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Recruitment

Faculty Recruitment

A planned approach to faculty recruitment focused on institutional mission and strategic goals is a signal to constituents—internal as well as external—that mission and goals are central to hiring decisions and that recruitment is one of the institution’s highest priorities.

Formal Recruitment Plan

A formal institutional recruitment plan can ensure that institutional mission and strategic goals are central in hiring decisions and can provide a context for institutional accountability in allocating positions and other resources. In addition, it can assist the institution in meeting the needs of student populations, allow for a more purposeful approach to resource allocation and reallocation, and signal a commitment to quality, productivity, and value.

The Search and the Search Committee

Conducting an effective search is not easy. Orientation on how to conduct the process would significantly improve most searches and promote uniformity of process. Institutions should develop orientation programs to assist search committee members in a variety of personnel activities, including drafting a job description, interviewing techniques, resume reading, and evaluation of credentials. The Human Resource office can provide ongoing support in these tasks.

One of the benefits of a search committee is legitimation of appointments. A good committee serves as a connection between the department and the institution. Search committees should be specially formed groups acting on behalf of both the department and the institution.

Individuals who serve on search committees should be current in their fields, knowledgeable about the institutional mission and departmental expectations, committed to equal opportunity, and aware that the recruitment process exists for the benefit of both the candidate and the institution.

Diversity

In order for diversity to become a reality within an institution and not merely an abstract goal, it must become part of the fabric of the institution. A growing body of evidence suggests that diversity within education institutions, both in the members of those institutions and their curricula, increases opportunities for learning and the future success of students. Research indicates that diversity initiatives on campuses positively affect both minority and majority students’ attitudes toward one another and the institution. Attention to issues of diversity in the curricular and in the classroom positively influences students’ attitudes regarding race, ethnicity, gender, class, physical challenges, and sexual orientation.

Diversity contributes to the institution as a whole as well as to the individual student. Recently, the American Council on Education joined with more than fifty other organizations and a host of universities and colleges in endorsing a statement which recognizes the value of diversity. The statement emphasizes four contributions of diversity to the education community: (1) the enrichment of the educational experience; (2) the promotion of personal growth and health for society; (3) the strengthening of communities and the workplace; and (4) the enhancement of America’s economic competitiveness.

Virtually all public institutions involve faculty in personnel recommendations. For that reason, faculty must be reminded of the need to search aggressively for qualified minority and women candidates.

As long as institutions continue to focus only on the diversity of traditional faculty pools, faculty diversity nationally will remain a zero-sum game. This issue must be addressed on a national level.

Faculty Orientation

New faculty often need support in all three areas of the traditional triad of teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty increasingly are expected to meet the needs of students with widely varied academic and social backgrounds. Given the increasing emphasis on student learning and the reemphasis of teaching as a primary responsibility, new faculty must be assisted in their efforts.

Orientation programs for newly hired faculty should incorporate the scholarship of teaching and learning, including differing learning styles and needs. The programs also should be a bridge to ongoing profes-
sional development. They should include the use of various media and methodologies to communicate subject matter, thus improving classroom effectiveness. Different methods of assessing learning and validating skills should be made available. Support for new faculty also may involve mentoring, team teaching, or paired courses.

Orientation and support for new faculty improves their ability to meet student needs; increases their morale and commitment to the institution; provides them with knowledge of the teaching methods they will be encouraged to adopt; signals the institution's expectation that faculty will approach the challenges of teaching with the same dedication they bring to their scholarship; and improves the institution's readiness to provide public service.

Policy Recommendations

13. Formal faculty recruitment plans, both for full-time and for part-time positions, should be developed at appropriate levels (e.g., institutions or academic units). (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 26, 38, 44 and 46.)

14. Institutions should improve and enhance the professionalism of their search processes.

15. Institutions should develop, implement, and monitor hiring procedures designed to enhance faculty diversity.

16. Orientation and development of new faculty should prepare them to better fulfill the roles of teaching, scholarship, and service. This should be a major institutional commitment supported by institutional financing.
Retirement

Early planning for retirement increases an individual's acceptance of, and interest in, a new stage in life. Extensive retirement planning programs are available from AARP, from state retirement systems, and from various consultant organizations. They can also be developed internally.

A retirement handbook detailing timelines and benefits should be available to all employees. Institutions should ensure that such handbooks are not viewed as contractual by including disclaimers or references to existing laws.

Retirement systems, state legislatures, and individual institutions should develop retirement options, including a phase-in to retirement. Institutions considering the implementation of retirement incentives would do well to review activity over the past ten years or so to determine whether incentives have indeed benefited the institution.

Layoff/Retrenchment

Many institutions are restricted in the options available to them because layoff or retrenchment of tenured faculty has been limited almost without exception to instances where financial exigency has been demonstrated. Changing student interest, budget pressures, market forces, and changing technology continually challenge institutions to remain competitive. Institutions should be able to consider several reasons for layoff, including redirecting institutional mission, strengthening course offerings, loss of grant revenue, responding to state budget cuts, and streamlining the institution. Colleges and universities are dynamic and may experience declines in some areas even as other parts of the organization are growing.

In instances where layoff of tenured faculty is unavoidable, institutions may discover policies that do not allow layoff in departments or specialties with low student interest or declining connection to mission but which mandate layoff based on seniority across a department or the institution as a whole. Layoff/retrenchment policies should provide institutions with flexibility to preserve strong programs by taking into account measures of performance as well as seniority.

Immediately after announcing that a layoff is planned, institutions should assist affected faculty in seeking positions for which they are qualified, either on campus or with other employers. Institutions should engage in retraining, reassignment, and/or outplacement efforts to minimize the impact of layoff decisions.

Separation for Cause

Sound human resource practices and judicial determinations establish standards for institutions regarding both causes and process for termination of faculty. A policy on progressive discipline up to and including separation for cause provides the framework upon which institutional procedures should be developed. This policy should include a statement on professional ethics and rules of conduct for faculty. The policy should assure due process and specify the procedures, rights, and obligations of both the institution and the faculty member, including the protection of academic freedom and tenure.

These policies and procedures should be widely distributed and readily accessible. Violation of institutional policies or continued poor performance may subject a faculty member to corrective action ranging from written notice of warning to dismissal.

Policy Recommendations

17. Annual retirement planning programs should be integrated into professional development.

18. Policies should permit layoff and retrenchment in response to mission or program alterations.

19. Policies should permit institutions to consider measures of performance as well as seniority in determining which faculty will be affected by layoff/retrenchment.

20. When an institution determines that layoff/retrenchment is necessary, it should assist affected faculty members in identifying alternative employment possibilities.

21. Institutions should have policies and procedures on separation for cause that respect the rights of all parties and provide for timely disposition.
Introduction

Investing in the ongoing professional development of employees is critical for the productivity of any progressive, future-oriented enterprise; it also can contribute to increased worker satisfaction. Higher education is no exception. This report not only assesses American higher education’s current faculty development practices, but also presents 15 recommendations for improving those practices. The recommendations make up a proactive response to the new paradigm in American higher education. That paradigm is the result of several factors, including the changing and more inclusive nature of the student body; the national commitment to lifelong learning; and the rising expectations of clients (students and parents), various governing bodies (boards, legislators, etc.), and the public.

Higher education has failed to effectively articulate the case for systematic, progressive faculty development. Within the academic community, the component parts of such a program too often are taken for granted. Outside the academic community, the public attacks higher education because the component parts are justified without reference to the whole. To the uninhibited, the justifications often seem weak and/or incomprehensible. It is therefore incumbent upon the higher education community to provide logical, well-reasoned, and simply stated rationales for faculty development. Toward that end, this report identifies and addresses the most commonly held public perceptions of faculty development.

This document discusses the following aspects of faculty development: tenure and promotion, faculty rewards and incentives, full-time and part-time faculty, sabbatical programs, and instructional technology as related to current policies. It also discusses the impact of these policies on outcomes valued by legislatures and state boards, on the public’s trust and confidence in higher education, and on institutions’ ability to respond flexibly to new challenges.

Although the need for faculty development has become increasingly clear, appropriate reward structures that link incentives to expanding expectations are not yet in place. The development and implementation of clear reward structures to encourage continuous improvement and achievement of the goals of promotion and tenure are key aspects of this report.

The 15 recommendations outlined in this report are for higher education in general. The recommendations embrace new approaches to teaching and learning, partnerships within and outside the academic community, and the potential impact of new instructional technologies. They are designed to be of value to every institution. However, institutional administrators and faculty should exercise appropriate caution in attempting to apply any or all of the recommendations to their specific situation. In every case, the value of the recommendations at the individual institutional level will be enhanced by discussion and customization to fit the specific needs and circumstances of the campus involved.

The Case for Faculty Development

Faculty professional development in teaching, research/scholarly activity and service/outreach, an activity common to all higher education institutions, is utilized to improve both the professional capabilities of faculty members and the quality of the institution. Professional development includes a diverse and vast array of support programs. These include start up grants and load adjustments for new faculty; travel support for professional engagements; orientation programs; mentoring programs; instructional development assistance (individual or workshop); assistance in identifying funding sources and support for the writing of grants; workshops in the integration of technology into instruction and scholarship; and teaching improvement centers.
Higher education faculty are not regularly trained in teaching, learning, advising, or the overall teaching and learning enterprise. New priority must be given to strengthening training programs for the next generation of teachers and to developing programs that will orient and train new faculty in the art and science of teaching and learning.

Institutional approaches to faculty development differ for full-time and part-time faculty. One underlying reason for the difference is that though many full-time faculty members are tenured or tenure track, many part-time faculty are not. In addition, institutions have a greater responsibility for those faculty whom they employ over a longer period of time.

Development opportunities for full-time faculty have expanded in recent years. Professional development opportunities for part-time faculty are being improved as institutions learn how to better serve the needs of this group.

Professional development activities in the area of teaching are offered at almost all higher education institutions but are geared generally toward full-time rather than part-time faculty. Activities are designed to meet the needs of faculty throughout their careers, but the majority seem to focus on serving new faculty. The type, variety, and frequency of professional development activities vary greatly across institutions. Institutional type appears to be an important variable. For example, community colleges employ sizable numbers of part-time faculty and, therefore, offer more professional development for part-timers than other types of institutions. Other important variables are institutional commitment and financial resources.

Professional development programs in teaching may occur in workshop sessions, day-long seminars, or term-long courses. Mentoring programs are another type of professional development. Formative evaluation and assessment of teaching practices is yet another common category of professional development. This practice includes peer review, supervisor review, student review, and feedback. Instructional assessments may be either optional or mandatory, depending on the institution and department.

While professional development in teaching is the most frequent form of development provided by institutions, many specialized needs have not yet been addressed. For example, very few programs have been designed to assist part-time and other faculty who are experiencing particular difficulties in their teaching performance.

Professional development in the areas of research, scholarship, and creative activities varies tremendously according to institutional type and mission. Research universities offer programs on writing grant proposals. Comprehensive institutions generally assist with the preparation of grant proposals, but also offer workshops on how to get published, improve writing skills, and connect research with teaching. Two-year institutions, with their focus on teaching and learning, often assist faculty with research connected to instruction. Much of the professional development in research, scholarship, and creative activities is provided on an individual or departmental basis.

Service/outreach is generally categorized as specific to the discipline/profession, institution, and community (local, state, national, international). Individual faculty members and academic departments—not institutions—typically provide opportunities for discipline/profession service development. Most institutions also do not provide professional development for institutional and community service. However, public pressure is beginning to mandate that institutions assume a greater role in supporting, encouraging, and rewarding community service by its faculty members.

Research has shown that facility professional development programs are successful (Chase, et al., 1996; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992). Increased institutional flexibility appears to be another valued outcome, as faculty members are better prepared to meet the changing demands of higher education. Because most professional development activities are designed for full-time tenure-track faculty, an emergent need is for such activities for the rapidly increasing numbers of part-time and nontenured faculty.

Despite ongoing professional development for faculty, a pervasive public perception is that teaching and learning practices are not valued in higher education. In fact, much of the public is unaware of current professional development activities.
Public Perception—Many faculty do not provide high-quality instruction, nor do they participate in professional development activities.

Ironically, this perception comes at a time when the academy is placing increased emphasis on student learning and, therefore, improved teaching. In addition, professional development opportunities are increasing, with many institutions requiring ongoing participation by their faculties. Much remains to be done, but American higher education has recognized the need to increase student learning through improved faculty instruction.

Public Perception—Research conducted by faculty is meaningless and expensive. Conducting research and remaining informed about current trends are not relevant to classroom instruction.

This perception betrays the lack of communication regarding the nature of teaching and learning in higher education and the vital linkage between research and high-quality teaching at the undergraduate level. The perception also points to the academy’s failure to demonstrate the role of research in advancing the economic and social lives of the nation’s citizens.

Public Perception—Faculty are failing to provide assistance to their communities.

While the academy has a long tradition of supporting its own communities, many community members are unaware of such efforts. In fact, higher education has neglected its mission to actively provide education and training for development in this area.

Policy Recommendations

22. Institutions should constantly improve and update faculty development opportunities, taking into consideration the changing needs of the institution, the changing nature of both the student body and the faculty, and the changing nature of knowledge. They should devote resources sufficient to support appropriate development for faculty at all stages of their careers.

23. Benefits of faculty development and valued outcomes should be aggressively communicated. The institution’s mission and goals should be emphasized in these communications.

24. Institutions should commit financial resources to educate and train faculty in service/outreach.
Faculty Reward Structures

Tenure and Promotion Policies
The public perception is that tenure insulates faculty from reasonable expectations of performance and from personal and collective responsibilities. In 1982, the National Commission on Higher Education Issues warned that tenure was viewed in many circles as a system designed to protect faculty from evaluation and assessment. One result has been the advent of numerous externally driven policies for post-tenure review (Chait & Ford, 1982; Gebert, 1996; Licata & Morreale, 1997).

In reality, the tenure and promotion system in use at many American colleges and universities plays a vital role in faculty development. At its best, the tenure process provides a rigorous review, related to institutional mission, of individual faculty members within an extensive (often six-year) probationary period. This period is far more demanding than in most other professions. However, it is under attack both from without and (perhaps surprisingly) from within. A 1996 survey found that 35 percent of all faculty believe tenure is outmoded (Tower, 1997).

It is worth noting that tenure does not apply to every faculty member. Despite a significant fear of "tenuring-in" as the large numbers of faculty members hired in the 1970s and 1980s become senior faculty, relatively recent data suggest that overall, about half of all faculty are tenured or are in tenure-track positions (NEA, 1995). Among sectors of higher education, however, there are significant differences in the percentages of faculty members who are tenured. At public research universities, for example, more than 70 percent of faculty are tenured; at community colleges, only 31 percent of faculty are tenured. Most "unprotected" faculty are employed part-time, but 8 percent of full-time faculty are employed by institutions that do not offer tenure at all.

Current trends indicate movement away from tenure rather than toward it. Recently hired full-time faculty are less likely to be on the tenure track than those hired ten years ago (NEA, 1995). The declining emphasis on tenure seems in part from a dramatic change in the employment pool of higher education. In 1970, only 22 percent of the professoriate was part time; by 1995, this percentage had increased to 41 percent (Schneider, 1998) – approximately 566,000 faculty members (NEA, 1997). At times, the decision to hire more part-time faculty has been economically driven. Tenure and promotion are perceived by faculty as a significant reward, so the elimination thereof strikes a substantial blow at the incentive for faculty development. This is often the case for part-time and nontenure track faculty.

Criteria for tenure and promotion differ by educational category (research institution, community college, etc.) because they relate to the institutional mission (Boyer, 1990). Kreppel (1998) recently reviewed tenure policies at major (NASULGC member) institutions. Among the most important findings to contradict popular opinion that tenure policies always are defined in terms of the teaching/research/service trilogy was that none of the institutions defined research as the preeminent criterion for tenure (Kreppel, 1998). This represents a significant increase in the importance of teaching: twenty years ago, research was the predominant (and frequently the exclusive) factor in tenure decisions. Fully 81 percent of faculty respondents to a national survey at research universities believed that teaching "counts more" now (1994) for purposes of faculty advancement, than it did five years earlier (Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997).

Nevertheless, the trend toward increasing the value of teaching and service in tenure decisions has not progressed far enough. In a recent survey of faculty, deans, and senior administrators at a wide variety of institutions, every group felt that high-quality teaching was undervalued and that research was overvalued in tenure and/or promotion decisions. Administrators and faculty actually were in agreement, but each group thought it was the other group that overvalued research.

Criteria and standards for promotion parallel those for tenure and are equally rigorous. They also differ by institutional category. At research institutions where research, teaching, and service are held equally important, the most common requirement for promotion involves demonstrated excellence in one or two of these areas with at least satisfactory performance in the other(s) (Mississippi State University, 1997). Again, excellence in teaching has become a sine qua non for promotion. At nonresearch institutions, the preeminence of teaching is well established, though some data suggest that longevity is an equally important criterion.
So why are our current policies criticized by the public? Most parents, most employers, and most communities expect higher education to produce graduates who communicate effectively, solve problems, and adapt to change. Conceptually, our productivity-based system of promotion and tenure has a beneficial impact on these outcomes. However, much of the public still believes that research is overemphasized with the result that the quality of instruction is diminished. These same individuals believe that instruction leads to the desired outcomes and that research is merely esoteric, separable from instruction, and of no inherent value (Chronicle, 1998). Clearly, the marked increase in the role of teaching in promotion decisions has not been effectively communicated. Higher education must make these changes broadly known.

On the other hand, higher education’s increasing reliance on part-time faculty adversely affect these outcomes. Part-time faculty typically are less available to interact with students and are less engaged with their institutions. The American model of promotion and professorial ranks (assistant professor, associate professor, and professor) has benefited all aspects of U.S. higher education. This is in marked contrast to the traditional Anglo-German model in which there was one professor in the department, and promotion meant either waiting for that professor to retire (or die) or moving to another institution. The consequence of this model was that institutions could not use the promotion system to reward (and thereby retain) their bright young teacher scholars, which led to diminished institutional loyalty. Worse still, the combination of tenure without any hope of promotion made indolence even more probable. It is no accident that most universities throughout the world have moved away from the Anglo-German model and have adopted systems more similar to the American model. Yet our own institutions’ increased use of part-time faculty represents a partial abandonment of the very model that was invented and proven successful here.

Many industrial and commercial leaders believe that the tenure and promotion system is outdated. In the 1980s, in response to intense competition from foreign companies, American industry undertook a comprehensive program of “right-sizing”; this resulted in a redefinition of the job security of managers and executives in corporate America. Many would argue that the nation’s current economic expansion is a tangible result. Because it worked for corporate America, many believe higher education should also undertake such a program. However, unlike Detroit in 1985, American higher education (particularly at the graduate level) remains the envy of the world; foreign students evidently prefer the American product to their own domestic product. Nevertheless, higher education must not become complacent; external challenges that may prove analogous to those that confronted corporate America are clearly on the horizon (consider, for example, Britain’s Open University).

Higher education’s current policies (with its enhanced emphasis on teaching) should prove much more attractive to the public than our past practices. Regrettably, our continuing failure to communicate major changes within the tenure system dooms us to be viewed as resisting change.

Policy Recommendations

25. Institutions of all kinds should increase the value of high-quality teaching in tenure and promotion decisions.

26. Because of its potential to adversely affect students and institutions, the extensive use of part-time faculty should be carefully re-examined as part of a larger re-examination of appropriate faculty mix. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 13, 27, 38, 44 and 46.)

27. The American model of promotion through the faculty ranks has had a beneficial impact on the professional development of faculty in all categories of higher education. It is imperative that this model be retained and that both part-time and non-tenure track faculty have opportunities for similar advancement and reward. (Regarding part-time faculty, see also recommendations 6, 8, 9, 13, 26, 38, 44 and 46.)

28. The higher education community should clearly communicate to all constituencies the importance of teaching in promotion and tenure decisions at institutions of all kinds.
Faculty Awards and Incentives

Public Perception—Institutions do not provide awards and incentives for the behaviors most valued by the public.

Paralleling the world of business, university leaders know that professional development of employees and the offering of awards/incentives to increase the level of professional satisfaction can contribute to higher productivity.

Indeed, awarding faculty for excellence in research, service, and especially teaching appears to have had a resurgence in popularity. Award systems have been designed to achieve two goals: first, to award those members of academies who strive for continued excellence in teaching productivity and learning; and second, to elevate the level of respect and esteem held for teaching, research, and public/professional service. While awards for conducting outstanding research and performing outstanding service exist, awards appear to be offered primarily for exemplary and innovative teaching.

Svinicki and Menges have gathered an impressive cadre of authors to explore the topic of awarding of excellence in teaching. (Van Note Chism, Fraser, and Arnold, 1996) report that academies outline several goals as awards are designed. The first and most important goal is to foster teaching excellence. Related goals include:

♦ to advocate the importance of teaching;
♦ to create an appropriate reward structure for teaching;
♦ to promote a sense of community among teachers;
♦ to serve as role models;
♦ to foster research on college teaching and learning; and
♦ to advise the institution on policies and practices (Svinicki, 1996).

Academies tend to agree on the goals, but the manner in which the awards are developed, evaluated, and administered varies greatly.

El-Khawas cites that “Seven in ten institutions in 1993 reported giving annual awards to recognize outstanding teaching; this was a sizable increase from 1987 when the proportion was about half. Institutions reported that they recognized teaching through ceremonies (69 percent), special funds (40 percent), and release time (26 percent). An increase of salary in recognition of outstanding teaching was reported by 45 percent, an unfortunate decline of 6 percent from 1987” (Menges, 1996).

Research universities, four-year comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges, and two-year colleges have faculty award programs which are similar, though the number of programs, awardees, and resources vary some by institutional category. For example, scholarly endeavor awards are granted to more faculty at research and comprehensive universities, while teaching awards are granted to more faculty at liberal arts and two-year institutions. Even within categories of higher education institutions, the resources available to award excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service vary. Also, faculty award programs may be administered at one or more institutional levels: viz., institutional, academic affairs, college, and department (Svinicki, 1996; Soricinelli and Davis, 1996).

Faculty awards tend to be granted individually, based on competition and collegial review. One negative aspect of collegial review and limited awards is that some applicants become frustrated over the selection process. Awardees usually must meet stated criteria in the award area, be it scholarship, teaching, or service. Lunde and Barret (1996) suggest that faculty awards can be supplemented with award programs that are unit (departmentally) based, with unit accountability and rewards.

Faculty awards for scholarship, teaching, and professional/institutional service are diverse. All award recipients should be provided due recognition and publicity. One or more of the following may also be provided:

♦ monetary award (base salary increase or bonus)
• release time for a specified period with contractual obligations

• seed money to be used, at the discretion of the awardee, for professional development opportunities (e.g., professional meetings, technology hardware/software, full or mini-sabbatical)

• institutional, divisional, or departmental award designation.

Scholarship awards tend to be categorized into senior-level faculty achievements and junior-level faculty promise. Often, discretionary funds for such awards are provided or matched by private donors. Professional and institutional service awards, with the latter more prevalent than the former, tend to be categorized either by external individual accomplishments (similar to senior-level faculty scholarship awards) or rather diverse excellence in institutional service.

Given that teaching excellence is increasingly valued by all relevant higher education constituencies, this faculty award category will continued to expand. Jenrette and Hays (1995) postulate that teaching has always been paramount to the mission of two-year institutions, but the mission statements of research, comprehensive, and liberal arts institutions also emphasize the quality of instruction. In all institutional categories, teaching awards are more prevalent than scholarship and service awards (Svinicki, 1996; Menges, 1996). Students often are involved (if in a secondary way) in the assignments of scholarship and service awards; undergraduate students, in particular, are much more involved in choosing the recipients of teaching awards. In fact, many student government associations offer faculty teaching awards in addition to those bestowed by the administration.

Teaching awards also pertain to advising and mentoring accomplishments. At many institutions, advising awards are separated from teaching awards.

Zahorski recommends caution in using awards to recognize excellence in teaching. Awards can be divisive and counterproductive if not designed and administered with continuous improvement and professional development clearly in mind.

Lunde and Barret (1996) postulate that an alternative to individual awards might be a decentralized, departmental award/reward system where departments determine the values which most closely reflect the disciplines within their purview. There is no single answer to how teaching can be elevated and honored in a given department on a given university campus. The catalyst, expertise, and energy for putting a recognition system in place may exist outside a department. However, if a department has a genuine interest in rewarding outstanding teaching, it not only will invite the help of external resources but also will work within its membership and discipline to build, promote, and maintain a reward system of its own (Svinicki, 1996, p. 97).

Faculty incentives are closely related to faculty rewards. Faculty incentives pertain to projected performance and/or advantages, while faculty rewards recognize past performance. Faculty incentives (except for termination, tenure, promotion, and merit policies) have less to do with faculty contracts than institutional practice. Faculty incentives are subject to collegial administrative-faculty negotiations and/or administrative actions. Faculty incentive programs have been initiated at system, institution, college, and departmental levels.

Policy Recommendation

29. Higher education communities should carefully review awards and incentives to ensure that they are closely linked to institutional initiatives and that they reflect changing expectations.

Sabbaticals

For this report, we reviewed the sabbatical policies of 50 colleges and universities across the country. The institutions were of all sizes and types (four-year public research, four-year regional public, four-year private, and two-year community colleges). All institutions had policies regarding sabbatical leaves and they had many characteristics in common. Not all institutions offer sabbaticals, but those that do (including the 50 we reviewed) offer them to full-time faculty members at regular intervals—usually every seventh year.
Sabbaticals have been and are a key ingredients in the faculty development continuum. Sabbaticals provide time for faculty to conduct scholarly work, improve their teaching, develop curricula, and enhance their artistic performance and creative growth. Sabbaticals enable faculty to study new developments in their fields and to complete ambitious scholarly and artistic projects. The knowledge and reinvigoration gained from time away from ordinary responsibilities improves employees' performance upon their return. And more than once, sabbaticals have led to discoveries that ultimately benefited millions of people.

In nearly all cases, the approval process for sabbaticals requires that interested faculty members submit a detailed proposal. The proposal is reviewed, and, if approved by the department head and dean, it is forwarded to a peer-review committee on sabbaticals, and finally to the president and governing board. Typically, faculty members may request a full-year sabbatical at half salary or a semester sabbatical at full salary. Institutions require that the sabbatical leave contribute to the individual's professional development. Relatively few institutions suggest that the sabbatical proposal be linked to the institution's mission and mandate. Some institutions set limits on the number of sabbaticals awarded each year (for example, "not more than X percent of the equivalent full-time faculty"); other institutions follow historical practices and/or base limitations on the budget available. Of the institutions surveyed, all expect faculty members who have taken a sabbatical to return for a minimum of one year, and sometimes two years, following the sabbatical. If faculty members fail to meet this requirement, they may be required to repay the salary earned during the sabbatical leave.

Faculty improvement leaves have become increasingly popular at institutions of all types and have been found to be a highly effective form of faculty development. Unlike traditional sabbaticals, faculty improvement leaves vary greatly in length (two to eight weeks) and type (travel, research, focused study, etc.) and are offered at varying times throughout the year. Faculty improvement leaves appear to be better suited to today's academic environment because they are targeted, available to a greater number of faculty at all ranks, conform to the life-styles of faculty and their families, can be relatively better funded than sabbaticals, and provide greater institutional flexibility.

Public Perception—Faculty members are automatically granted leaves at regular intervals, and the outcomes of these leaves are not closely monitored.

Higher education needs to more effectively communicate the value of sabbaticals to students, institutions, and the public. The public believes that faculty members are granted leaves automatically at regular intervals, but in fact, many institutions cannot afford to offer sabbaticals. Many faculty members do not take sabbaticals without first obtaining grants so they can afford to conduct research away from their home institutions. Many institutions have addressed the issue of accountability for sabbatical outcomes, but more attention to this is needed. Some institutions require that faculty members on sabbatical submit progress reports. In addition, many institutions require faculty members to communicate the results of their sabbaticals, either through presentations, articles published in the local media, or through other means. The key is to strike a balance between accountability and the "freedom" that is a primary benefit of sabbaticals.

Private sector information on training and development confirms that colleges and universities should encourage more sabbatical-type activity. More and more businesses in the United States (14 percent to 24 percent according to Austin) offer their employees sabbatical-type leaves because such opportunities boost productivity, promote flexibility, and counter mediocrity and burnout. Such businesses as American Express, DuPont, and Xerox offer employees both short- and long-term sabbaticals because they boost overall productivity and boost morale. Sabbaticals provide a similar kind of renewal for faculty. Research on corporate sabbaticals may help institutions and the public measure the return-on-investment (ROI) so important to constituents.
Policy Recommendations

30. Institutions should develop and implement strategies to more effectively communicate to the public the benefits of sabbaticals to students, institutional mission, and the community.

31. Institutions need to continue to strengthen the sabbatical process. While many institutions are demanding greater accountability, all institutions should have policies that require a rigorous application process, means of monitoring progress, and appropriate dissemination of the results.

32. Institutions should consider allowing greater flexibility in the traditional sabbatical program to include faculty improvement leaves.

Instructional Technology Policies

Over the past two decades, technology has permeated professional institutions and, to a lesser extent, educational ones. Used as a teaching, learning, research, and communication tool, technology has the potential to transform and expand the higher education experience. We have yet to come to grips with the changes it has brought. Technology is costly and has a short "shelf life," but it also enables its users to do new things and to explore old concepts in new ways. To reap the benefits of technology, a comprehensive program of support is needed.

The introduction of Instructional technology requires an expanded focus for the faculty professional development process. Traditionally, faculty development has focused on support for refining content knowledge and research skills in order to gain tenure or promotion and continue a research agenda. Now, faculty must continually learn new skills and devote time and effort to refining curricula to make full and appropriate use of technology's capabilities. Faculty must become learning, teaching, and technology specialists in addition to being expert in a given discipline.

Achieving this goal requires a fundamental change in the concept of professional development and in how faculty are supported during a career-long process of learning and skill enhancement. In short, technology has forced higher education to expand the faculty professional development paradigm to include time, support, and access to resources required to develop new skills, materials, tools, and strategies. New faculty professional development infrastructures must bring together specialists in content, teaching/learning/evaluation approaches, knowledge management strategies, and technical support so faculty can access the expertise they need to adopt new technologies and make them appropriate and integral components of curricula.

The change in faculty professional development fueled by increased access to technology is not one that higher education can choose to embrace or ignore; for it is driven by the expectations of internal and external clients and of faculty themselves. The populations served by higher education expect faculty and administrators to make use of technology enhancements that meet individual and collective needs. This expectation increasingly is reflected by changes in corporate grant programs. For example, corporations such as Hewlett Packard (1996) and Hitachi (1998) have encouraged universities to partner with them to find new ways to improve learning. The Hewlett Packard request for proposals called for higher education institutions to create partnerships to develop technology-enhanced collaborative learning environments that help students acquire problem-solving and interaction skills needed in the 21st century. Hitachi is seeking partners to design new instructional tools that will speed or otherwise enhance learning. These two examples point to the growing need for technology-enhanced education that promotes real-world, lifelong learning and problem-solving skills. Higher education must produce students who are skilled in technology use, able to work in teams, and able to navigate and manage interdisciplinary information. Unless faculty skills, instructional materials, tools, teaching and learning strategies, and attitudes toward faculty development support technology-driven change, this goal will be impossible to achieve.

In early 1998, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education exerted direct pressure to place more emphasis on instructional uses of technology by revoking the accreditation of a major university. One reason cited for this drastic action was the university's failure to provide students with adequate technology skills. If institutions do not provide high-
quality technology tools in all disciplines, they will lose students to peer institutions that can, and/or they will suffer externally imposed sanctions.

Existing policies and attitudes toward technology use and faculty support are based on a number of assumptions related to the benefits technology brings to the teaching and learning process. These assumptions often are based on anecdotal rather than actual data. Following are public perceptions and suggestions for change that can lead to real and attainable expectations for faculty professional development and support for instructional technology use. These changes stress the use of technology to improve learning outcomes, including enhanced problem solving, critical analysis, and communication strategies.

**Public Perception**—Technology leads to better learning.

No reliable data supports this assumption. Russell (1996) reviewed 248 research reports, summaries, and papers describing the introduction of various instructional technologies ranging from film to computers and compared them to what were at the time “traditional teaching approaches.” In all cases, studies showed that adding a technology enhancement without changing the underlying instructional techniques, procedures, materials, and activities had no measurable impact on learning. This should alert higher education to a flaw in its current approach to developing technology enhancements for teaching and learning: as mere add-ons to existing practices, technology enhancements will have no impact on learning.

**New Direction**—Technology is a flexible tool that allows learning in ways that are not possible without it. It is NOT a $2,000 pencil.

Research should focus on the value added by technology enhancements as measured by the use of teaching and learning techniques and procedures that are not possible in a traditional face-to-face environment. Such fundamental changes as increased access to information and information management tools, or even increased time on tasks, are desirable outcomes that can be measured.

**Public Perception**—Technology will bring more cost effectiveness.

Technology is an expensive instructional tool. Technology enhancements, related training, and curriculum design programs, as well as the purchase of electronic tools such as library resources, absorb any profit that might result from raising enrollment caps or expanding traditional courses to include students at a distance.

Those who believe technology will lead to reduced costs are likely to doubt those in higher education who say costs will not go down. Likewise, persons in higher education will doubt that cost cutters have a sincere interest in maintaining or improving the quality of higher education. Only as higher education demonstrates the effectiveness of enhanced student learning utilizing technology will the issues be enjoined in such a way that they can be resolved. With the exception of the “early adopter”/innovative minority, faculty are not necessarily eager to accept the risks inherent in change to a technology-enhanced system. Faculty may fear they will be penalized if they do not jump on the technology bandwagon. They may fear that the tools they are creating will chip away at their academic freedom—as well as their jobs. They may fear that they will have no support for curricular innovation unless they choose to embrace technology. *(The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1998)*.

**New Direction**—Technology is an expensive but vital tool that enables new teaching, learning, and communication experiences. The transformation process will be smoother if administrators take faculty perspectives into account and respond with comprehensive support and reward programs that encourage the appropriate use of technology as a means of achieving desired learning outcomes.

Technology is an expensive addition to any curriculum. Yet, the addition of appropriate technologies increases performance, expands access to information, and provides the ability to engage in simulated or real experiences. Research is needed to determine the extent to which technology enhancements increase time on task, improve communication and collaboration strategies, expand mentoring opportunities, and enhance overall satisfaction with the learning environment. WebCT and other online instructional environments now offer tracking tools, even in chat rooms, that will allow researchers to shift emphasis to the learning processes.
Decisions to add and support technology now can be made on the basis of institutions’ goals and missions. Questions to address when considering technology enhancements include: Is the institution committed to reaching a diverse audience and to supporting individual learning differences? Do the institution’s teaching and learning goals embrace active learning approaches rather than information delivery and acquisition? How can faculty be recognized and rewarded for the time and effort they invest in curricular innovation?

*Public Perception—The existing culture of the academy can be easily transposed into the technological age.*

Solutions to problems associated with workload, incentives, course scheduling, credits, and copyrights/intellectual property rights have not been identified; thus, institutions pursue a traditional approach to education with technology supports. Faculty have not been allowed—much less encouraged—to take full advantage of the benefits of technology by transforming how they teach and how students learn. Many faculty in the humanities in particular have limited access to support and to state-of-the-art equipment because of funding formulas and traditional ideas regarding what constitutes excellent teaching in a particular discipline. Interaction between faculty experts and technology experts has often been limited to faculty following the direction of technology experts or even abdicating control of their courses by turning over the design of instructional tools. Faculty interdisciplinary partnerships, a key element in the successful development of flexible instructional tools and materials, are still discouraged because of budgetary difficulties associated with assigning credit for collaborative work. Finally, technology innovation has tended to be a costly experiment involving a few entrepreneurial faculty without the benefit of collaboration or institutional infrastructure support. Higher education's cultural value of publishing its successes has not yet extended to the instructional technology arena, so it has not yet invoked the collaborative and cooperative approaches that encourage faculty members to learn from each other.

*New Direction—Curriculum innovation is a complex professional development process that combines the development of new strategies, tools, and materials with discipline research.*

Changing a culture requires a multifaceted approach. For example, focus on curriculum change as a professional development activity will bring about the following:

- New definitions of workload and the role of curriculum innovation (individual as well as collaborative) in the promotion and tenure process must be outlined at the department, college, and university levels. Such guidelines will discourage the use of formulas that over-value time in front of students and will encourage the use of teaching portfolios and other techniques for documenting time, effort, and performance. In isolation, individual institutions will be unable to solve the problems associated with traditional definitions of classes, courses, and semesters. Higher education in general must address this problem so as to take advantage of technology as a tool that allows learning to occur at different paces. Disciplines may need to approach this issue from a proficiency and performance perspective.

- Campus-wide faculty professional development initiatives that help faculty introduce new methods, design attainable learning outcomes, and employ appropriate technologies for achieving stated goals are crucial elements of faculty support. To be successful, however, these activities must be collaborative in nature and encouraged and supported by administrators, technology experts, and peers. The notion that professional development implies "fixing bad faculty" must be replaced by a lifelong learning concept that is expected, recognized, and rewarded as part of the higher education career.

- Partnerships involving faculty, librarians, and publishing companies (including copying services) support efforts to access, distribute, and discover new knowledge. The steps currently required to distribute copyright-protected materials for educational purposes represent a barrier to the teaching and learning process. Resource partnerships that take on copyright clearance tasks will greatly enhance the ability of faculty to teach with the aid of technology.

- Formulas for release time, access to graduate assistants, or other support based on workloads associated with curriculum design and development
should be developed, and on-going implementation of technology enhancements should occur. Case studies are needed to accurately describe the increase in work that occurs when technology enhances or replaces a “face-to-face” course. Anecdotal evidence suggests that technology enhancements will at least double the workload of faculty members.

**Public Perception**—Students will have unlimited access to education, resulting in improved learning opportunities.

This is a tested assumption, but is rendered invalid in many cases because of limited access to technology and dated hardware/software. Depending upon the institution, upwards of 25 percent of the students may be computer illiterate. Dated home computers may not be capable of rapid access to the Internet. On-campus labs most often have limited workstations and or connectivity to centralized servers. Anecdotal evidence indicates that less than 30 percent of faculty actively integrate technology into their curricula. For those who are computer illiterate and require personal support, the lack of training programs discourages them from mastering the equipment. Benchmarking projects for instructional technology are only beginning. For example, the SHEEO project began to collect data on technology use in April 1998 and is not expected to produce results until 1999.

**New Direction**—There is always a contingency plan so learning can continue when the technology isn’t available.

The technology is changing so quickly that it is unlikely that all students and faculty will ever enjoy easy access. A variety of solutions are possible. These include but are not limited to:

- Clear guidelines, goals, and team-oriented approaches for learning so students can continue to engage in learning and communication tasks even if the technology is unavailable.
- Combined lease/purchase/loan programs that enable students to have their own computers.
- Open-access labs equipped with the latest technology and a wide variety of tools.
- Easy-to-access campus networks that provide high-speed access for everyone.
- Department-, college-, and university-wide technology purchase and refresh programs to ensure that faculty have access to the technology they need. Such programs may involve “hand-me-down” efforts to pass obsolete technology from scientists and engineers to faculty and students in disciplines that require less computing power.

- Recurring training, just-in-time learning programs, and tutorials (such as those that can be prepared with Lotus Screen Cam) for faculty and students. Such programs should begin during orientations for students and faculty and should continue throughout their careers. By taking advantage of peer tutors and student assistants, a wide population can be served on a recurring basis.

**Public Perception**—Strong technology partnerships are vital to the success of instructional computing.

Tapscott (1996) and other futurists believe that corporate and academic interests must merge in order for higher education to continue to grow in the 21st century. At present, corporate and academic cultures are so different that communication and collaboration are difficult. If collaboration is to be successful, ground rules that provide mutual benefit must be agreed upon.

A growing concern among some faculty and members of the public is that public/private partnerships, virtually inevitable to technology enhancement in higher education, are bringing with them a set of values that contradict those of the academy. Consider the worry of a generation ago that the university/government partnership in basic research would alter academic values. The partnership did in fact alter the structure of many universities, but by no means did it destroy their integrity. Instead, it led to research
achievements that are the envy of the world. The partnership continues to flourish.

**New Direction—New ground rules will grow out of discussions and collaborative planning.**

The traditional partnerships based on funding for universities to complete research or product development projects driven by corporate needs can expand to include partnerships that examine the lifelong learning needs of employees. Such partnerships with technology corporations would focus on the development of education-oriented tools that incorporate current understanding of how learning occurs. By allowing learning needs to drive the development of instructional tools, higher education would benefit from access to prototype tools that would meet its ever-changing instructional needs; corporations would enter new markets as solutions to specific learning problems. Such an approach is in direct contrast to current efforts to find instructional uses for tools originally developed for business purposes.

**Public Perception—The use and understanding of technology in higher education is driven by market demand.**

Higher education is confronted with enormous challenges brought about by increased demands from clients for anytime, anywhere access to lifelong learning opportunities that emphasize knowledge management, problem solving, critical thinking, and collaboration skills. New knowledge about how people learn has encouraged a shift away from the traditional lecture model to one that places students at the center of a more active learning process. "The teacher as primary source of knowledge" no longer suffices in a world where knowledge doubles every seven years and 10,000 scientific articles are published every day (Tapscott, 1996). Improved communication tools, including RealAudio and RealVideo presentations and forum-based collaborations, can provide direct contact with experts in almost any field.

**New Direction—The demands of the market and the goals of higher education meet in learning outcomes.**

The demands for distributed learning and access to experts in the field have altered the responsibilities of teachers and learners. Students (especially those at a distance) must accept responsibility for their own learning. They must control the skills and tools required to find, organize, and apply information. But they must also have the skills to use that information to discover new knowledge.

Teachers and experts in the field are using technology enhancements to develop more collaborative and interdisciplinary focuses to courses; knowledge is shared and students are provided with opportunities to explore a field. Remedial work can be done within courses as students with different backgrounds follow different paths to reach common learning goals.

Professional development efforts can help faculty create new courses that take advantage of distributed learning options, support individual differences and apply appropriate technologies to shift the focus from information delivery to experiential learning. Corporate partnerships will help design the tools teachers need to make this a successful reality.

**Policy Recommendations**

Institutions should provide faculty with professional development opportunities that include four broad areas of support:

33. Education opportunities (technology use and teaching, learning, and evaluation issues and methods; curriculum design processes).

34. Access to people, materials, and equipment during the entire curriculum design, development, delivery, and evaluation process.

35. Funding for release time (including sabbaticals), technology purchases and upgrades, and materials.

36. Guidance and assistance in documenting and evaluating the impact of curriculum change and technology enhancements.

Institutions should systematically recognize and reward all aspects of curriculum innovation through changes to peer evaluation, promotion, and tenure processes. These changes imply a university, college,