

U of MN 2008-2009 President's Emerging Leaders



Engaging Faculty for the Work of a Lifetime

PEL Team:

Stacy Doepner-Hove,
Office of Human Resources

Renee Rivers,
Office of Information Technology

Kent Spaulding,
University of Minnesota Rochester

Yelena Yan,
College of Education and Human Development

Makeda Zulu-Gillespie,
System Academic Administration, UROC/UNP

Content

Diary of Professor Ranoc.....	3
Charter.....	5
Executive Summary.....	5
Literature review.....	6
Methodology.....	11
Findings.....	12
Recommendations.....	20
COAFES Faculty Development Committee Report.....	31
Implementation Strategies.....	33
Conclusion.....	34
References.....	36
Appendix.....	39

Diary of Professor Ranoc – University of Minnesota – St. Paul campus

– May 1989

The sun rises over the MN State Fair grounds and shines past the top of Hodson Hall and on to the experimental fields that line Larpenteur Avenue. The rosebush that grew so well last year is beginning to bloom. The students are less common as they settle in to take their finals and prepare to leave campus for the summer. Research projects are gearing up and my first summer season of study burns in my mind as I end a great year of teaching. It was a great first year. Students learned, we faculty experimented, imaginations were spurred, and administrative innovations moved the campus forward. Life in academia is exactly what I imagined and hoped for.

– May 1999

The sun rises over the MN State Fair grounds and shines past the top of Hodson Hall and on to the experimental fields that line Larpenteur Avenue. The rosebushes have been moved to the other side of the building. The students are studying at their computers before they take their finals and prepare to leave campus for the summer. My research projects are gearing up and I look forward to a summer season of study as my teaching ends for the year. The year was a good one. Students learned, faculty experimented, imaginations spurred, and administrative innovations moved the campus. Life in academia moves ever onward.

– May 2009

The sun rises over the MN State Fair grounds and shines past the top of Hodson Hall and on to the experimental fields that line Larpenteur Avenue. The roses will grow in the front again, but are joined by daffodils this year. The students are chatting online with their friends as they think about taking their finals and prepare to leave campus for the summer. I will research again this summer as I end my teaching for the year. The year was a fine one. Students learned, faculty experimented, and administrative innovations appeared again. Life in academia continues.

The academic cycle of life is never boring, but it is repetitive. Students come and students go, research and experiments begin and end and the faculty remain. The University of Minnesota strives to attract exceptional faculty from around the world to teach and perform research on campus. The goal is to keep faculty for the life of their academic career. Often a University staff member may find new professional vigor in a new position, a new project, or even a new committee, but how will a U of M faculty member stir their professional passion over the lifetime of their career? The rosebush may shift, but is that enough to spur the mind to new heights? How can the College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences (CFANS) administration provide inviting opportunities for its faculty to push the bounds of innovation in their research, their teaching, and their outreach? Are there incentives through which CFANS faculty can find the inspiration that will help them continue to be truly exceptional over the course of their decades with this institution?

Charter

Research, evaluate, and identify incentive opportunities for tenured faculty in CFANS that align with the CFANS strategic initiatives, inspiring faculty to continue innovation over the course of their careers.

Executive Summary

In September of 2008 a University of Minnesota President's Emerging Leaders (PEL) project team was assigned to review this topic. The project charter was to research, evaluate, and identify incentive opportunities for tenured faculty in CFANS that align with the CFANS strategic initiatives, inspiring faculty to continue innovation over the course of their careers. The team spent time reviewing the literature on faculty incentives before drafting questions to ask current, tenured faculty members in CFANS for their thoughts and ideas about faculty incentives.

Forty interviews with tenured faculty from the Twin Cities campus were conducted in person by the PEL project team in February and March of 2009. From these interviews, faculty expressed what incentives were important to them. From this list the PEL team has three broad recommended areas for CFANS to consider as it looks to create and implement opportunities to engage and inspire faculty throughout the course of their careers. These areas are:

1. Recognition
2. Partnerships: Collaboration and Private Partnerships
3. Support of the academic mission

Each of these areas already hold interest for many of the faculty and the PEL team encourages CFANS to expand on these interests and look at creating structured incentive opportunities through the work of faculty and administration committees. These committees should then bring their ideas to the discussion of the full faculty for consensus. Only with the participation of the CFANS faculty will structured systems of incentives and opportunities create real value for the faculty members whom CFANS wishes to continue to inspire and retain for years to come.

Literature Review

Research literature on engaging faculty through over the life of their careers varies in its quality and isn't as plentiful as literature looking at employees in the private sector. Included below are highlights from those pieces that were most closely associated with the work of the PEL team. For a more thorough review of each piece, see Appendix B.

Faculty Culture and College Life: Reshaping Incentives Toward Student Outcomes, Marilyn J. Amey, 1993

- The role and workload of faculty members are often dictated by the academic culture of the institution and of the particular discipline of the faculty member.
- There is a perception by faculty that institutions are moving toward an emphasis on research over teaching.
- At the same time there is an increased emphasis on the quality of the instruction for undergraduate students with a parallel shift of focus toward student achievement.
- The article discusses dichotomy of institutional regard for research and practical regard for teaching, and the seeming lack of regard for outreach. How do institutions create incentive structures that can balance the focus of faculty between these three things?
- Focus of the article is on shifting toward teaching, and ideas for incentives to help do that.

Two-Tiered Faculty Systems and Organizational Outcomes, Pamela S. Tolber, 1998

- Personnel arrangements for faculty members often present difficulties to the faculty as well as to the organization.
- When institutional supports are not in place for faculty to do their jobs well, it threatens the institutions' ability to deliver high-quality education.

Making Mid-Career Meaningful, R. G. Baldwin, 2005

- Academic life and engagement post-tenure, and especially once full professorship is attained is not well defined.

- The article looks at the question of post-tenure faculty engagement and offers both questions and suggestions for department chairs and institutions.

Motivating faculty through transformational leadership: A study of the relationship between presidential leadership behaviors and faculty behaviors, Frank Anthony Grosso, 2008

- In the past ten years, the meaningful faculty incentives debate has focused on the “big picture” of the institution, and what truly motivates faculty.
- In the following Abstract, the correspondence between the president leadership style and the faculty perceptions about the university president has a direct impact on the productivity of the faculty.
- Increased competition, tighter budgets, technological advancements, and the diverse needs of students are just a few examples of why college and university presidents need to continually foster development and growth within their institutions.
- Presidents thus have the delicate job of motivating faculty to work beyond their individual expectations, scholarly interests, and basic responsibilities, while also making sure they are satisfied with their individual academic pursuits and the institution's direction.
- This study explores the relationship between the leadership behavior of a university president and faculty effort and satisfaction.
- The results confirm that presidents have an enormous and significant influence upon the faculty regardless of how much interpersonal interaction there is between the two.

Factors That Motivate Business Faculty to Conduct Research: An Expectancy Theory Analysis *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, Yining Chen, Ashok Gupta, Leon Hoshower, 2004

- This abstract reviews the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards that are important to faculty.
- Study findings suggest that faculty members who assign higher importance ratings to both the extrinsic and the intrinsic rewards of research exhibit higher research productivity.
- Study findings suggest that:

- untenured faculty members are motivated by extrinsic rewards (e.g. tenure, promotion, and salary raises)
 - tenured faculty members are motivated by intrinsic rewards (e.g. peer recognition, respect, personal needs to contribute to the field)
 - research productivity is positively correlated with tenure status and the percentage of work time allocated to research activities and negatively correlated with years in academic employment
- **What is Important to Faculty:** Percent consider important or very important

1	Receiving or having tenure	91%
2	Being full professor or receiving promotion	84%
3	Getting better salary raises	79%
4	Satisfying my need for creativity / curiosity	75%
5	Satisfying my need to stay current in the field	76%
6	Satisfying my need to contribute to the field	64%
7	Achieving peer recognition	64%
8	Having satisfying collaborations with others	56%
9	Getting respect from students	59%
10	Getting reduced teaching load	52%
11	Getting a “Chaired Professorship”	35%
12	Finding a better job at another University	34%
13	Getting an administrative assignment	10%

Faculty Development Recommendations and Committee Report, COAFES Faculty Development Committee, 2005

- Starting in 2003 the COAFES Faculty Development Committee spent two years researching, consulting, and interviewing on the topic of faculty development. This Committee did its work as the new CFANS College was being envisioned. The Committee wanted to provide a plan for a structured approach to faculty development as a whole for the new college. Two major goals of this work were established:
 - to provide more active support of career development to a larger proportion of our faculty

- to reduce the number of faculty whose professional development and engagement wanes before their time
- The Committee came up with five recommendations to enhance faculty and institutional vitality
 - Hire/appoint College Faculty Development Officer
 - Enhance support for sabbaticals and leaves
 - Develop mandatory faculty career planning and provide explicit benefits and support for planning
 - Expand faculty mentoring program to include all faculty, with accountability resting with the department heads
 - Support professional development workshop series
- The Committee report goes into detail on these five areas and expands the description and understanding of each.
- “A vigorous commitment by the College and faculty,” said the Committee, “to continuing faculty development and a strong administrative structure supporting continuous professional development are important parts of maintaining faculty engagement and productivity over time.”
- This report will be discussed in more detail later in this paper.

Faculty Incentives: Some Practical Keys and Practical Examples, Zeddie Bowen, 1985

- Ten practical keys to faculty incentives
 - Do not have unrealistic expectations
 - Renegotiate the priorities, do not just add new expectations, so that each individual can see how the new priority is to be accommodated in the day-to-day schedule
 - Create incentives that build on positives, on personal wants rather than needs
 - Tie the incentives to the primary motivators of the faculty
 - Tie specific and clearly defined goals or changes in behavior to specific and clearly defined rewards, which should be delivered as soon as the desired goal or behavior occurs. Special care must be taken in designing the rewards when

behavior modification is the goal because the rewards must be repeated in order to reinforce the behavior change

- Individualize the incentives
- Empower the recipient to use the incentives or rewards however and whenever it best suits him or her
- Make programs selective and somewhat exclusive. It is easier to hold an individual accountable if he or she is participating in a selective incentive program
- Define the goals and measures and hold individuals accountable for reasonable achievement. Define the administration's role with equal care and emphasize the importance of its being accountable for upholding its part of the contract
- Be sure the goal is worthy of the time and expense, if not abandon it

Faculty Involvement in Institutional Budgeting, John G. Dimond, 1991

- This article looked at how much influence faculty have in budgetary and planning processes at public institutions around the nation.
- When there is more participation by faculty (true participation where the faculty input is highly valued) there is more satisfaction by the faculty of the process and the outcomes.

Incentives in the Academy: Issues and Options, Roger G. Baldwin and Marsha K Krotseng, 1985

- This article explored what organizational conditions most effectively foster faculty vitality and what types of incentives can higher education institutions offer to sustain high quality faculty performance.
- Intrinsic satisfactions of the academic career have a greater relationship to faculty vitality than do extrinsic rewards
- Monetary rewards are not so important for what they will buy as for what they symbolize
- Work environment is important in the satisfaction and engagement of the faculty.
- An opportunity and power structure that opens career paths, provides developmental activities, facilitates lateral movement across fields, that involves people in goal setting, planning, and governance, and that recognizes good performance in a variety of ways

- Colleges and universities need to structure incentives that are directly relevant to their institutional goals and to the needs of the professors they employ.
- Incentives that are insensitive to professor’s developmental differences are likely to be less than fully effective.
- However, the most important factor is to consider professors individually and to offer incentives that most appropriately respond to their unique interests and needs.

Methodology

There are nearly 260 faculty members in CFANS. They are spread out across the state at research and outreach centers as well as on the Twin Cities campus. However, the vast majority of faculty members are housed and do their work on the St. Paul campus. The project focused solely on tenured faculty members from the St. Paul campus. This was done to limit the scope of the project to a narrower field of interview subjects. The hope is that the recommendations that come from this project, and the structures that are implemented in the future, can be used as templates and guidelines that can be adapted for the unique needs of the research and outreach center faculty and those faculty who have not yet attained tenure.

Of the approximately 220 CFANS faculty who are tenured on the St. Paul campus, forty interviews were conducted. The PEL team worked with the Office for Equity and Diversity to

Question 6:

For you personally, which part of the faculty mission do you find most important: teaching, research, or outreach?

ensure that that interviewee list was as diverse as possible. These interviews were based on a set of structured questions that were created to identify areas where faculty felt there would be opportunities to build on the existing incentive systems that would be both applicable and inspiring. The questions included a list of potential “incentives” taken from the literature review. The interviewees were asked which, if any, of the things on the list would be of interest to them personally. The interviewees were also asked what the most important part of the faculty mission was: teaching, research, and/or

outreach. They were asked which was most important to them personally as well as which was most important to CFANS and the U of M in general. (See question list in Appendix A)

The interviews were conducted in person with one or two of the PEL team members conducting each interview. The interview time ranged from ten minutes to an hour and a half, with an average time of approximately forty-five minutes. The questions were given to the interviewee prior to the interview and time was given for the interviewee to talk about other issues or ideas beyond the questions as well. Notes were taken on site by the interviewer(s) and then compiled by the PEL team.

The PEL team looked at which items on the incentives list were of importance to the majority of interviewees as well as what were the most important points stated during each interview. From the important points as well as the incentives list, the team gathered themes around what areas of interest there would be for CFANS to create structured opportunities for inspiration and growth of the faculty.

Findings

CFANS is a blended college. In fiscal year 2007, six separate colleges at the University of Minnesota were blended to create three new colleges. CFANS came out of that blending of colleges, combining the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences; the Department of Food Science and Nutrition from the College of Human Ecology; and the College of Natural Resources. Each of the three new colleges has faced challenges, but CFANS seems to be taking great strides forward as a new, single unit. The single most important comment to come out of nearly all of the interviews was that the CFANS administration is perceived as open to hearing new ideas. This invoked a feeling of trust. Some faculty from the old colleges had memories of administrators who were far out of touch with what was happening with and to their faculty.

It is an incentive to continue to work here simply that there is an open dialogue between the administration and the faculty.

One interviewee mentioned that she had never received recognition from the old dean for a prominent award she was given. While she had received congratulations from the University President and even a US Senator, nothing from her college administration. “Not a note; not a phone call; not even an email”. She went on to say that things had changed significantly and for the better with the CFANS administration. “I may not agree with everything that happens here,” she said, “but at least I know they want to hear what I have to say.”

This is an important point for CFANS administration to consider. They have the opportunity to create new programs, implement new structures, move the college forward with faculty input— as long as the administration continues to ask for and listen to the advice and input of their exceptional faculty.

Another important item that emerged from the interviews was that the faculty members are impressed and inspired by their colleagues. The interviewees were glad to be at the U of M because of the quality of the people and research being done. Again, this offers a great opportunity to create interesting and effective systems to inspire and encourage the faculty in ways they don’t normally imagine. If the systems are such that they are created with the integration and imagination of the faculty, the quality of the faculty will inspire innovation for careers to come.

Specific findings of the interviews fell into many areas. From sabbaticals to commercialization, there was great discussion during all the interviews. Listed below are many areas of interest that came up during the interviews. Each area is a combination of various interviews and all could be the subject of further discussion and deliberation.

Sabbaticals

CFANS currently has policies in place for faculty to take sabbaticals. However in many interviews faculty members said there were concerns with the policies, or with the realities that surround the sabbatical option. It seems that some of the departments are much more likely to use the sabbatical policies than others. Perhaps if those departments that have faculty using this

option could talk with CFANS administration about what works with their lifestyle, this could be passed on to other departments or worked into a new sabbatical policy structure.

In general faculty members felt there were many drawbacks to taking sabbaticals. Taking a shorter sabbatical in order to retain full pay means that the work that the faculty member wants to do while on sabbatical is limited and often the time frame is simply not long enough. Yet using the option of a longer sabbatical provides its own problems. A longer sabbatical means there is less income for the faculty member. In order to supplement the income stream the faculty member needs to find a grant to supplement their income over the course of the sabbatical. And searching for that short-term grant can take time and energy away from obtaining the longer term grants both the college and the faculty would prefer.

There is also the question of teaching load while on sabbatical. Many faculty members need to find a colleague to take their teaching in their absence. While it is possible to find coverage, it burdens the colleague and often is an uncomfortable ask for the faculty member who wants to go on sabbatical. And while the sabbatical bound faculty member is looking for a teaching replacement, he or she also needs to explain to anyone with whom collaborative research is being done that the collaboration needs to be put on hold while the faculty member on sabbatical pursues a new line of research for a year. Again, it can be a difficult conversation without a solid structure to back up the sabbatical policy.

There is also the reality of a faculty member's significant other and/or children that puts the sabbatical out of reach for some. Many faculty members feel they simply do not wish to take such extended time away from family, nor is there an easy way to bring the family along. Yet, the majority of the faculty members that were interviewed said that sabbaticals are important to the research process. Work done in this area could provide a more supportive structure so that the faculty member taking a sabbatical would have the structure and resources to make the transition to and from the time away an easier move. Again, talking with the departments that use sabbaticals most may provide insight into how it can work well. Institutionalizing the process may make it easier for others to see the benefits and alleviate the drawbacks.

Ideas:

- Grant pool specifically dedicated to provide time to do cutting edge research while on sabbatical
- Formal structure for teaching and collaboration to continue while on sabbatical
- Open discussion of how sabbatical can work with a family

Teaching and the Funding Model

Teaching may be part of the faculty mission, but many faculty members felt it never quite got the recognition it deserves. Many faculty members who were interviewed simply felt it didn't have the same weight as research. "We are not," one faculty member said, "striving to be one of the top three *teaching* universities in the world." So many of the opportunities offered to faculty are not for the development of their teaching skills. Some ideas for encouraging faculty members to try new teaching techniques are discussed later in this report, but the fundamental concern mentioned in many interviews is that the funding model for teaching puts the incentives on all the wrong things.

The budgeting model for the University gives more credit for faculty members to teach larger classes. So CFANS faculty members think about what classes they can teach that will attract students from both inside the college and outside its doors. "I can," said one faculty member, "certainly teach a biology 101 class as well as someone from College of Biological Sciences (CBS). But why?" There may be an incentive for the college to have more large classes taught. The money from the large classes comes directly into the college, and typically into a central fund. But where is the incentive for the faculty member? They get no extra pay, their department gets no extra benefit, and teaching a large class of three hundred can be more work and less fun than an intimate class of twenty.

The creation of an internal budgeting structure that would allow for more pass through to a department or a faculty member would encourage the development of new classes. And, if the number of students in the class helps to determine the size of the pass through the faculty member has a direct incentive to develop innovative curriculum that will lure students to CFANS from across the University.

The use of overload pay may be another option to encourage innovation and engagement in teaching. Allowing for faculty members who teach beyond their contractual courses, whether that is a study abroad course, a new niche course, or an innovative large lecture, and paying them to do so may spark interest in making teaching a higher priority for faculty throughout their careers.

Or, perhaps, encouraging faculty members to rethink their appointments as they run the life of their careers could engage someone who was wondering from their initial inspirations. If a faculty member begins with an appointment with 75% research, 20% teaching, and 5% outreach that may be just what they want as their research is as young as they are. But, as time goes on some (not all) faculty members find themselves wanting to shift the percentages. Allowing, and even encouraging, periodic review of that initial appointment letter may give room for innovation when the rosebushes are starting to fade.

The University of Minnesota is a research one institution. Faculty members approach this reality in vastly different ways, and those approaches may shift and slide over the life of a career. The opportunities are there to encourage faculty members to try new things in teaching and continue to innovate in new spheres.

Ideas:

- Create a budgeting framework that would encourage new, large class creation among CFANS faculty members
- Use overload pay to encourage new class creation
- Encourage the periodic review of appointments to allow for flexibility throughout the life of a faculty member's career

New Pay-Options

The reality of retention is often simply money. There are always more considerations than simply what ends up in someone's paycheck, but it is the consideration that cannot be ignored.

CFANS, like every college at the University, is looking for ways to be as innovative as possible with the funding it gives to its faculty and staff. Employees at the University of Minnesota as a whole make up 70% of the University budget. So offering money as an incentive, whether for retention or engagement is often a difficult reality. However, there were a few ideas discussed by the faculty members interviewed that should be related here.

Allowing faculty members to switch to a nine-month appointment may give people the option they need to augment their own salary. For example, if a professor was paid \$80,000 here at the University and was offered \$100,000 by another University, CFANS would be hard pressed to come up with \$20,000 to match. However, if the faculty member was given the \$90,000 on a nine-month appointment and was able to augment with a summer research grant, the faculty member may end up with \$110,000 in his/her pocket and the research grant will pay \$5000 in overhead costs to CFANS, so that \$30,000 bump only actually costs CFANS perhaps \$5000. Now this may be a single specific example, but the fact that at least one very similar situation took place should encourage the college to look at nine-month appointments as the foundation of a new way to structure pay for faculty.

There are also colleges, around the University and elsewhere, that allow for portions of grants to put directly into the faculty member's salary. This could be a great incentive, for some faculty members, to bring in new grants for new research as well as for their own monetary gain. The PEL team understands that there may be limitations to this option on many federally funded grants, but the option was mentioned often enough that it should be evaluated and discussed as a potential framework for the college.

Finally, there is the option for outside consulting. Many faculty members already do this, and many feel it isn't something they want to do. But, often this option is one that is difficult to pursue for faculty members when they simply don't know where to start. Providing training, administrative support, and clear policy guidelines on what works and what doesn't would encourage faculty members to bring their work and expertise to the world outside of academia. This may not be the best option for everyone, but when the realities of pay inside the academy

continue to tighten; having a clearly defined and structured path to creating pay opportunities may be of interest in the future.

Ideas:

- Nine-month appointments as an option for faculty members would allow for summer research and consulting that may boost pay without taking away from the teaching, research, and outreach of the college
- Though much more research and structure would be needed before implementation, allowing grant monies to be added directly to a faculty members salary may provide incentives for faculty members
- Provide a structure, a network, and training for faculty members to engage in outside consulting as a way to supplement income and share knowledge beyond the academy

Faculty Club

It seems so simple to say, but having a place where the faculty members can get together and talk would be of great interest to many of the faculty members that were interviewed. Often there is little opportunity for collaboration and discussion within the academy. Everyone is working on his or her own research, or rushing to class, or helping a student. There is no time to slow down and have a discussion about the work, talk through a problem, or discover work that may compliment other research. Simply bringing people together in an open setting might be enough to initiate new ideas. The majority of Faculty members interested in a Faculty Club stressed they were not interested in driving to the Minneapolis campus to interact with their colleagues. It simply is not convenient, and needs to be close (if not on) the St. Paul campus.

The St. Paul Student Union is just that, a place for students. There is no sit-down type food option, and no real place to sit down. Faculty members go there to eat out of necessity, but it is not conducive to open discussion and collegiality. There was mixed thoughts about whether faculty members would go to a faculty club at the end of the work day. Lives have changed since the days when people would head out for drinks together after the work day. Many faculty members are ready to head home or to other activities when each work day is through. But, many said they would relish the opportunity to have a place they could go during the day to sit and talk with their colleagues.

So perhaps the answer is not a full time faculty club. Perhaps it would be enough to have a designated room where faculty and staff on the St. Paul campus could gather over lunch or in the morning and simply talk. If the interest was there, the food could come later. Just create an inviting space and encourage people to bring food from home, from the Student Center, or wherever. Just be sure it is comfortable enough that people really want to be there and stay awhile. The Faculty Club may not bring immediate results in research, teaching or outreach. But it will increase the level of collegiality amongst the people on St. Paul campus. If CFANS is hoping to retain faculty over the course of thirty year careers, supporting social interaction as well as collegial collaboration becomes more of an imperative.

Ideas:

- Create a centrally located place on the St. Paul campus where faculty and staff can gather
- Make sure the space is welcoming and conducive to long discussions
- Bring food in for purchase and/or create a welcoming space for people to bring in their own food

International Opportunities

The rosebushes on the St. Paul campus look very different from the rosebushes on the campus of Peking University in China. And the work being done at these two places can also be vastly different, and intriguingly interesting to faculty looking for something new. Having the opportunity to get away and research, teach, and talk somewhere new can inspire creativity and innovation for years after the travel itself is done. Having and supporting a number of international opportunities for faculty members may be a great way to expand the research of the faculty and inspire innovation throughout the college.

Interviewed faculty members showed great interest in the possibilities offered by international research, teaching, and outreach. However, the same problems that often face faculty looking to take a sabbatical or leave face faculty looking to spend time around the world. Much like the ideas mentioned with sabbaticals and leaves, creating a structure of support for

international opportunities could be a good step to encourage innovation over a lifetime. This structure would need to both communicate the opportunities and benefits of international work as well as help work through the difficulties that can be faced by faculty members as they plan to go abroad.

Another way to strengthen CFANS world-wide presence is to bring in more visiting professors from around the world. Some faculty said they thought the visiting international professors brought a great diversity of opinion to the department and to the research for the time they were in residence. Other faculty members felt like they didn't really notice when visiting faculty were in residence because they didn't really get much chance to talk with them about their work. So bringing the world to CFANS is a great way to infuse new ideas into the work of the college, but only if there is a structure that encourages all the faculty members in the college to actively engage with the visiting professors. Sharing thoughts and exchanging ideas with professors from around the world can bring a truly foreign perspective to the work of the faculty. And that perspective may help to engage faculty throughout their careers.

Ideas:

- Establish a structure of communication and support for faculty members who wish to try an international opportunity for research, teaching, or outreach
- Encourage all faculty members in the college to engage with visiting international faculty when they are in residence

Recommendations

The interviews gave great insight into the workings of CFANS. The findings presented above have many and varied points of entry for CFANS administration to look at new ways to keep faculty engaged throughout the life of their careers. Some of the findings are more thought exercises than places for practical application given the budget realities of today. However, some provide more pressing opportunities.

There are three broad areas of recommendation that were mentioned in one way or another by a majority of the faculty we interviewed. These areas are ones where CFANS administration has a chance to move quickly to implement structures that would help provide faculty with ongoing opportunities for growth. There are three opportunities that would directly benefit faculty growth. One is an indirect opportunity to provide support for faculty to grow by allowing others to help in their work.

Recognition

Everyone wants recognition for doing good work. While many faculty members specifically said they do their work because they love the work, no one doubted that a call from the Dean or an

Trying something different can be seen as a diminishing of your research/teaching/outreach work in the eyes of colleagues. Having an award behind you makes you feel like you can take a risk since you have proven yourself in another way.

award of excellence can make your day. In fact there were some interviewees who stated that an award or recognition allowed them to explore other research they would not normally have done. Having the recognition behind their name implied to their colleagues that they must be doing something right, so even if what they are doing is unorthodox research, perhaps it might work.

Recognition fell into three main groups. First, there is internal recognition by administration and colleagues. Second, there are awards for exceptional merit by CFANS or the University. Finally, there are awards on a national or international level. Each of these groups provides valued recognition for faculty members. In fact, often some faculty members would prefer one form of recognition while others would prefer a second. Multiple forms of recognition give faculty members the opportunities to continue to strive for exceptional work throughout their careers. They can provide a needed spark to try something new when simply counting the rosebushes seems to work well enough.

Internal recognition from CFANS administration and colleagues was important to many of our interviewees. It was clear that they were not looking to the CFANS Dean to give them a pat on the back every time they have a good class or get a new grant. But it meant a lot when the

administration took an interest in the work they were doing. Congratulations on a particularly important grant, recognition of a new teaching load or excellent student reviews, or acknowledgement of an award of thanks from a community partner for exceptional outreach efforts. Some of these things may happen often in the college, but a word of thanks or a public award means that the administration appreciates the work you are doing. And that means a lot to anyone. It may be difficult for the CFANS Dean to know everything that is going on in all departments, but a system could be set up to ensure that the Dean saw any mention of recognition that happened in a department meeting or that would allow colleagues to alert the administration of exceptional work being done by someone else in the department. Recognition, as long as it doesn't become simply an award for everything done by anyone, should be a natural part of the workplace. Exceptional work should be acknowledged and rewarded. This is simple task, and important in the work of the college.

Formal awards pose a different problem. We often heard from interviewees that it was difficult to know what award opportunities were available. Faculty members are often so focused on their research, teaching, and outreach that they have little time to think about nominating themselves for awards. Or they know little about what it takes to win a particular award. If the award nomination process could be streamlined within CFANS to not only help faculty members apply for awards, but to give faculty members the knowledge of what it takes to get an award there may be more interest in making the nomination.

Reading the award qualifications, I realized my work was close to the exceptional work of the past award recipients. I just needed that little nudge to push my work to the next level.

Many interviewees stated that even seeing what an award nomination called for could be inspiring. One faculty member said that when her department head suggested she apply for a prestigious award she took a look at the award requirements and the vitae of past award recipients. She then realized that her work wasn't quite there, but it could get there with a plan and some extra effort. The suggestion that she was worthy of the award, and the realization that she was very close, was enough to spur her to try some new things beyond her yearly pattern of quality work.

Creating an award nomination process within CFANS will take time and effort. Streamlining the process and helping faculty with nominations may take a dedicated staff member to seek out awards, help with nominations, and publicize the winners. However, the benefits of having faculty members who are spurred to bring their research to the next level, or to push their teaching to have greater impact, or to branch their outreach into new areas can be of huge reward for CFANS as a whole. From something as simple as a Dean's phone call to something as big as an international competition nomination, having CFANS structure the process of awards and recognition will be of immense value to the faculty throughout the college.

Ideas:

- Establish a structure to ensure the Dean's office knows about exceptional happenings in the departments and follows up with appropriate recognition
 - Ensure these happenings are given to the CFANS communications department for dissemination within and beyond the college
- Create a nominating committee tasked with searching out awards at all levels and encouraging faculty members to apply
 - Ensure that awards and their criteria are disseminated throughout the college so faculty can see the works of past recipients
 - Provide staff support to the committee for nominations and communications
- Structure a "star faculty" system through which department heads can nominate a small set number of faculty members each year to CFANS administration. CFANS administration will choose from among the nominations to provide monetary awards to the star faculty. Awards should be based on research, teaching, outreach and/or a combination of the three.
- CFANS administration should take special care to notice the works of department heads as they are often doing the nominating and are therefore not nominated themselves.
- Small awards could be issued with tickets or passes to events on campus. This would be less expensive and would provide opportunities for more faculty members to get involved and feel a part of the University as a whole.

Partnerships

In many of the interviews faculty members said that one of the greatest frustrations they faced was the lack of incentives to partner with others. Some faculty are looking for a better way to bridge the gap between the research labs and the marketplace, while others are simply looking for better ways to partner internally on interdisciplinary research projects and grant opportunities. Faculty members in CFANS are focused on research and that research can be a valuable tool for the college as it looks to create opportunities for partnerships. Some faculty members are looking for more creative ways to partner with their colleagues inside the college, and some are also looking for more creative ways to partner with the outside world.

Internal Collaboration

The University of Minnesota's goal to become one of the top three public research universities in the world makes it essential that faculty members are working together to help the University succeed. Today, CFANS faculty members are pulled in many different directions. They have teaching responsibilities, research to conduct, and in most cases, outreach responsibilities through their departments or through University of Minnesota Extension. Many faculty members said that there is a great opportunity for improvement in how they are working with their colleagues to achieve the mission of the University.

Collaboration is an essential ingredient to doing quality experimentation. However, the opportunities for collaboration aren't supported by the structures of the college.

In the research realm, faculty collaboration becomes more than a nicety. Collaboration is an essential ingredient to doing quality

experimentation. As federal grant opportunities continue to get more competitive, Principle Investigators (PI's) on grants are always looking to create the best research team possible. The stronger the PI and the stronger the research team involved, the more likely a grant will be funded. However, the opportunities for collaboration aren't supported by the structures of the college.

More than once faculty members suggested that CFANS create an incentive system that would reward faculty members for serving as team members on grants. Right now it is often the case that unless a faculty member is the lead PI on a grant, there is no credit given for working

on a grant. The lead PI has the bulk of the work to do, but also gets all the credit. This means that in order to get high marks in a performance review, each faculty member must lead his or her own grant. Yet no grant can be completed with only the PI doing the research. So, each PI seeks out fellow faculty members to help do the research – but can offer them only a promise that the PI will return the favor when they have a grant to finish. CFANS should revise its system of performance reviews to balance the desire for more grants, and therefore more lead PIs, with the need for collaboration to execute the grants and to inspire innovation amongst the faculty members.

Second, faculty members sometimes feel they have more in common with researchers at other institutions researching the same topics, then with their colleague across the hall or down the hill. Faculty members might define themselves as studying the Ash Borer or environmental asphalt instead of as members of CFANS or even the University of Minnesota. And while CFANS doesn't want to discourage collaboration with faculty from across the world, structures should be put in place to encourage collaboration with those you see every day.

Faculty members found the idea of holding “umbrella topic” discussions was a good one. Looking across the college and finding broad subject areas that may appeal to faculty members throughout the college. Holding discussions, debates, even one-day symposiums could attract faculty members who have vastly different areas of subject expertise, but may find areas of overlap that would enhance the research of many faculty members. Bringing the faculty members together, in ways that make sense and are of interest, may provide the spark of innovation and collaboration that enhances the sense of community for the college and the University as a whole, and moves the University closer to its “top three” goal.

Many of the same things can be said in the areas of teaching and outreach. CFANS structures currently reward faculty members for teaching their own classes, doing their own research, and creating their own outreach. If faculty members look to help each other there is no way to truly reward that offer of help. This leads to faculty isolation and breeds the feeling of collegiality with those on other campuses instead of within the college. If one faculty member

wants to do an outreach project but needs the expertise of another, there is little encouragement for the faculty expert to lend his/her time – other than professional courtesy.

Structures within CFANS should be shifted to encourage collaboration in any of the areas of the faculty mission. Not only would the workload for faculty members become a bit more realistic, the work product will improve as experts collaborate on projects or classes and the productivity level will increase in areas outside of the norm.

Ideas:

- Revise CFANS performance review structures to encourage collaboration in research, teaching, and outreach
- Be sensitive to the workload of the faculty members and design a structure that will encourage productivity through collaboration and not feel like more work
- Provide opportunities for and encourage participation in college-wide discussions of broad areas of interest for CFANS faculty members

Private Partnerships

Bringing research discoveries to the public is part of the University of Minnesota's land grant mission. This process also helps fund new research and can potentially help fund research assistants and facility needs as well. As state and federal funding decline, the dependence on these research initiatives will continue to increase. By partnering with businesses and industry, CFANS faculty members can make an investment in the college's future and also help strengthen the local community by creating more jobs through potential start-up companies, or helping boost the research ideas and work of industry through consulting agreements.

To that end, many of the CFANS faculty members were interested in conducting more partnerships with industry, but some expressed a concern about the resources and the commitments made by the college. Many faculty members believe they should be given more time to focus on research away from the university setting and that there should be more leave time and money available to conduct research that is beneficial to the college. Some of those in favor of outside partnering believe that it would be easier to work with industry if the University

wasn't so risk adverse – there are many strong research ideas that could be of interest to outside partners, but right now there isn't a good system in place to make those connections. That strong research could be leveraged with private industry partners or perhaps with college money to be spun out into industry – but there isn't enough emphasis on faculty having time away to do research or enough emphasis on partnering with industry as it relates to the commercialization process.

It must be said that there are faculty members who strongly believe that working with industry and partnering with the outside world isn't and shouldn't be a part of the faculty member's responsibility. Private partnerships run the risk of having the research driven to an end, rather than allowing the research to truly discover new knowledge. Many faculty members came to the academy because they specifically wanted to do research that wasn't driven by a corporate bottom line. CFANS administration must look critically at the expansion of private partnerships, with faculty involvement partnerships can be structured to ensure that academic freedom is preserved while private partnerships are pursued.

CFANS administration must look critically at the expansion of private partnerships, with faculty involvement partnerships can be structured to ensure that academic freedom is preserved while private partnerships are pursued.

External partnerships already exist within CFANS and across the University. However, faculty members said that it isn't always easy for industry to work with the University and it isn't easy for faculty to work within the constraints of the University system. To make this point, one faculty member we interviewed made the suggestion that the process of having a more streamlined system for working with outside entities could help the college in its goal to build or renovate facilities. The faculty member believes the college is missing a "...golden opportunity by not doing more partnerships and collaboration with the outside world."

"If it was easier to work with the college and if there was more of an emphasis internally to work with outside partners, new labs would already exist for research," said this faculty member. However, he believes that business and industry leaders will (and are) exploring other alternatives because the University is much too difficult to access or connect with in a timely

manner. The faculty member believes that there are many of his colleagues in CFANS who could do more partnering if the process were made easier.

Part of the hesitancy on the part of faculty members and the University may be a lack of awareness and familiarity with what is available to industry partners or a lack of understanding about how CFANS researchers could apply their research to industry problems. Either way, CFANS administration has an opportunity to improve external collaboration by streamlining and improving the processes for getting information disseminated as it relates to potential outside partnerships. Gathering a workgroup of interested faculty members to decide how consulting and research collaboration could be improved would be a step in building this new structure. This group could then meet with potential outside partners to find out what they want from CFANS and its faculty to determine the best, and most appropriate, way to partner.

Ideas:

- Create a faculty workgroup to look at how to structure more private partnerships to ensure academic freedom while tapping the resources of industry.
- Streamline the information process to allow faculty members to know and understand potential opportunities with private partners.
- Build a workgroup of faculty and development staff to meet with private partners to encourage collaboration between industry and the academy.

Support of the Academic Mission

Faculty today face increased pressure to produce more research, teach more classes, and reach more people with their work. It is true that the University of Minnesota has a tri-partite mission for its faculty: research, teaching, outreach, but it is also true that individual faculty members have a finite resource in time. It is also true that some faculty excel in one area and others in another. These areas of excellence may change as the faculty member's career progresses. The excitement of research in the pre-tenure era may change its form to become an equal excitement to share the knowledge gained over a lifetime with students both in school and around the state. All the pieces of the faculty mission are of deep import to the University. So

how does CFANS help encourage innovation in all areas throughout the course of a faculty member's career?

From interviews with CFANS faculty, two areas of particular interest were discussed. First, the support for graduate students was a common area of interest. Second, college sponsored funding to allow faculty to do what may be seen as “riskier” research, untested teaching techniques, or unique outreach opportunities. Both of these areas would allow faculty to change the course of their career over time and shape the way they look at the faculty mission.

Graduate student funding is something of a misnomer. The faculty members the PEL team talked to said time and again that they had never had trouble funding a graduate student once that student was at the University and doing the work. The problem really lies in the recruitment portion and timing of a graduate student's life. Many graduate students see the amazing work being done at the University and are enticed to come to this northern climate for their education. But, when the departments are recruiting these students in February they have not yet secured all the funding necessary to pay for the graduate student that would come on board in September. Students are interested in the packages being promised, but they are hesitant to accept an offer that is contingent on funding coming through. This gap in the definite funding between the time of recruitment and the time of arrival allows many of the very best students to accept offers at other schools, to ensure themselves a paid position.

Graduate students are the building blocks upon which the faculty can do their work. Graduate students conduct research, analyze data, speak to the public, and teach classes that the professors simply don't have the capacity to do. Faculty members are able to expand their capacity because of the skills and talents of the graduate students. Graduate students are, for many faculty members interviewed, the reason why they are professors. They are what the school builds its reputation upon. For it is our graduate students who go off to do amazing things that people around the world know about and associate with the University of Minnesota.

So it is vital, both for the fulfillment of the faculty mission and for the continued world-wide reputation of CFANS that graduate student funding be a priority for the college. But this is easy

to say, and perhaps much harder to actually do. Funding of any sort in this economic climate is hard to come by. And, funding for an indirect (albeit vital) form of faculty support like a graduate student may be harder to come by still. The PEL team does not have any easy answers to this question. There were ideas from the faculty members. One idea was to put off the hiring of a faculty member in each department and pool that money to be used as gap funding for graduate students. Another idea was to offer slightly lower pay to incoming faculty, but the benefit of having more graduate students might offset that drawback. Perhaps neither of these ideas would be practicable. However, CFANS needs to consider the importance of this question on the faculty and perhaps something more doable will emerge.

The second recommendation for supporting the faculty mission also requires additional dollars. However, these may not be as large, nor as constant, as the graduate student gap funding. Here the dollars would be spent to directly encourage faculty members to continue their innovative work through their careers. Often, the interviews showed, it is not a lack of ideas that hinders faculty engagement. Rather it is a lack of demonstrated support for taking the innovative route that keeps a faculty member from trying something new.

Small grant funding coming directly from the college would allow faculty members to try new things without having to worry about the restrictions that come with grant funding from outside. There may not always be a product or a direct application of research that should be done nonetheless to move the field forward. Or perhaps there is a new teaching technique a faculty member would like to try. Funding is not always available to learn this new technique so the desire to “give it a try” is minimal. And there are many underserved communities around the state where funders are wary to go. Yet, there may be a small project a CFANS faculty member could do that would enhance the lives of these people to no end – but where will that little bit of money come from?

The demonstrated support of the CFANS administration for these sorts of small projects would not only encourage faculty members to try new things, it would allow these new things to happen at all. Certainly money is still an object. But in this case, a small amount of money could go a long way towards keeping faculty members engaged over the course of their careers.

Ideas:

- Prioritize funding to allow for funding the recruitment gap for the best graduate students
- Create small college-supported grants to encourage and allow faculty members to try new things in all areas of the faculty mission

COAFES Faculty Development Committee Report

In 2003, before the blending of colleges to create CFANS, there was a committee assigned to look at the topic of faculty development. This committee worked for two years reviewing research, interviewing experts, holding faculty workshops, and discussing best practices in faculty development. Their work is clearly and concisely laid out in their final report and it is something that CFANS should pay close attention to. The work this committee did aligns well with some of what the PEL team recommends. The Committee specifically states that one of their main objectives was to reduce the number of faculty whose professional development and engagement wanes before their time. This is the same theme as *Engaging Faculty for the Work of a Lifetime*. And, the Committee's five recommendations are sound:

1. Hire/appoint College Faculty Development Officer
2. Enhance support for sabbaticals and leaves
3. Develop mandatory faculty career planning and provide explicit benefits and support for planning
4. Expand faculty mentoring program to include all faculty, with accountability resting with the department heads
5. Support professional development workshop series

The Committee report goes into detail on these five areas and expands the description and understanding of each.

1. Faculty Development Officer: The Committee felt that having one person charged with the responsibility for keeping faculty development going was essential. It is always easy for professionals in general, and faculty in specific, to become so involved in the work they are doing that they forget to be mindful of their own professional development. Having a single person looking for ways to help the faculty members define and expand their professional growth would help to keep the topic on everyone's mind. "By concentrating faculty development duties within one position," said the Committee, "the College will ensure that its faculty are prepared for the changes and opportunities promised in the University's strategic planning process."
2. Sabbaticals and Leaves: The Committee felt that having time for faculty to concentrate on their research through sabbaticals or leaves was essential to keeping a faculty member engaged throughout his or her career. It encouraged the new college to provide additional funding and to ensure internal communication about funding sources for faculty to have the capacity to take such leaves.
3. Faculty Career Plans: Through its research the Committee found that having a defined academic career plans is of huge benefit to the continued engagement and productivity of the faculty. These individual plans should include a career mission, a vision, and strategic goals spanning three-to-five year intervals. These plans, the Committee said, should be integrated into the annual performance reviews so they are discussed regularly and updated as needed.
4. Mentoring Program: Mentoring programs have been consistently found to have a positive impact on academic productivity, satisfaction, commitment, and morale – found the Committee. The recommendation was that there be formal mentoring programs set up between junior and senior faculty and group and peer mentoring for faculty at all career stages. There was also discussion of cross-unit peer mentoring to support faculty development.
 5. Professional Development Workshop Series: The Committee recommended that there be three workshops a year to specifically address the needs of its faculty and professional development. The workshops could focus on topics such as time management, enhancing communication, grants management, personnel management,

etc. The Committee also recommended that continuing faculty development opportunities be communicated on the web as well.

The PEL team work enhances that work of the Faculty Development Committee and both their recommendations and the recommendations listed in this report provide strong opportunities for beginning the work of enhanced faculty engagement within CFANS.

Implementation Strategies

The CFANS administrative team is in an enviable position. They have built a level of trust with the CFANS faculty that was related through interviewees as simply was not there before the blending of the colleges. To implement any of the recommendations above, or any system of incentive opportunities for CFANS faculty, the administrative team will need to continue to listen to the faculty members and create integrated teams of faculty and administrators to decide what structures will work for this college.

CFANS should prioritize the recommendations (both those listed above and those from the COAFES Faculty Development Committee) and decide which area to work with first. Looking at streamlining awards and recognition may give the quickest return for the work done, but implementing a commercialization structure may provide the largest long-term growth. The administrative team must also look at the CFANS strategic plan.

Where does the college as a whole need to strengthen its work? What, from the strategic plan, are the most important points to encourage innovation by the faculty members? Are there a few things that this particular area of incentive opportunity could easily fit with? Not all areas of incentives will fit with all areas of the strategic plan. CFANS administration should choose where to focus which areas of the strategic plan with which incentive opportunity so there is a connection to the work of the college as a whole as the structure for the incentives begins to take shape.

Once CFANS decides which area to begin with and where it fits within the strategic plan, a team of faculty and administration (with a faculty member from each department) should form a workgroup to discuss ideas and define a structure for this area of incentive opportunity. This new

workgroup should try to include faculty members who may not usually be involved in the workings of the college. Bringing in new voices may help build consensus. Having key stakeholders contributing to the planning from the beginning affirms their value. The workgroup should plan to meet no more than three times to establish a draft structure for the recommended incentive opportunities. This draft should go to department heads for comment and then to all faculty for comment, suggestions, ideas, and discussion. An open meeting on this topic alone should be held for all faculty members to give input and thoughts. There should also be written solicitation of the faculty members to provide comments in written form if they don't wish to or can't attend the open meeting. Most importantly, these ideas must be reviewed and incorporated where possible into the final incentive opportunity structure. Nothing frustrates employees more than being asked to contribute and then seeing nothing come from their contributions.

Following this implementation scheme will ensure that the structures put in place will be ones that the faculty actually want. Implementing incentive schemes that are unwanted or unappreciated simply creates resentment and feelings that the administration is telling faculty members to do yet one more thing, instead of allowing them to try new things and innovate beyond the norm. Each faculty member will find themselves driven by different forces. But gathering faculty ideas and buy-in will help set CFANS up to provide ongoing support for innovation and ideas that will grow the college as it grows the faculty.

Conclusion

The rosebushes move from front to back, daffodils are added and taken away, students come and go, and still the faculty remains. The University of Minnesota in general and CFANS in particular is graced with an abundance of brilliant faculty. For decades to come, these faculty members will continue to do great work in teaching, research, and outreach. But for the faculty member, how can the professional passion that flowed vigorously through tenure be raised again as the natural ebb of an academic life takes hold? When you are already doing good work, and have been for years, from where does the spark of innovation spring?

Creating a faculty incentive opportunity structure is not about getting the faculty members to do their jobs. That good work is already being done. Creating the structures of opportunities is

about giving faculty members the spark needed for them to be newly innovative when life has conspired to make the professional passion run more slowly. No one can remain on top of their game forever and it is the job of a strong and supportive administration to provide those sparks when the faculty member is ready to use them.

References

- Adeogun, J. (2008). **Will monetary motivation lead to an increase in job performance and job satisfaction? A study at multicultural for-profit institutions of higher learning.** *PsycINFO*.
- Amey, M. J. (Spring 1999). **Faculty culture and college life: Reshaping incentives toward student outcomes.** *New Directions for Higher Education*, (105), 59-11p.
- Baldwin, R. G., & Krottseng, M. V. (1985). **Incentives in the academy: Issues and options.** *New Directions for Higher Education*, 51, 5 - 20.
- Bowen, Z. (1985). **Faculty incentives: Some practical keys and practical examples.** *New Directions for Higher Education*, 51, 33-11p.
- Dimond, J. G. (1991). **Involvement in Institutional Budgeting.** *New Directions for Higher Education*, 75, 63-78p.
- Goldsmith, S. (2007). **University of Minnesota –twin cities faculty salary increases FY 2007-2008** (Report prepared for the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs Office of Institutional Research.)
- Grosso, F. A. (2008). **Motivating faculty through transformational leadership: A study of the relationship between presidential leadership behaviors and faculty behaviors.** *PsycINFO*,

- Hamill, P. J., Jr. (1985). **Faculty incentives at the college of Charleston: A case study.** *New Directions for Higher Education*, 51, 83-15p.
- Harter, C. L. (Winter 2004). **Changing incentives and time allocations for academic economists: Results from 1995 and 2000 national surveys.** *Journal of Economic Education*, 35(1), 89-9p.
- Lawrence, J. H. (1985). **Developmental needs as intrinsic incentives.** *New Directions for Higher Education*, 51, 59-10p.
- Mangan, K. (2009). **Professors compete for bonuses based on student evaluation.** *The Chronicle of Higher Education; the Faculty*, 55(21), 10.
- Palmer, Adam, Collins, Roz. (May 2006). **Perceptions of rewarding excellence in teaching: Motivation and the scholarship of teaching .** *Journal of further & Higher Education*, 30(2), 193-13p.
- Tolbert, P. S. (Winter 1998). **Two-tiered faculty systems and organizational outcomes.** *New Directions for Higher Education*, (104), 71-10p.
- Vellella, R. F. (2008). **Comp+ 101.** Carlson School of Management
- Wergin, J. F. (Winter 2001). **Beyond carrots and sticks.** *Liberal Education*, 87(1), 50-4p.
- Yining, C., & Gupta, A. (March/Aril 2006). **Factors that motivate business faculty to conduct research: An expectancy theory analysis.** *Journal of Education for Business*, 81(4), 179-11p.

Yining, C., Gupta, A., & Hoshower, L. (December 2004). **Faculty perceptions of research rewards.** *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 1(12)

Young, P. (April 2006). **Out of balance: Lecturers' perceptions of differential status and rewards in relation to teaching and research.** *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(2)

Appendix A

Interview questions

Project definition: the PEL team is looking at incentives for tenured faculty within the College of Food, Agricultural, and Natural Resource Sciences. We are interviewing tenured faculty from around the College to see what issues, concerns, ideas, and suggestions may be out there that we can incorporate into our report.

These interviews are for use by the PEL team only. Your answers will be kept confidential, though non-accredited quotes may be used in the final report. (If you answer would show who you are, that quote will not be used.)

Incentives definition: anything beyond your base level of pay and the standard benefits package provided by the U of M. For example:

- An endowed chair
- Extra pay coming from a research grant
- Access to lab space
- Teaching assistants and support staff

1. As a baseline, how satisfied are you with the following packages you receive at the University of Minnesota?
 - a. Compensation (base pay)
 - b. Benefits (health benefits, insurance, vacation, leave, etc.)
2. What sort of incentives, if any, do you receive currently?
 - a. Incentives (as above)
3. The following is a list of incentives we have found in our research. Which of these are important to you? (can be as many as you want) What about to the University as an institution?
 - a. Merit pay
 - b. Teaching or research grants for books, equipment, travel, etc.
 - c. Support staff
 - d. Graduate students
 - e. Facilities
 - f. Equipment
 - g. Libraries
 - h. Faculty club
 - i. Location of the institution
 - j. Tenure
 - k. Promotion
 - l. Sabbaticals

- m. "Release Time" (lowering course load for semester to pursue a specific project or to create a new course)
 - n. Workshops and other learning experiences
 - o. Recognition (please define what this means to you, examples below)
 - i. Call from the dean on a publication or current research
 - ii. Public recognition and physical award
 - iii. Monetary award
 - p. Faculty brown bags (regular meeting to present one's own research to colleagues)
 - i. Do you prefer lectures about current research
 - ii. Do you prefer discussion and debate about current research ideas
 - q. Student research symposium
 - r. Visiting professors (at CFANS to bring in new ideas and research)
 - s. Outside speakers
 - t. Quality of faculty (please define what this means to you)
 - u. Quality of students (please define what this means to you)
 - v. International opportunities
4. Do you have other ideas or suggestions from other institutions about what might be good incentives for faculty at CFANS?
 5. Which part of the faculty mission does your department find most important: teaching, research, or outreach?
 6. For you personally, which part of the faculty mission do you find most important: teaching, research, or outreach?
 7. If there were incentives targeted to each of those three areas, would that help motivate you to engage in those areas you are not naturally inclined toward?
 8. Is there anything else related to incentives you would like to share?

Appendix B

Faculty Culture and College Life: Reshaping Incentives Toward Student Outcomes,

Marilyn J. Amey, 1993

“Traditionally, faculty role and workload are shaped by academic culture, including values and incentives that tend to be in large part discipline related and institutionally driven. Teaching, research, and service are the common tripartite “assignments” for faculty, with weights, distributions, and definitions of terms being more institutionally specific than discretely generalizable (Moore and Amey, 1993). As institutions evolve, so do the expectations held for and by faculty. As new initiatives and directions take hold, it is common to find faculty work following suit, at least as a generality. For example, an academic unit interested in increasing its national standing and prestige is likely to reflect this ambition in increased expectations for faculty-generated external research funding, publications, and national visibility. Faculty also do not maintain the same interests and levels of expertise in all three areas over the life of their career, and often negotiate greater emphasis on one area for a period of time (R.G. Baldwin, 1990). This article focuses on the perception by faculty in the 1990s that post-secondary institutions are moving toward an emphasis on research over teaching. At ratios often higher than two to one, faculty at comprehensive colleges through research universities believe that there has been a shift in focus and evaluation to favor research over teaching (Atkinson and Tuzin, 1992). At the same time that there has been increased attention given to improving the quality of undergraduate instruction (teaching), there has been a parallel discussion of the need to shift the focus to student achievement.”

Two-Tiered Faculty Systems and Organizational Outcomes, Pamela S. Tolbert, 1998

“The limitations of typical personnel arrangements for non-tenure-track faculty, in combination with the very difficult working conditions (for example, last-minute hiring that precludes sufficient course preparation, minimal staff support for organizing course materials, assignment of faculty to overcrowded offices, and so forth), threaten institutions’ ability to deliver high-quality education.”

Making Mid-Career Meaningful, R. G. Baldwin, 2005

“In most higher education institutions, the tenure system sets achievement milestones that guide an early career professor’s activities and set standards for assessing his or her performance. Post-tenure (especially after promotion to full professor), the path through academic life is less well defined. For this reason, midcareer can be a challenging time both for faculty members and for department chairs. What are appropriate mid-career goals? What is successful performance at mid-career? What forms of support do mid-career faculty need? These are key questions that should concern mid-career faculty and their department chairs.”

In the past ten years, the meaningful faculty incentives debate has focused on the “big picture” of the institution, and what truly motivates faculty. In this abstract, the correspondence between the president leadership style and the faculty perceptions about the university president has a direct impact on the productivity of the faculty.

Motivating faculty through transformational leadership: A study of the relationship between presidential leadership behaviors and faculty behaviors, Frank Anthony Grosso, 2008

“Increased competition, tighter budgets, technological advancements, and the diverse needs of students are just a few examples of why college and university presidents need to continually foster development and growth within their institutions. In order to accomplish this, university presidents find themselves demanding more from their faculty as financial resources become limited. Presidents thus have the delicate job of motivating faculty to work beyond their individual expectations, scholarly interests, and basic responsibilities, while also making sure they are satisfied with their individual academic pursuits and the institution's direction. Leadership research in higher education has not empirically examined the relationship between presidential leadership characteristics and the faculty. This study explores the relationship between the leadership behavior of a university president and faculty effort and satisfaction. It also examines how such variables as individual faculty motivation and academic tenure status affect this relationship.

Faculty members responded to a questionnaire and a self-concordance survey used to measure the motivation of the faculty (**Toward Understanding the Motivational Effects of Transformational Leaders**, University of Minnesota Joyce E. Bono and Timothy A. Judge,

Academy of Management Journal, 2003). Using correlation and multiple regression analyses, this study examined transformational and transactional leadership factors of the president and found strong empirical evidence that university faculty were more likely to exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction and extra effort if they perceived the president as having transformational leadership characteristics. The results confirm that presidents have an enormous and significant influence upon the faculty regardless of how much interpersonal interaction there is between the two, and may be best able to motivate their faculty by utilizing transformational leadership behaviors and characteristics. By focusing their time and effort on transformational leadership strategies, university presidents may be more likely to build faculty morale and motivate them to transcend their own interests for the benefit of the institution.”

Factors That Motivate Business Faculty to Conduct Research: An Expectancy Theory Analysis Journal of College Teaching & Learning, Yining Chen, Ashok Gupta, Leon Hoshower, 2004

This abstract reviews the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards that are important to faculty. This study conducted a similar survey to the PEL Team, however, faculty participants in this abstract included both tenured and non-tenured faculty. The PEL Team group focused on tenured faculty, and found some similar results.

“Study findings suggest that faculty members who assign higher importance ratings to both the extrinsic and the intrinsic rewards of research exhibit higher research productivity.

Study findings suggest that:

1. untenured faculty members are motivated by extrinsic rewards (e.g. tenure, promotion, and salary raises);
2. tenured faculty members are motivated by intrinsic rewards (e.g. peer recognition, respect, personal needs to contribute to the field);
3. research productivity is positively correlated with tenure status and the percentage of work time allocated to research activities and negatively correlated with years in academic employment;

Academic institutions classified as *research universities* are often perceived as indicative of having quality programs, faculty, and students (Hu & Gill, 2000). This study surveyed 320 faculty members from 10 business schools to examine the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards that

motivate faculty to conduct research. Of the thirteen rewards studied, receiving or having tenure is the most important reward, while getting a possible administrative position was the least important

What is Important to Faculty: Percent consider important or very important

1	Receiving or having tenure	91%
2	Being full professor or receiving promotion	84%
3	Getting better salary raises	79%
4	Satisfying my need for creativity / curiosity	75%
5	Satisfying my need to stay current in the field	76%
6	Satisfying my need to contribute to the field	64%
7	Achieving peer recognition	64%
8	Having satisfying collaborations with others	56%
9	Getting respect from students	59%
10	Getting reduced teaching load	52%
11	Getting a “Chaired Professorship”	35%
12	Finding a better job at another University	34%
13	Getting an administrative assignment	10%

Factors That Motivate Business Faculty to Conduct Research: An Expectancy Theory Analysis

Faculty Development Recommendations and Committee Report, COAFES Faculty Development Committee, 2005

Starting in 2003 the COAFES Faculty Development Committee spent two years researching, consulting, and interviewing on the topic of faculty development. This Committee did its work as the new CFANS College was being envisioned. The Committee wanted to provide a plan for a structured approach to faculty development as a whole for the new college. Two major goals of this work were established:

1. to provide more active support of career development to a larger proportion of our faculty
2. to reduce the number of faculty whose professional development and engagement wanes before their time

The Committee came up with five recommendations to enhance faculty and institutional vitality:

1. Hire/appoint College Faculty Development Officer
2. Enhance support for sabbaticals and leaves
3. Develop mandatory faculty career planning and provide explicit benefits and support for planning
4. Expand faculty mentoring program to include all faculty, with accountability resting with the department heads
5. Support professional development workshop series

The Committee report goes into detail on these five areas and expands the description and understanding of each.

6. Faculty Development Officer: The Committee felt that having one person charged with the responsibility for keeping faculty development going was essential. It is always easy for professionals in general, and faculty in specific, to become so involved in the work they are doing that they forget to be mindful of their own professional development. Having a single person looking for ways to help the faculty members define and expand their professional growth would help to keep the topic on everyone's mind. "By concentrating faculty development duties within one position," said the Committee, "the College will ensure that its faculty are prepared for the changes and opportunities promised in the University's strategic planning process."
7. Sabbaticals and Leaves: The Committee felt that having time for faculty to concentrate on their research through sabbaticals or leaves was essential to keeping a faculty member engaged throughout his or her career. It encouraged the new college to provide additional funding and to ensure internal communication about funding sources for faculty to have the capacity to take such leaves.
8. Faculty Career Plans: Through its research the Committee found that having a defined academic career plans is of huge benefit to the continued engagement and productivity of the faculty. These individual plans should include a career mission, a vision, and strategic goals spanning three-to-five year intervals. These plans, the Committee said, should be integrated into the annual performance reviews so they are discussed regularly and updated as needed.
9. Mentoring Program: Mentoring programs have been consistently found to have a positive impact on academic productivity, satisfaction, commitment, and morale – found the

Committee. The recommendation was that there be formal mentoring programs set up between junior and senior faculty and group and peer mentoring for faculty at all career stages. There was also discussion of cross-unit peer mentoring to support faculty development.

10. Professional Development Workshop Series: The Committee recommended that there be three workshops a year to specifically address the needs of its faculty and professional development. The workshops could focus on topics such as time management, enhancing communication, grants management, personnel management, etc. The Committee also recommended that continuing faculty development opportunities be communicated on the web as well.

“A vigorous commitment by the College and faculty,” said the Committee, “to continuing faculty development and a strong administrative structure supporting continuous professional development are important parts of maintaining faculty engagement and productivity over time.”

Faculty Incentives: Some Practical Keys and Practical Examples, Zeddie Bowen, 1985

Ten practical keys to faculty incentives

- Do not have unrealistic expectations
- Renegotiate the priorities, do not just add new expectations, so that each individual can see how the new priority is to be accommodated in the day-to-day schedule
- Create incentives that build on positives, on personal wants rather than needs
- Tie the incentives to the primary motivators of the faculty
- Tie specific and clearly defined goals or changes in behavior to specific and clearly defined rewards, which should be delivered as soon as the desired goal or behavior occurs. Special care must be taken in designing the rewards when behavior modification is the goal because the rewards must be repeated in order to reinforce the behavior change
- Individualize the incentives
- Empower the recipient to use the incentives or rewards however and whenever it best suits him or her
- Make programs selective and somewhat exclusive. It is easier to hold an individual accountable if he or she is participating in a selective incentive program

- Define the goals and measures and hold individuals accountable for reasonable achievement. Define the administration's role with equal care and emphasize the importance of its being accountable for upholding its part of the contract
- Be sure the goal is worthy of the time and expense, if not abandon it

C **Table 2. Varieties of Incentives**

<i>Tangible</i>	
<i>Direct</i>	<i>Indirect</i>
Merit pay	Facilities
Teaching and research grants for books, equipment, travel, and so forth	Equipment
Secretarial and technical assistance	Libraries
	Faculty club
<i>Intangible</i>	
<i>Direct</i>	<i>Indirect</i>
Tenure	Faculty forum
Promotion	Student research symposium
Sabbaticals	Visiting professors
"Release time"	Outside speakers
Workshops and other learning experiences	Quality of faculty
Responsibility and authority	Quality of students
Recognition	

Faculty Involvement in Institutional Budgeting, John G. Dimond, 1991

This article discussed research done to see how much influence faculty have in budgetary and planning processes at public institutions around the nation. The consensus is that when there is more participation by faculty (true participation where the faculty input is highly valued) there is more satisfaction by the faculty of the process and the outcomes.

Incentives in the Academy: Issues and Options, Roger G. Baldwin and Marsha K Krotseng, 1985

What organizational conditions most effectively foster faculty vitality? What types of incentives can higher education institutions offer to sustain high quality faculty performance?

- Intrinsic satisfactions of the academic career have a greater relationship to faculty vitality than do extrinsic rewards

- Association with college students
- Opportunity to contribute to student development
- Intellectual interchange characteristic of academic life
- Derive pleasure from the freedom and autonomy available in a faculty position
- Institutional practices regulating how faculty members are chosen, socialized, promoted, and rewarded are all likely to be related to professors' vitality
- Rewards
 - Monetary rewards are not so important for what they will buy as for what they symbolize
 - Communicate the values of a professor's colleagues and institution
 - Promotion tells an academic that he or she is esteemed by peers
 - Other types of institutional rewards, such as special status designations, prizes, and special privileges, can also send clear signals to faculty members
- Environment
 - A schedule that leaves two days a week free from classroom commitments is likely to foster more scholarship than a schedule that requires daily class meetings encompassing both morning and afternoon
 - Campus structural and physical arrangements can facilitate the effectiveness of professors
 - A streamlined committee system with a minimum number of meetings can protect professors' precious energy and ability to concentrate
 - Attractive, well-maintained facilities and state-of-the-art equipment can make academic work efficient and productive
 - Comfortable meeting places (for example, a faculty dining room or library lounge), where faculty members naturally converge, can facilitate the exchange of ideas, professional collaboration, and the spread of enthusiasm
 - Secretarial support, library services, and computing
 - Research demonstrates that the most prolific scholars are those who are in touch with a wide variety of professionals beyond their own campuses
 - A similar leavening function is provided by lectures, symposiums, and concert series that bring fresh ideas or models of excellence to a campus

- Professional development
 - An opportunity and power structure that opens career paths, provides developmental activities, facilitates lateral movement across fields, that involves people in goal setting, planning, and governance, and that recognizes good performance in a variety of ways
- Tangible incentives
 - Salary increases, promotions, more interesting assignments, fringe benefits, and status symbols
- Intangible incentives
 - Institutions that encourage close student-faculty relationships, facilitate scholarly activity, and protect faculty from excessive bureaucratic regulation can boost professors' morale, and probably their effectiveness, without directly rewarding their hard work
 - School or campus-wide publications can note such events, and faculty books and articles may be prominently displayed in the school or library
 - Special teaching and research awards can also heighten morale and encourage excellence, particularly when presented as part of an important ceremonial occasion
- To remember
 - Colleges and universities need to structure incentives that are directly relevant to their institutional goals and to the needs of the professors they employ
 - Incentives that are insensitive to professor's developmental differences are likely to be less than fully effective
 - However, the most important factor is to consider professors individually and to offer incentives that most appropriately respond to their unique interests and needs