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Dr. Paul Yu, President
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Dear President Yu:

We write to report the successful conclusion of the task you assigned us in December 1997. As you know, on Monday, December 7, the Faculty Senate first amended and then voted unanimously [with one abstention] to approve our recommendations. We enclose the amended and approved "Final Report of the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee."

In closing, we wish to thank you for providing us with this opportunity to participate in shaping the future of Brockport. We are all agreed that it was a valuable experience and we take much pride in both the process we developed and the final report we produced. It represents, we believe, an extraordinary consensus for a campus as large and as diverse as ours.

Thanks also for your continued support and your wise counsel throughout this long and demanding year. In the beginning, you defined our tasks clearly and then throughout the year provided us with useful information and the necessary resources. Finally, we felt that throughout the process, we had your confidence, commitment, and good will, all of which made a near-impossible task possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

The Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee

Sri Ram Bakshi  Richard Meade
Virginia Bachelor  Sheila Myer
Michael Fox  Christopher Norment
Owen S. Ireland, Chair  Heidi Rath-Melens
Sharon Keboe
FACULTY ROLES & REWARDS

FINAL REPORT

INCLUDING AMENDMENTS
AS APPROVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE
DECEMBER 7, 1998
Faculty Roles & Rewards Committee
Final Report
DECEMBER 7, 1998

Assumptions:

1. Our answers to each of the questions in the President’s charge assume that the college faculty will have teaching loads that allow them to teach effectively, maintain scholarly productivity, and meet their service responsibilities. Thus, faculty pursuing an active program of scholarship as defined by individual departments and/or with major or multiple service responsibilities would normally teach no more than a 3/3 course load or its equivalent (see Question 6, paragraph 2).

2. We seek to construct a framework within which each department develops policies and procedures. To construct such a framework we must first come to an understanding as to the nature of our common responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service so that departments and individuals will know whether or not they are contributing below, at, or above expectations.

3. We seek to empower faculty rather than to discipline, punish, or eliminate them.

4. The extraordinary diversity of our programs precludes one model of roles and rewards. We recognize that the proportion of time and energy each faculty member devotes to teaching, scholarship, and service varies from discipline to discipline, individual to individual, and changes over an individual’s career. Still, to promote equity among faculty we must have some common understanding about department and individual productivity standards. The following document represents our efforts at articulating a common framework within which departments will maintain a great deal of autonomy.

Question 1: How should we define teaching and learning, scholarship, and service?

Teaching/learning: Encompasses promoting, guiding, facilitating, and evaluating student learning. Faculty members are catalysts for creating and adapting learning environments in and outside the classroom that stimulate students to learn, to be curious, to be critical thinkers, effective writers and speakers, and creative problem solvers. Effective teaching
and learning are dependent upon faculty utilizing a variety of teaching techniques and designing and revising curriculum to produce student learning outcomes. Included within teaching/learning are the professional development processes of attending workshops and conferences and efforts necessary to maintain mastery of subject matter and teaching methodologies. Also included are the teaching-related activities of independent study and thesis supervision, field supervision, mentoring of students, and student involvement in research.

**Scholarship/Creativity:** Encompasses producing an identifiable product subject to systematic internal and external evaluation by professional peers and resulting from:

1. The creation of new knowledge or artistic expression within the discipline (Discovery). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: original research as reported in articles, books, and presentation of papers; performances; grant proposals; inventions and patents; software development.

2. The synthesizing of existing knowledge or creative work within one or more disciplines into new patterns and/or for new audiences (Integration). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: publication of interpretive studies or criticism; critical reviews or editing of scholarly work; development of public policies or of interdisciplinary programs.

3. The utilization of discipline-based knowledge to solve problems (Application). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: development and implementation of innovative clinical practice or public school programs; environmental impact analyses; consultant work in the public or private sector based on the faculty member's discipline-based knowledge and expertise.

**Service:** Encompasses governance of the department, the school, the college, the university, or the profession, as well as discipline-based or college mission oriented contributions to the community that are not included in Scholarship. Examples of governance include but are not limited to:

**Department** - department meetings and committees, advisement, registration, Saturday Information Sessions, and peer review.
School - grade appeals, Deans' committees.

College - Faculty Senate, college-wide committees, college-wide student organizations.

University - University Faculty Senate, SUNY Ad Hoc Committees.

Profession - leadership and other service in discipline-based organizations at local, state, national, or international levels.

Community - work related to faculty member's area of professional expertise or to the mission of the college.

These three areas will be referred to hereafter as teaching, scholarship and service. It is understood, however, that teaching is teaching/learning and that scholarship is scholarship/creativity.

Question 2: Should teaching and learning be regarded as the most important responsibility of SUNY Brockport's teaching faculty? And what is the place of scholarship and service?

Yes, teaching is our most important function. In our role as college professors we strive to create high quality learning opportunities for our students. Excellence in teaching is our first and foremost responsibility. This excellence is demonstrated, among other ways, by the quality of instruction and student learning outcomes.

Sustained scholarship is essential to quality teaching. It adds to the body of knowledge within the discipline, keeps us current in our fields, exemplifies for our students the intellectual skills we want them to learn, and provides them with opportunities to participate in intellectual discovery as they prepare for the world of work and advanced studies.

Service within the department, the college, the university, the community, and the profession supports the advancement of learning and the enrichment of campus culture.

Through teaching, scholarship, and service, the faculty shape and achieve the goals of the college.
Question 3: What expectations should we have of teaching faculty (with reference to reappointment, tenure, and promotion) in the areas of teaching and learning, scholarship, and service?

**Teaching:** Faculty must demonstrate continued successful teaching which includes consideration of student learning outcomes to support recommendation for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion. Departments should define the expected levels of achievement appropriate to each rank.

**Scholarship:** Faculty must demonstrate continued successful scholarship to support recommendations for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion. Departments should define the expected levels of achievement within the three modes of scholarship.

**Service:** Faculty must demonstrate continued successful service to support recommendations for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion. Service may be in one or more of the following areas: the department, the school, the college, the community or the profession. Departments should define the expected levels of achievement appropriate for each rank.

Question 4: How should faculty performance in these areas be assessed? Who should be involved in assessment of performance?

**Annual Review**

The Chair of a department is responsible for evaluating individual faculty members as part of the formal annual review and more frequently if circumstances require it.

**Term Renewal, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion**

Thorough evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service shall take place when making personnel decisions of term renewal, continuing appointment, and promotion.

Chairs and APT committees should work with their departments to develop formal procedures for evaluation of all aspects of each faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The extraordinary diversity of our programs precludes agreement on any single model, but within broad limits we recommend the following:
Teaching: In order to give teaching the stature it should have, its evaluation for term appointment, continuing appointment and promotion must be rigorous. It must involve some form of student evaluation, peer review of a teaching portfolio and may include peer observation of classroom performances. The teaching portfolio may include the following: teaching philosophy; student learning outcomes; grading practices; assignments; requirements; and assessment methods; advisement; mentoring; independent study projects; and supervision of theses; accomplishments of present and past students when directly related to the educator's influence; quality and effectiveness of pedagogical strategies; development and use of instructional technology; innovation for the purpose of improved learning productivity; and evidence that the course content is current.

Scholarship: Each department should develop a system for evaluating the scholarship of its faculty members consistent with the principles outlined in this document.

Scholarship should be evaluated according to these six criteria*, as described by Ernest Boyer in Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., Maeroff, G. I. (1997). Scholarship Assessed. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 22-36:

1. Clarity of goals
2. Adequacy of preparation
3. Appropriateness of methods
4. Significance of results
5. Effectiveness of presentation
6. Reflective critique where appropriate

*(See appendix A for a brief description of the criteria. Entire text is on reserve in the Library).

Application of these six criteria will ensure uniform evaluation of scholarship across disciplines.

Service: Faculty members should play a service role commensurate with their rank and the changing needs of their various constituencies. Faculty will prepare a statement of all relevant service activities with a brief description of the individual's responsibilities, participation, and any product developed. Where service is community-based, such activity should have a direct relationship to the faculty member's disciplinary expertise or to the central mission of the college.

In those instances where service ranks as a major responsibility and is a key component in the evaluation and
assessment of the individual faculty member’s rewards, departments should develop a set of criteria for evaluating that service which is equally as rigorous as that used in evaluating teaching and scholarship.

Question 5: What system of post-tenure review would be appropriate?

Faculty development and enrichment is an important process in any educational institution. Therefore, this committee strongly supports strengthening the current system of annual faculty review, with the goal of throughout a faculty member’s career.

By policy and practice, Chairs are responsible for the annual review of all faculty members, including those with continuing and term appointments. Thus, the Academic Council should create a training system for Chairs and program directors to help them understand their responsibilities regarding faculty review, the proper procedures for meeting those responsibilities, and the types of institutional support available. Also, Deans and Chairs shall ensure that each faculty member has a clear sense of his or her responsibilities, expected standards, and methods of REVIEW, in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, under policies established by each department.

The annual review should include a thorough evaluation of the faculty member’s activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and may involve a meeting between the Chair and the faculty member. At this time, the Chair should take the opportunity to point out to faculty members areas of strength, as well as any areas for possible improvement. If areas for improvement are identified, a written action plan should be developed. This action plan may include referral to an employee assistance program (EAP), if appropriate, or formulation of a professional development plan, with specific goals, expected outcomes, time frame, and monitoring of activities. The faculty member would have the option of working in consultation with the departmental Chair, both the Chair and the departmental APT committee, or the Dean, to formulate this development plan. Institutional support for implementation of the plan may be provided, when appropriate. If, after implementation of the development plan and sufficient time for remediation, improvement

---

1 The proposals contained in the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee’s response to Question 5 are covered by Article XII of the Policies of the Board of Trustees of SUNY, Articles 19 and 49 of the current UUP agreement with SUNY, and Chapter 122 of the SUNY Brockport Faculty Handbook.
does not occur, the faculty member would become subject to appropriate actions, under procedures outlined in the Policies of the Board of Trustees of SUNY, and the current UUP agreement with SUNY.

Question 6: When actual assignments of work responsibilities are made, what framework (one which must be consistent with resource constraints) would be most appropriate?

The Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards is cognizant of the emerging educational practice of measuring work load in terms of learning outcomes rather than teaching inputs, and understands that this academic community is currently exploring the potential for increased learning productivity inherent in such a shift. Until that examination is complete, however, we recommend the following policy:

The normal expectation is a 3/3 course load or its equivalent for faculty demonstrating an active program of scholarship as defined by individual departments and/or with major or multiple service responsibilities. The Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee recognizes that variability among disciplines and teaching styles, as well as historic patterns, may lead individuals and departments to deviate from this norm. Nonetheless, we see it as the norm around which particular variation will occur.

Chairs should make individual work assignments within the department in accordance with procedures and principles adopted by the department and in such a way as to ensure that:

1. Each department meets the curricular and educational needs of its own students as well as those of other students who depend upon it as agreed upon by the Department, the Dean, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

2. Each faculty member has sufficient time:
   a. to teach well and to promote student learning
   b. to complete scholarly undertakings
   c. to meet service obligations

In addition,

1. Chairs should expect those faculty who do not demonstrate an active program of scholarship to contribute more in the areas of teaching and/or service.
2. The blend of teaching, scholarship and service may change from year to year and over a life-time career as long as departmental responsibilities are met on an annual basis.

3. Any release time beyond the normal 3/3 course load shall be reported to the VPAA and publicized annually.

4. An important consideration in granting faculty release time should be to ensure that the total departmental effort is not compromised and that other faculty within the department are not required to take on an unfair load. Accomplishing these goals may require that the Administration provide the department with sufficient resources for support staff and replacement faculty depending upon the nature of the release.

Question 7: How should reappointment, tenure, and promotion procedures be structured so as to dovetail with the institutional stance on faculty roles?

We should re-structure reappointment, tenure, and promotion procedures to dovetail with these proposals in the following ways:

Departments/Programs

1. Each department must develop, publish** (see page 10), and obtain School-level approval for its policies and procedures to distribute the work-load and to evaluate personnel.

2. These policies and procedures must be consistent with the principles articulated in this document, as well as with the needs of the School and the College as defined in the strategic plan.

3. These policies and procedures should include at least the following:

   a. An explicit means for evaluating teaching that is rigorous and includes both peer review of a teaching portfolio and student evaluation of all faculty members.

   b. An explicit identification of the kinds of scholarship most appropriate to the discipline and the levels [quantity and quality] appropriate for each rank.

   c. An explicit system of weighting the relative importance of teaching, scholarship, and service for
the evaluation of individual faculty members. All systems developed must conform to the following formula: Teaching > Scholarship > Service where Teaching ≥ 50% in assessing and evaluating faculty performance.

d. Departments that give considerable recognition to Service must devise an explicit method of evaluation that is as systematic and rigorous as methods used to evaluate Teaching and Scholarship.

e. An explicit definition of total department teaching load consistent with the needs of their majors, students in other programs who depend upon that department, and the General Education program.

Schools

Each School must:

1. Develop and publish** its procedure for reviewing and validating departmental policies and procedures.

2. Develop and publish** the specific departmental policies and procedures that have been validated.

3. Develop and publish** specific policies and procedures for the annual evaluation of Chairs.

College

The President or the President's designee must:

1. Review and validate each School's proposed procedures for reviewing and approving departmental policies and procedures.

2. Review and validate the actual departmental policies and procedures that each School has approved.

3. Publish** the School policies and procedures it has validated.

4. Allocate the resources and devise the policies and procedures necessary for training Department Chairs in developing personnel policies and procedures according to the guidelines of the Board of Trustees, the College, the UUP Contract, and these proposals.
5. Bring its current "Guidelines for Faculty Renewal, Tenure, Promotion, and Performance at Rank" into line with the principles articulated in this document, with the requirements of the strategic plan, and with the School policies and procedures it has approved.

6. Replace the current IAS with a reliable and valid vehicle for measuring student evaluation of individual faculty and establish legitimate procedures for its utilization.

7. Publish** the reassignment of faculty [released time] and provide departments with appropriate replacement resources.

8. Publish** brief summaries of the teaching and scholarly accomplishments of the faculty who have been granted appointment, re-appointment, tenure, and promotion.

**Publish: "To publish" means to make public, i.e., to make available [in printed or electronic form] to members of this academic community.

Question 8: How should other kinds of recognition (both monetary and non-monetary) be structured so as to dovetail with the institutional stance on faculty roles?

Recognition of faculty on either a monetary or non-monetary basis should include faculty accomplishments in the three principal faculty roles: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. The purpose of merit pay and/or non-monetary recognition is to reward those individuals who have made particularly valuable contributions to SUNY Brockport and its mission.

**DISCRETIONARY SALARY INCREASES (DSIs)**

If and when negotiated by the UUP, monies made available to reward faculty for exceptional performance in one or more of the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service shall be awarded individually or to a group, and shall be added to each recipient’s base salary.

1. One-Year Individual DSI

Individuals with exceptional Teaching, Scholarship, or Service, and performance at least at rank in the two other areas, may be nominated for a DSI based on a one-year period of review. The Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards urges the administration to distribute DSI awards among the three areas in accordance with the relative weight assigned to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service [see above, Question 7]. We also
encourage establishing award levels that will ensure DSIs will be
greater in number for a smaller amount of money (example: $800-
$1,000) rather than fewer in number for a larger amount of money.

Faculty members wishing to be considered for DSI will submit
their annual reports and the supplemental documentation for
Teaching, Scholarship, and Service to their department APT
committee. The APT committee will review the reports and make
recommendations to the department Chair. Chairs will add their
own recommendations and then meet as a group with their
respective Dean and recommend DSI recipients each year. Monetary
compensation for Chancellor’s Awards, promotions, and salary
inequity adjustments, will not come from the DSI pool. A maximum
of twenty (20) percent of the DSI teaching faculty funds will be
reserved for distribution by the College President. The
remaining teaching faculty funds will be distributed to Schools
based upon the number of full-time equivalent faculty, including
those on leave, in each School. DSIs for department Chairs will
be paid from the discretionary fund held by the President.

2. Multi-Year Individual DSI

Faculty members who have not received a DSI in the previous
three consecutive academic years would be eligible to apply at
the beginning of the 4th year for a DSI that considers work
completed over the previous three-year period. The application
process and the criteria would be the same as the current DSI
process for the one-year review except that the money will come
from the President’s share of the DSI fund, and will not exceed
the amount awarded for a one-year Individual DSI.

3. Group DSI

Groups of two or more individuals whose collective
achievement in Teaching, Scholarship, or Service is exceptional
may be nominated for a Group DSI by the Dean(s) of the School(s)
to the College President. Recipients of a Group DSI may be
nominated based on collective achievement that spans one to three
years. Membership in a group recognized for a Group DSI does not
preclude an individual from being awarded a One-Year or Multi-
Year Individual DSI based upon exceptional achievement in one or
more areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, with
performance at least at rank in the other roles. Faculty may not
be awarded a DSI as an individual and as a member of a group for
the same exceptional achievement. The application process and the
criteria would be the same as the current DSI process for
Individual Awards except that the money will come from the
President’s share of the DSI fund.
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

In addition to existing faculty development incentives, we strongly recommend:

1. University Fellows

   In order to foster faculty development and to promote excellence in Teaching, the College should establish at least six University Fellowships, with a minimum of one Fellowship from each School. The Fellowships will carry half-time teaching responsibilities for one academic year. Open to all full-time faculty, these Fellowships would be used primarily for the improvement of individual teaching, significant training, curriculum development, or for experimentation with team-teaching and/or new technology. University Fellows would be required to share the results of their work with the College community.

2. Conference/Seminar Fund

   In an effort to assist faculty in keeping current with developments in their field and to encourage their professional growth, the College should establish a permanent fund to pay up to $1,000 of expenses for attendance at conferences/seminars. The grants should be rotated on a yearly basis so that no person receives a second grant from this fund before all other qualified applicants have had the opportunity to do so.

3. Team Teaching

   The College should actively promote faculty development in the area of interdisciplinary teaching/learning. One way to encourage this is through interdisciplinary team-taught courses. The College should establish a fund to allow a limited number of faculty each term to receive full credit, in terms of contact hours, for full participation in an interdisciplinary team-taught course. If these courses are to be taught properly, they typically require more than a part-time commitment by participating faculty. For example, a 3-credit course being instructed by two faculty should demand three hours of class time from each team member each week, plus full participation in grading and lesson preparation.

   Faculty wishing to participate in this program would develop an interdisciplinary course proposal and submit it to their appropriate Chair(s) and Dean(s) for approval. The number of proposals that could be supported during a semester would be contingent upon available resources.
4. Document Preparation Fund

Recognizing the important role of the faculty in contributing to the creation of new knowledge through research and writing, the College should create a document preparation fund to provide individual faculty members up to $500 to be used by the faculty exclusively for the purpose of paying support personnel to prepare manuscripts for publication, or to cover the incidental expenses incurred in the publication of manuscripts. Reimbursement to faculty would require submission of a paid billing statement from the support personnel, a copy of the prepared manuscript, and the proposed transmittal letter to a publisher.
Conclusion

The members of the Committee have systematically reviewed the roles and rewards of faculty. This report provides a unifying guideline for assigning and evaluating faculty workload. At the same time, the Committee recognizes the diversity of this campus and has intentionally included parameters which allow for individual as well as departmental variations with respect to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

The Committee urges full implementation of these recommendations while recognizing that any definition of faculty roles and rewards is a dynamic process.

Finally, we want to thank all who helped us in this difficult task. Paul Yu, President of the College, Thomas Bonner, President of the Faculty Senate, Anne Parsons, Past-President of the Faculty Senate, Ed Van Duzer, President of the local UUP, Timothy Flanagan, Vice President for Academic Affairs, the earlier committee on the Redefinition of Scholarship chaired by Jeremiah Donigian on whose work we built, the 90 or so faculty and staff members who took the time to share their thinking with us in writing, the Departments that responded with written criticisms and suggestions, as well as those who attended one or more of our open meetings and shared their ideas with us.

Respectfully submitted,

The Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards

Sri Ram Bakshi
Interdisciplinary Arts, x5262
sbakshi@po.brockport.edu

Virginia Bachele:
Communication, x5289
vbachele@atspri.acs.brockport.edu

Michael Fox
Academic Affairs, 2504
mfox@po.brockport.edu

Ewen S. Ireland
History, x5672
esireland@po.brockport.edu

Sharon Kehoe
Educational Administration, x5513
shekoe@yumo.com

Richard Meade
Personnel, 2126
rmeade@po.brockport.edu

Sheila Myer
Nursing, x5309
smyer@po.brockport.edu

Christopher Normant
Biology, x5748
cnormant@acs.brockport.edu

Heidi Rath-Melens
Secretary
hmelens@frontiernet.net
APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF STANDARDS


Clear Goals

Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

Adequate Preparation

Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?

Appropriate Methods

Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

Significant Results

Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar’s work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar’s work open additional areas for further exploration?

Effective Presentation

Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

Reflective Critique

Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?