." Research in Higher Education, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1981:19-30.

Cameron, Susan W. and Robert T. Blackburn. "Sponsorship and Academic Career Success." In the Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 52, No. 4, 1981:369-377.

Centra, John. "Maintaining Faculty Vitality through Faculty Development." Taken from Faculty Vitality in American Education. Darrell Lewis and Shirley Clark, eds. Unpublished manuscript, 1983.

Chickering, Arthur. "Adult Development and Learning: Implications for Higher Education." Nolte Center, University of Minnesota, January 8, 15, and 16, 1982.

Chickering, Arthur. The Modern American College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Clark, Shirley. "Effective Administrative Behavior in Organized Anarchies." In Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of Administrators of Home Economics. Atlanta: AAHE, 1980.

Clark, Shirley. "Qualitative Approaches to the Study of Faculty Career Vitality," read at the Meeting of the Association for Study of Higher Education in Washington, D.C., in March, 1983.

Clark, Shirley and Mary Corcoran. "Professional Socialization and Faculty Career Vitality," read at the meetings of the American Educational Research Association in Montreal, Canada, April, 1983. Selected to be abstracted in College Student Personnel Abstracts, in press.

Clark, Shirley and Darrell R. Lewis, Editors. Faculty Vitality Issues in American Higher Education. In press: New York: Teachers College Press, 1984. See especially chapters entitled "Faculty and Institutional Vitality in

Higher Education," "Individual and Organizational Contributions to Faculty Vitality: An Institutional Case Study," and "Implications for Institutional Response."

Corcoran, Mary and Shirley M. Clark. "Development of Guidelines for Policy Relevant Studies of Faculty Vitality through an Institutional Case Study." American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April 1983. Selected to be abstracted in College Student Personnel Abstracts, in press.

Corcoran, Mary and Shirley M. Clark. "Faculty Vitality Under Changing Conditions." In T. Benjamin Massey, ed., Improving University Teaching (Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference). Dublin: National Institute for Higher Education, 1983, pp. 375-383.

Corcoran, Mary and Shirley M. Clark. "Professional Socialization and Contemporary Career Attitudes of Three Faculty Generations." Accepted for publication in Research in Higher Education, AIR Forum issue, probable date: Spring, 1984.

Corcoran, Mary and Shirley M. Clark. "As the Twig is Bent" or "Career Implications of Faculty Socialization Differences." Paper read at the Fourth International Congress of the European Association for Research and Development in Higher Education (EARDHE) at Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt on Main, Federal Republic of Germany, September, 1983. Abstract in Congress Catalogue, p. 113.

Dresch, Stephen P. and Adair L. Waldenberg. "Academe in the Late 20th Century Disharmony, Discontinuity, and Development." Institute for Demographic and Economic Studies, New Haven, Connecticut, November 27, 1981.

"Employment of Humanities Ph.D.'s: A Departure from Traditional Jobs." National Research Council. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1980.

"Employment of Minority PhDs: Changes over Time." Betty Maxfield, Project Director. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1981.

Furniss, W. Todd. "New Opportunities for Faculty Members." In Educational Record, Winter 1981:8-15.

Herring, Carol P. and Allen R. Sanderson. "Doctorate Employment: Supply and Demand Considerations, 1981-2000." Technical appendix to Report of the President on Graduate Education in the Arts and Sciences. Princeton University, April 1981.

Hodgkinson, H. L. "Adult Development Implications for Faculty and Administration." In Educational Record, Vol. 55, No. 74:263-274.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. The Change Masters: Innovation for Productivity in the American Corporation. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.

- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe." In Current Issues in Higher Education, 1(1977):3-10.
- Kidd, Charles V. The Outlook for Academic Positions: A Comparative Report for Europe, Canada, and the United States Graduate Programs in Science, Technology, and Public Policy. Unpublished, March 1980.
- Ladd, Everett C. "Faculty." In Higher Education Planning, D. Kent Halstead, ed. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1979:129-156.
- Levinson, D. J. The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.
- Lewis, Darrell R. and William E. Becker, Jr., eds. Academic Rewards in Higher Education. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1979.
- Marsh, Herbert W. and Kristine E. Dillon. "Academic Productivity and Faculty Supplemental Income." In The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 51, No. 5: 546-555.
- Mathis, B. C. "Academic Careers and Adult Development: A Nexus for Research." In Current Issues in Higher Education, R. Edgerton, ed. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978.
- O'Toole, James. Making American Work: Productivity and Responsibility. New York: Continuum, 1981.
- Palmer, David D. and Carl V. Patton. "Mid Career Change Options in Academe: Experience and Possibilities." In The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 54, No. 4, 1981:378-397.
- Radnor, Ray and Charlotte Kuh. "Preserving a Lost Generation: Policies to Assure a Steady Flow of Young Scholars until the Year 2000." Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, October 1978.
- Riesman, David. On Higher Education: The Academic Enterprise for an Era of Rising Student Consumerism. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- See especially chapters 1 and 2--"The Era of Faculty Dominance and Its Decline" and "Sources of Faculty Hegemony," respectively.
- Sarason, Seymour B. Work Aging and Social Change: Professionals and the One Life One Career Imperative. New York: Free Press, 1977.
- "Science, Engineering and Humanities Doctorates in the United States: 1979 Profile." Betty Maxfield, Project Director. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1980.
- Shils, Edward. "The Academic Ethos." In American Scholar, 47, 1977:165-190.
- "Summary Report 1980 Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities." Peter D. Syverson. Commission on Human Resources National Research Council. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1981.

Tatel, David S. and R. Claire Guthrie. "The Legal Ins and Outs of University Industry Collaboration." In Educational Record, Vol. 64, No. 2, Spring 1983:19-25.

Three Thousand Futures. The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education. Final report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Weiler, William. "Simulation of Institutional Incentive Plans for Faculty Early Retirement. Using a Behavioral Model of Retirement Decision Making." In Research in Higher Education, 15(2), 1981.

Weiler, William and Stephen A. Hoenack. "A Comparison of Effects of Personnel and Enrollment Policies on the Size and Composition of a University's Faculty." In The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLVIII, No. 4, July/August 1977:432-452.

APPENDIX C

Preliminary Observations on the Utility
of a Joint Administration/Senate Steering Committee
to Study University Policy Questions



Background

The Steering Committee to Facilitate the Scholarly Activities of the Faculty was appointed jointly in April of 1981 by University of Minnesota President C. Peter Magrath and the Senate Consultative Committee Chair Professor Marcia Eaton. The idea of a joint administration/Senate study of potential issues facing the University arose from concerns raised in the University planning process that the University should have mechanism to allow it to anticipate significant planning issues. The idea also grew out of the recognition that it was important to overcome a difficulty which had hitherto been present in the University governance structure. Previously, it was noted that the Senate structure and the administration sometimes approached subjects singly and that as a consequence information and reports did not have joint credibility. A committee appointed jointly, it was believed, would overcome the difficulties encountered in refining and implementing recommendations from task forces or committees that were appointed either by the administration or by the Senate singly. The concept, then, of a joint appointment was seen as sound not only since it would allow the University to identify a significant long-range planning issue, but also from a governance perspective since it would allow for a joint consideration of an issue of mutual concern to the administration and the Senate. Furthermore, it was seen as economically desirable since resources and staff would be committed to a single project.

The Steering Committee was chaired by Professor Jack Merwin. Members of the Committee included Professor Carl Adams, Dean Elizabeth Blake, Professor Mario Bognanno, Dean Richard Caldecott, Professor Anne Pick, Professor Richard Poppele, Professor Donald Rasmusson, Assistant Vice President Betty Robinett, Professor John Turner, and Assistant Vice President John Wallace. Ann Pflaum served as an ex officio member of the Committee representing the administration; Nancy Cooper and Faye Powe served as interns assisting the Committee.

The Steering Committee received guidance in its task from a preliminary committee chaired by Professor Robert Carr. The Carr Committee was asked to prepare guidelines to aid its successor committee in developing a conceptual framework within which to consider the topic of enhancing scholarly activities of the faculty. The Steering Committee was advised to dig below the rhetoric of myths regarding current and projected issues related to faculty vitality, to base its recommendations on verifiable data and information, and to inform itself of existing information regarding specific areas of concern.

Three Questions About a Jointly Commissioned Policy Study

Since this represents a new approach to policy study at the University of Minnesota, it is appropriate to evaluate the effectiveness of this Steering Committee's work. As a first step, the Committee offers its own perspective in this. Three questions are worthy of review. The first question is: Did the joint appointment of the Committee by both the Senate and the administration enhance its credibility? The second question is: Did the jointly appointed Steering Committee function effectively? The third question is: Was the topic--enhancing the scholarly activities of the faculty--a suitable choice for a jointly appointed steering committee?

In response to the first question --its credibility--it should be noted that the Committee functioned in every sense as a joint faculty/administration committee. Its members were drawn from both the faculty and administration. It was appointed by both the President and the Chair of the Senate Consultative Committee, and has prepared its final report and forwarded it to both groups. The Steering Committee has worked on an interim basis with the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and has kept in touch with the Vice President for Administration and Planning. The Committee's meetings have been harmonious and constructive--emphasizing the complementary roles of the administration and the faculty.

In response to the second question--how the Steering Committee functioned--it should be pointed out that it was originally estimated that it would take a single academic year to complete its work. This proved to be overly optimistic and, in fact, the work of the Committee has taken more than two academic years to complete. One explanation for this fact is that in the earliest conception of how the Committee might work, there was the expectation that a far larger professional staff might be available to assist it. Instead of a staff of up to four or five FTEs, the members of the Steering Committee themselves shouldered a considerable amount of the work and were assisted by a graduate intern working one-quarter in each time of the two academic years.

Further contributing to the time required to complete this assignment was the Steering Committee's belief that it should familiarize itself with existing policies and practices at the University of Minnesota (see Part II, page 6). Too, the Committee took time to acquaint itself with literature in areas related to enhancing scholarly activities of the faculty. The subject includes a number of fields such as adult development, career development, and organizational theory (see Appendix B). Moreover, the Steering Committee believed it essential to take time to survey the University faculty to determine their views and to record their suggestions (see Appendices A and A-1).

In response to the third question--the suitability of the topic for joint study--it is worth noting that the topic seemed an extremely appropriate choice since it is one of fundamental importance to the faculty members as well as to the administration. Furthermore, it is a subject on which direct involvement by faculty in the design and execution of a study is not only desirable but also essential.

The Steering Committee notes that the real proof of its effectiveness will be whether or not its recommendations are given a serious hearing and whether or not at least some of the ideas put forward are implemented within the University. The Committee has been quite conscious of the relatively uneven record within the University of implementation of committee or task force recommendations. While some part this may stem from a disagreement over the substance of recommendations, it is believed that the University lacks adequate mechanisms to monitor such follow-up. Accordingly, this Committee respectfully urges that once agreement is reached to implement a particular recommendation, responsibility for follow-up on such implementation should be established. It will be noted that most of the recommendations put forward contain a suggested plan of implementation and therefore it should be relatively easy to follow up a year later on those recommendations where action has been agreed upon.

In conclusion, this Steering Committee believes that the mechanism of a joint faculty/administration steering committee has provided credibility; that the mechanics of the process were workable; and that the subject chosen for the experiment was appropriate to the mechanism. Clearly, however, the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Senate Planning Committee should also reflect on this report, remembering that not only should they review the substantive recommendations, but also they should review the experiment with a joint study of an institutional planning issue.