

Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Committee on Mid-Career Faculty Development

Town Hall Meetings on North and South Campus

October 12 & 25, 2017

*Toby Benis, Professor and Department Chair of English and
Committee Co-Chair*

*Michael Lewis, Associate Provost (Faculty Development),
Associate Professor of Chemistry and Committee Co-Chair*

Composition of Committee

Toby Benis (English; CAS)

Kira Banks (Psychology; CAS)

Julie Birkenmaier (Social Work; CPHSJ)

Craig Boyd (School of Professional Studies)

Charles Croissant (Libraries)

Bob Cropf (Political Science; CAS)

Mark Ferris (Information Management; Business)

Roobik Gharabagi (Electrical and Computer Engineers; Parks)

Jean Krampe (School of Nursing)

Karen Myers (School of Education)

Silvana Siddali (History; CAS)

Connie Wagner (Law and Women's and Gender Studies)

Anders Walker (School of Law)

Jinsong Zhang (School of Medicine)

Ex-officio:

Michael Lewis (Associate Provost)

Matthew Christian (Associate VP Research)

Miriam Joseph (Assistant to the Provost)

Jane McHowat (School of Medicine)

Gina Merys (Reinert Center)

MCFDC Charge from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Through surveys and other data-gathering techniques, develop a basis for explaining why some associate professors remain at that rank for extended periods of time.

Areas of focus include:

Are expectations for tenure and promotion not aligned with promotion to full professor?

Do associate professors become unduly burdened with administrative or service work or teaching?

Do policies on work/life issues (e.g. medical and parental leave; lack of subsidized/onsite childcare; etc.) contribute to difficulties for those seeking promotion to full professor?

Can data on these issues be disaggregated by race and/or gender?

What recommendations might improve mid-career faculty development at SLU?

Phase 1: Data Collection; SLU Partnership with the COACHE Collaborative

Spring 2017.

Selection of Peer Institutions for Comparative Survey Analysis:

College of the Holy Cross (Jesuit)

Hamilton College

Loyola Maryland University (Jesuit)

Tulane University (Medical School)

University of North Carolina/Chapel Hill (Medical School)

Survey of SLU faculty coordinated by the Harvard Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE).

Fall 2017.

Presentation of Preliminary Survey Results to SLU faculty for discussion and feedback

Future Work: Phases 2 and 3

Phase 2 (2018):

- Interpret data and feedback
- Develop recommendations to address issues

Phase 3 (2019):

- Implement recommendations

Major Thematic Areas of COACHE Survey of SLU Faculty

Nature of Work: Research

Nature of Work: Teaching

Nature of Work: Service

Interdisciplinary Work, Collaboration and Mentoring

Tenure and Promotion

Institutional Leadership

Shared Governance

Department Leadership, Quality, and Collegiality

Appreciation and Recognition

Retention and Negotiation

The committee analysis, and this presentation, concentrate on responses from associate professors, women faculty, faculty of color, and underrepresented minority faculty.

Summary of Survey Findings: Research

Overall Areas of Strength:

Compared to Peer Institutions:

- None

Compared to entire COACHE Cohort:

- Quality and Support for Graduate Student Assistance
- Availability of teaching releases for research

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):*

- Support for research-related travel
- Support for Undergraduate Research
- Influence over focus of research
- Support for seeking and maintaining grants
- Expectations for seeking external funding

* results were similar for all responding associate professors; women; faculty of color; and under-represented minorities.

Summary of Survey Findings: Teaching

Overall Areas of Strength:

Compared to Peer Institutions:

- Time spent on teaching; course load

Compared to entire COACHE Cohort:

- Quality of and Support for Graduate Students
- Overall Quality of Students
- Availability of teaching releases for research
- Discretion over course content
- Support for assessing student learning

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):

- Equitability of distribution of teaching load*
- Teaching Schedule*
- Support for teaching diverse learning styles
- Level of courses taught

*associate professors rated significantly lower on these questions than full professors

Summary of Survey Findings: Service

Overall Areas of Strength (compared to Peers and Cohort):

- Time Spent on Service
- Number of student advisees

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):

- Support for faculty in leadership roles*
- Equitability of committee assignments**

* associate professors, women, faculty of color, and under-represented minorities rated significantly lower on these questions than full professors

** women and under-represented minorities rated significantly lower than white men

Summary of Survey Findings: Resources and Support

Overall Areas of Strength (compared to Peers and Cohort):

- Retirement benefits and phased retirement options
- Tuition waivers and exchange programs
- “Stop the tenure clock” policies

Areas of Concern (compate to Peers and Cohort):*

- Laboratory, research, and studio space
- Equipment
- Library Resources
- Computing and technical support
- Personal and Family policies
- Childcare and Eldercare
- Family health and leave benefits
- Salary

* associate professors and women rated lower

Summary of Survey Findings: Interdisciplinary Work

Overall Areas of Strength:

*Compared to Peer Institutions:**

- Interest in Interdisciplinary Work

Compared to entire COACHE Cohort:

- None

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):**

- Interdisciplinary Work supported by budget allocations, facilities, and reward in terms of merit and promotion
- Departmental understanding of how to evaluate interdisciplinary work

* women, faculty of color, and under-represented minorities rated significantly higher

** associate professors, women, faculty of color, and under-represented minorities rated significantly lower

Summary of Survey Findings: Collaboration

Overall Areas of Strength (compared to Peers and Cohort):*

- Opportunities for Collaboration in the Institution
- Opportunities to Collaborate outside the Institution

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):**

- Opportunities to collaborate outside departments and institutions

* faculty of color and under-represented minorities rated significantly higher than other groups

** associate professors and women rated significantly lower

Summary of Survey Findings: Mentoring

Overall Areas of Strength (compared to Peers and Cohort):*

- Effectiveness of Mentoring outside the Institution

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):**

- Mentoring effectiveness within departments and outside departments
- Mentoring pre-tenured faculty
- Mentoring associate professors
- Support for faculty to be good mentors

* associate professors, women, faculty of color, and under-represented minorities all rated higher

** associate professors, women, faculty of color, and under-represented Minorities all rated lower

Summary of Survey Findings: Tenure and Promotion

Overall Areas of Strength (compared to Peers and Cohort):*

- Clarity of tenure expectations
- Reasonable expectations for promotion to full professor

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):**

- Department culture encourages expectation of promotion to full professor
- Clarity of criteria for promotion to full professor
- Clarity of time frame for seeking promotion to full

* faculty of color and under-represented minorities rate higher than associate professors and women

** associate professors, women, faculty of color, and under-represented Minorities all rated lower

Summary of Survey Findings: Institutional Leadership

Overall Areas of Strength (compared to Peers and Cohort):

- Senior leadership -- President and CAO; communication of priorities
- Faculty leadership -- pace of decision making; communication of priorities; ensuring faculty input

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):

- Pace of decision making*
- Departmental leadership*
- Stated priorities**
- Communication of priorities**

* women rated lower

** white faculty rated lower

Summary of Survey Findings: Shared Governance

Overall Areas of Strength (Compared to Peers and Cohort):*

- Shared Sense of Purpose
- Productivity
- Leaders understand issues at hand

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):**

- Institution cultivates new leaders
- I understand how to voice opinions about policies
- Administration communicates rationale for important decisions
- Shared Governance holds up in unusual situations
- Faculty and administration define decision criteria together
- Faculty and administration respectfully consider the other's view

* associate professors, women, faculty of color, and under-represented minorities all rated higher

** associate professors, women, faculty of color and under-represented minorities all rated lower

Summary of Survey Findings: Department Engagement, Quality, and Collegiality

Overall Areas of Strength (Compared to Peers and Cohort):*

- Meeting times compatible with personal needs
- Interaction with pre-tenure and tenured colleagues

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):**

- Collegiality
- How well I fit*
- Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion*
- Intellectual Vitality of Tenured Faculty
- Scholarly Productivity of Tenured Faculty
- Teaching Effectiveness of Tenured Faculty***
- Department Addresses Substandard Performance****
- Work/Life Balance
- Colleagues pitch in when needed*
- Department Quality**

* associate professors, women, faculty of color, and under-represented minorities all rated higher

* women and under-represented minorities rated lower

** non-tenure-track professors rated lower *** associate professors and women rated lower; pre-tenure faculty rated significantly lower

**** associate professors and women rate lower

Summary of Survey Findings: Appreciation and Recognition

Overall Areas of Strength:

- Recognition for advising (associate professors and women compared to peers)
- Recognition for scholarship (faculty of color compared to cohort)

Overall Areas of Concern:

- Recognition for scholarship (women compared to peers/cohort; URM faculty compared to peers)
- Recognition from colleagues (women compared to peers/cohort; faculty of color compared to peers)
- Dept./School/College is valued by Pres./Provost (women compared to peers/cohort)
- Recognition from CAO (women compared to peers/cohort; faculty of color and URM faculty compared to peers)

* Associate professors rated lower on recognition for: teaching, advising, scholarship, service, and outreach; from: colleagues, CAO, department Chair, Pres./Provost

** Women faculty rated lower on recognition for: advising, scholarship, service; from colleagues, CAO, department Chair, Pres./Provost

*** Faculty of color and URM faculty rated lower on recognition for outreach; URM faculty rated lower on recognition for scholarship; white faculty rated lower on recognition from CAO, Pres./Provost

Summary of Survey Findings: Retention and Negotiation

Overall Areas of Strength (Compared to Peers and Cohort):

- None

Overall Areas of Concern (compared to Peers and Cohort):*

- Base Salary
- Administrative Responsibilities
- Lab/research support
- Sabbatical and other leave time
- Improved quality of life

* results were lower across all demographic categories: associate professors, women, faculty of color, and underrepresented minorities, white faculty, and men

Initial Emerging Themes

Information collection will continue through this semester. Themes that currently appear to be emerging as areas for recommending action:

- Leadership development
- Mid-career faculty mentoring
- Research and teaching development for mid-career faculty
- Discussion on how current policies impact mid-career faculty (i.e., P&T guidelines, workload policy)

Accessing the COACHE Survey Results

- The MCFDC decided anyone wishing to access this data will require the written permission of both the President of the Faculty Senate and the University Provost.
- A request form will be posted on the Provost's website <https://www.slu.edu/the-office-of-the-provost/mid-career-faculty-development>

Next Steps for MCFDC

Remainder of **Year 1 of Committee Work** :

- 1) Discussion at Faculty Assemblies
- 2) Focus groups and individual interviews where indicated
- 3) Targeted follow up surveys where indicated by responses in particular disciplines (e.g. biological sciences; visual and performing arts; breakout of school of medicine vs. allied health professions)

Future Calendar of Tasks:

Year 2: Data Analysis and formulation of initial recommendations for action

Year 3: Implementation of recommendations

Questions? Comments?

<https://www.slu.edu/the-office-of-the-provost/mid-career-faculty-development>

Toby Benis

toby.benis@slu.edu

Mike Lewis

michael.lewis@slu.edu