

# *FACULTY SUCCESS STRATEGIC INITIATIVE WORKGROUP*

Preliminary Progress Report

*Pritish Mukherjee & Dwayne Smith, Co-Chairs*

*June 28, 2019*

# I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## A. INTRODUCTION AND PROCESS

In this report, the Faculty Success Strategic Initiative Workgroup, comprised of thirty-three members (Appendix A), presents a preliminary response to the charge provided by Provost Ralph Wilcox. The Workgroup met as a whole on May 16<sup>th</sup>, May 28<sup>th</sup>, June 10<sup>th</sup>, and June 25<sup>th</sup>. Workgroup co-chairs Prithish Mukherjee and Dwayne Smith presented the charge (Appendix B) to the Workgroup at the first meeting on May 16<sup>th</sup>.

In order to effectively address the tasks, the following five subcommittees were formed based on the charge:

- Faculty Recruitment, Equity and Diversity;
- Faculty Research, Scholarship, Innovation, and Instructional Impact;
- Faculty Assignment, Assessment, and Compensation;
- Faculty Professional Development; and
- Academic Structures and Leadership.

By May 28<sup>th</sup>, subcommittee membership was finalized (Appendix C). The subcommittees met separately in the periods between Workgroup meetings. Each subcommittee produced initial recommendations which were presented to the Workgroup for discussion and feedback on June 10<sup>th</sup>.

## B. OUTCOMES

By June 25<sup>th</sup>, the subcommittees further refined their initial recommendations and identified high-risk items, prioritized needs, and preliminary recommendations with a now, near, or far suggested timeline. The Workgroup agreed that high-risk items were those that would yield negative impact on faculty success if no action was taken. These results are presented in Section II, Subcommittee Recommendations.

## C. CONCLUSION

The following subcommittee recommendations are provided as the preliminary deliverable to guide initial steps towards the final three-year action plan due on November 30, 2019. The discussions and work to date are helping to crystallize certain overarching themes that will propel faculty success at USF. We anticipate that these ideas will take shape during the next few months as we tackle some fundamental issues such as the definition of faculty success, continued analysis of national paradigms and identification of metrics that can be used to gauge effective progress through recommended actions.

The results contained in this progress report are preliminary in nature and not intended for general circulation. We look forward to continued engaged discussions within the Faculty Success Strategic Initiative Workgroup, and the engagement of a broader community of stakeholders on all three campuses as the final plan is developed.

DRAFT

## II. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. FACULTY RECRUITMENT, EQUITY, AND DIVERSITY

FACULTY RECRUITMENT, EQUITY, AND DIVERSITY SUBCOMMITTEE			
<i>High Risk Items</i>	<i>Prioritized Needs</i>	<i>Preliminary Recommendations</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<b>1. Recruitment and Retention</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inability to recruit and retain high quality faculty, often for lack of sufficient salary and start-up package funding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial: Bringing up salaries at least to AAUP standards and/or our Florida peers will be expensive, as will achieving gender equity in salaries, and we are facing a year of austerity. We nonetheless should prioritize faculty salaries when that is possible. We cannot hire or retain world-class faculty on second-tier salaries.</li> <li>Culture of Support: We need to review how we help faculty transition into new roles (new faculty, new rank, administrative roles); review our processes for working to keep (and support) faculty.</li> </ul>	Improve salaries and fund start-ups adequately, on the level of other preeminent research universities. Based on AAUP 2018-2019 Faculty Compensation Survey, salaries at USF Tampa run substantially behind national averages for public doctoral universities and behind salaries at UF, FSU, and UCF. USFT salaries lag behind USFSM salaries, too, in all categories except Asst. Prof. We cannot recruit or retain faculty when salaries are not competitive.	Near
		Address gender pay inequity. Women's salaries at USFT, expressed as a percentage of men's salaries, are 88% (Profs.), 92% (Assoc. Profs.), 89% (Asst. Profs.), and 92% (Instructors).	Near
		Implement exit interview process for outgoing faculty	Now
<b>2. Equity and Diversity</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"World Class" is defined in such a way as to exclude people in the middle of productive careers, and tilts toward older faculty, who are more likely to be white and male.</li> <li>The presidential cabinet overrules departments and colleges on decisions about hiring.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leadership: Create a culture that values diversity and prioritizes hiring and mentoring faculty from diverse backgrounds. This will involve both training and leadership.</li> <li>Better policy: Target of opportunity and spousal hiring depend on the finances to make those hires possible, but they also depend on having policies</li> </ul>	We need protocols across colleges to actively recruit faculty of color.	Now
		We need better plans for target-of-opportunity and spousal/partner hiring, including across-colleges partner accommodation.	Now
		We need a culture of mentoring and support.	Now
		We could more directly support excellence in teaching by creating an Academy of Distinguished Educators (on the model of the one in Engineering).	Near to Far

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without a genuine culture of inclusion and support, we risk losing high-quality faculty.</li> </ul>	<p>that support those initiatives. We also can redefine “world class scholar” (within whatever limits were set by legislation); while national academy members may “move the needle” on rankings, they do not necessarily add much to department culture or mentoring. Hiring mid-career rising stars can do more to enhance and build faculty research/morale/student success.</p>	<p>We could create a physical space on campus where faculty could interact with graduate students on an informal basis (more inclusive than a faculty club).</p>	<p>Far</p>
		<p>We should implement proposals made by the 2016 Faculty and Administrator Diversity at USF Workgroup for following best practices, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>View conferences and annual meetings as recruitment venues</li> <li>Define a clear process for recruiting and hiring minority faculty members</li> <li>Develop a tool kit with best practices for all faculty search committees</li> <li>Support DIEO’s effort to train committee chairs in best practices in faculty searches</li> <li>Create and support a formal mentorship program</li> <li>Conduct a campus climate survey for faculty (<i>Faculty climate questions to gauge faculty satisfaction and needs will be included in the upcoming faculty survey planned by the Workgroup for Building a Digital Ecosystem.</i>)</li> </ul>	<p>Now</p>

DRAFT

## B. FACULTY RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, INNOVATION, AND INSTRUCTIONAL IMPACT

FACULTY RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, INNOVATION & INSTRUCTIONAL IMPACT SUBCOMMITTEE			
<i>High Risk Items</i>	<i>Prioritized Needs</i>	<i>Preliminary Recommendations</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<b>1. Insufficient base budget funding slows growth</b>			
Insufficient faculty strength	Hire new faculty in areas of priority need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct units to develop hiring plans, concatenated in strategic clusters</li> <li>• Reorient World Class Scholar Funding on early and middle career faculty</li> <li>• Hire as funding is available</li> </ul>	Now Now Near, Far
Insufficient space & facilities	Modernize existing space and facilities, construct new space and facilities to support new faculty hires	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engage faculty on space and facilities needs and priorities</li> <li>• Develop strategy for annual modernization of space and facilities</li> <li>• Develop strategy for construction of new space and facilities</li> <li>• Modernize and construct when funding is available</li> </ul>	Now Near Near Near, Far
Insufficient support staff	Hire and properly train and empower new staff in areas of priority need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engage faculty on staffing needs and priorities</li> <li>• Reorganize, reorient, retrain, and empower existing staff where possible</li> <li>• Hire as funding is available</li> </ul>	Now Near Near, Far
<b>2. Top-down management blocks innovation and enterprise</b>			
Faculty and units find it difficult to implement innovative and/or enterprising actions	Delegate more authority and responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engage Deans and Chairs in budget planning and decision-making</li> <li>• Distribute additional budget authority and responsibility to Deans and Chairs</li> </ul>	Now Now
<b>3. A culture of risk aversion and one-size-fits-all creates unnecessary barriers</b>			
Staff are afraid to go off script, requiring routine escalation to higher levels of authority	Sufficiently trained and empowered staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reorient staff culture around facilitating faculty and student success, less around protecting the institution</li> <li>• Properly train and empower staff to make informed, data-driven decisions</li> </ul>	Now Near
Processes built for normative activities create barriers to many unique initiatives	Creation of flexible processes that maintain core requirements while accommodating unique initiatives		
<b>4. Monetization/weaponization of performance metrics discourages collaboration</b>			
Silo mentality that discourages cross-unit collaboration	Encourage cross-unit collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aggregating metrics at the highest level</li> <li>• Implement collaborative performance metrics</li> <li>• Reward faculty and leadership alike for cross-unit collaborations</li> </ul>	Now Near Near

**5. Poor rate of F&A returns limits critical strategic investments**

Faculty and units lack sufficient resources to make critical investments in space and facilities	Implement key recommendations from the Huron Consulting Group's Research Operating Structure Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• "Increased portion of indirect cost recovery, as well as responsibility to pay for other costs, allocated back to the research community consistent with clarified policy and the broader USF Budget Model" (Huron Report, p. 6)</li></ul>	Now
--	---	--	-----

DRAFT

## C. FACULTY ASSIGNMENT, ASSESSMENT, AND COMPENSATION

ASSIGNMENT, ASSESSMENT, AND COMPENSATION SUBCOMMITTEE			
<i>High Risk Items</i>	<i>Prioritized Needs</i>	<i>Preliminary Recommendations</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<b>1. Faculty Classification System</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of faculty who desire more prestige</li> <li>Successful research-focused faculty divorced from departmental work</li> <li>Many necessary tasks outside of current classification possibilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider new classification categories</li> <li>Increase opportunities for upward movement for successful non-tenure track faculty</li> <li>Consistency with university policy and CBA</li> <li>Meeting AAU ratios/standards</li> </ul>	Study the classification system of AAUs	Now
		Conduct a needs assessment of departmental, college, and university needs that considers broadened options	Near
		Reclassify faculty considering priorities and prestige	Near
<b>2. Roles and Responsibilities: equity of assignment, support, and performance expectations</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual assignments of faculty not aligned with university priorities</li> <li>Research prioritized while other needs under prioritized</li> <li>Assistant professors and instructors overloaded with administrative duties</li> <li>Lack of tools for allocation management</li> <li>Unnecessary overload pay due to “gaming” current system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reconsider and standardize how effort assignments are completed based on AAUs and Best Business Practices (BBP)</li> <li>Increased valuation of administration, service, etc. based on institutional priorities and principles of equality (especially re: all marginalized groups)</li> <li>Protect low-ranking faculty so they can arrive at tenure and promotion</li> <li>Reconsider assignments for those “retired” on the job</li> </ul>	Produce a guiding document related to annual assignments based on priorities listed	Now
		Training for all chairs and all administration according to all guiding documents	Near
<b>3. Formative assessment of faculty and faculty mentoring program</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ineffective annual assessment</li> <li>Standards of promotion don’t match university/departmental needs</li> <li>“Retirement” on the job</li> <li>Disincentivizing of excellence in areas of priority</li> <li>Loss of departmental and university reputation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce evaluation “inflation”</li> <li>Align Annual Evaluation criteria with Tenure and Promotion Standards and with institutional priorities</li> <li>Reconsider evaluation tools (including student evaluations) and mentorship tools for all areas</li> <li>Provide a USF-wide framework that establishes criteria for excellence in teaching, service, research, etc. based on institutional values</li> </ul>	Produce a guiding document for annual assessment based on priorities listed	Now
		Implement post-tenure review	Near
		Enforce 360 reviews for all positions	Now
		Study mentoring programs for all roles/classifications	Now
		Adopt or create a mentoring program for all roles with appropriate effort allotted for participation	Near



**4. Faculty compensation and benefits**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of provision of incentives for all priorities</li> <li>• Loss of good faculty and/or reduced productivity</li> <li>• Inflated salary of faculty administrators</li> <li>• Difficulty recruiting and hiring</li> <li>• Competition for resources based on changing metrics</li> <li>• Discrimination based on various factors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider how faculty administrative roles can be avoided with equally effective but more cost-effective non-faculty administration</li> <li>• Create incentive structures to encourage attainment of all institutional goals based on AAU standards and BBPs</li> <li>• Clear provision of incentives for upward achievement in all current and future categories</li> <li>• Collective bargaining to prioritize such provision of incentives</li> </ul>	More strongly tie compensation and increases to success according to all strategic initiatives and priorities as measured on annual evaluations	Near
		Avoid high-paid faculty administrators when lower-paid non-faculty administration would not sacrifice effectiveness	Near
		Strategically address compression based on USF priorities	Near

DRAFT

## D. FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<b>FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE</b>			
<b>High Risk Items</b>	<b>Prioritized Needs</b>	<b>Preliminary Recommendations</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>1. Professional Development</b>			
Lack of a clear path and adequate support, including mentoring, for faculty advancement and professional development	Remove barriers/provide support for faculty advancement at all levels, including post-tenure loss of momentum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey key stakeholders, including all faculty at all levels on all campuses</li> <li>Implement a post-tenure review process</li> <li>Improve/expand mentoring initiatives</li> <li>Improve/expand leadership development initiatives</li> </ul>	Now Near Near Near
Finding balance in expanding faculty roles in research and instruction	Analysis of existing programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research existing faculty development programs already in place</li> <li>Develop a matrix</li> </ul>	Now Near
<b>2. Cultivate and Sponsor USF Faculty for National Recognition in support of USF's Goals</b>			
Meeting USF's goals to retain Preeminence and attain AAU Membership	Develop a culture of recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to facilitate high-level award nominations</li> <li>Continue to cultivate a culture of recognition to encourage faculty to nominate colleagues</li> </ul>	Now Now
<b>3. Promote Faculty Collaboration Across Campuses, Colleges &amp; Disciplines</b>			
Lack of centralized resource(s) to help promote/support faculty collaboration	Create opportunities for collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research existing faculty collaboration initiatives already in place</li> <li>Develop a matrix</li> <li>Increase communications/awareness/recognition of collaboration opportunities and achievements</li> </ul>	Now Near Near
<b>4. Cultivate a Stronger Sense of Academic Community</b>			
Lack of defined communal interactive space for faculty to engage in research, conversation, social engagement, etc.	Determine faculty needs – is the need for a physical space or an enhanced sense of community?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey key stakeholders</li> <li>Consider course release for service or leadership</li> <li>Develop a Canvas program &amp; cohort as follow-up to New Faculty Orientation</li> <li>Consider institutional membership in Engagement Scholarship Consortium</li> </ul>	Now Now Near Near
Include faculty community/public engagement	Community extends beyond USF's boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand communications and awareness of faculty community/public engagement</li> </ul>	Near

## E. ACADEMIC STRUCTURES AND LEADERSHIP

<b>ACADEMIC STRUCTURES AND LEADERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE</b>			
<i>High Risk Items</i>	<i>Prioritized Needs</i>	<i>Preliminary Recommendations</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<b>1. Organizational Structure</b>			
Dysfunction and lack of clarity	Clear academic structure	Give authority to those accountable, e.g., to the PBF and Preeminence metrics	Now
		Push this as far down as possible, to localized information and decisions	Now
Disenfranchising regional campuses; unintended hit to metrics	Clear authority to respond to local community and employers	Determine what authority can be best managed regionally	Near
Assignments and opportunities that don't match criteria leading to turnover and low morale	Equitable assignments and opportunities	Align assignments/opportunities with expectations across departments and campuses (2 separate issues)	Now
<b>2. Culture, Communication, Engagement</b>			
Loss of institutional (faculty/chair/dean) productivity and morale	Change in culture to avoid keeping deans and chairs in the dark on key matters, leading to a proliferation of mixed messages and an erosion of credibility (as currently described in EAB consultant's report)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Empower chairs and deans (see EAB report.) Include deans and department chairs in decision-making on matters that significantly affect their units' performance</li> <li>Make information about institutional priorities freely (and transparently) available to faculty and include them in important decisions that affect their work life (programs, career)</li> <li>Avoid compromising agility, authority, and succession planning</li> </ul>	Now
Lack of success in faculty recruitment, retention and professional development			Now
			Now
			Now
<b>3. Infrastructure</b>			
Lack of sufficient research infrastructure	Better research support	Inventory infrastructure (laboratory space, equipment, etc.) across all three campuses. Invest for strategic priorities. Enhance cooperation between colleges.	Near
Information technology	More responsive and nimble IT	Better engagement with faculty and other stakeholders to determine actual IT needs.	Near
<b>4. Business practices to support faculty success</b>			
Faculty motivation, efficiency, performance	Better service from internal support departments	Leadership setting clear goals and purposes for support departments. Change from a risk-avoidance to a problem-solving mentality.	Near, Far

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A. WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP

<b>Vonzell Agosto</b>	Assoc. Professor, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, College of Education, USFT
<b>Bob Bishop</b>	Dean, College of Engineering, USFT
<b>John Bomba</b>	Senior Data Management Analyst, ODS, USFT
<b>Kiki Caruson</b>	Asst. Vice President, USF World and Assoc. Professor, School of Interdisciplinary Global Studies, USFT
<b>Tiffany Chenneville</b>	Professor and Chair, Psychology, USFSP
<b>Terry Chisolm</b>	Vice Provost and Professor, Communication Sciences & Disorders, USFT
<b>Eric Eisenberg</b>	Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, USFT
<b>Sidney Fernandes</b>	Vice President, IT/CIO, USF System
<b>Michael Gillespie</b>	Faculty Senate President and Assoc. Professor, Psychology, USFSM
<b>David Himmelgreen</b>	Professor and Chair, Anthropology, USFT
<b>Brett Kemker</b>	Regional Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs, USFSM
<b>Matt Knight</b>	Asst. Librarian, USFT
<b>Moez Limayem</b>	Dean, College of Business, USFT
<b>Jennifer Lister</b>	Assoc. Dean, Undergraduate Studies; Professor, Communication Sciences & Disorders, USFT
<b>Jamie McHale</b>	Professor, Psychology, USFSP
<b>James Moy</b>	Dean, College of The Arts, USFT
<b>Pritish Mukherjee</b>	Co-Chair; Vice Provost and Professor, Physics, USFT
<b>Valerie Parisi</b>	Sr. Assoc. Vice President, USF Health; Vice Dean, Faculty Affairs, Morsani College of Medicine, USFT
<b>Steve Permuth</b>	Professor, Educational Leadership, USFT
<b>Devona Pierre</b>	Asst. Director of Faculty Diversity, DIEO, USF System
<b>Diane Price-Herndl</b>	Professor and Chair, Women's and Gender Studies, USFT
<b>Mark Rains</b>	Professor and Chair, Geosciences, USFT
<b>Sudeep Sarkar</b>	Professor and Chair, Computer Science and Engineering, USFT
<b>Jenifer Jasinski Schneider</b>	Professor and Chair, Teaching & Learning, USFT
<b>Dwayne Smith</b>	Co-Chair; Senior Vice Provost and Professor, Criminology, USFT
<b>Victoria Stuart</b>	Program Director, USF Research & Innovation, USF System
<b>Steven Surrency</b>	Instructor and Chair, Communication Sciences & Disorders, USFT
<b>Michael Teng</b>	Assoc. Professor & Assoc. Dean, Morsani College of Medicine, USFT
<b>Sylvia Thomas</b>	Assoc. Professor, Electrical Engineering, USFT
<b>Thom VanderKlipp</b>	Asst. Vice President, UCM Marketing, USFT
<b>Tanya Vomacka</b>	Director of Strategic Communications, Office of the Provost, USFT
<b>Dennis Walpole</b>	Director of Online Student Services, Innovative Education, USFT
<b>Lillian Wichinsky</b>	Director, Office of Community Engagement and Partnerships, USFT

## APPENDIX B. SUBCOMMITTEE CHARGES

### **FACULTY RECRUITMENT, EQUITY & DIVERSITY**

- Strategic faculty talent identification, recruitment, and retention consistent with a Preeminent State Research University
- Promoting equity for inclusive excellence: championing and celebrating faculty diversity

### **FACULTY RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, INNOVATION & INSTRUCTIONAL IMPACT**

- Enhancing undergraduate and graduate instruction, student mentoring and student learning for early and mid-career professionals and senior scholars, together with contingent faculty
- Improving scholarly, research, and creative productivity for early and mid-career professional and senior scholars – including contracts, grants and citations – support for research
- Supporting innovation and technology transfer for USF faculty

### **FACULTY ASSIGNMENT, ASSESSMENT & COMPENSATION**

- Considering formative assessment of faculty and faculty mentoring programs
- Re-examining faculty roles and responsibilities: equity of assignment, support and performance expectations
- Re-evaluating the faculty classification system for optimal outcomes: clinical faculty, etc.
- Faculty compensation and benefits

### **FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

- Professional development
- Cultivating and sponsoring USF faculty for national awards
- Promoting faculty collaboration across campuses, colleges and disciplines
- Considering the need for a Faculty Club to cultivate a stronger sense of academic community

### **ACADEMIC STRUCTURES & LEADERSHIP**

- Optimal organizational structure in a consolidated USF to achieve strategic outcomes
- Culture, communication, and faculty engagement
- Business practices supportive of faculty success
- Academic leadership succession

## APPENDIX C. SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

### **FACULTY RECRUITMENT, EQUITY & DIVERSITY SUBCOMMITTEE**

Bob Bishop, David Himmelgreen, James Moy, Devona Pierre, Diane Price-Herndl, Sylvia Thomas

### **FACULTY RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, INNOVATION & INSTRUCTIONAL IMPACT SUBCOMMITTEE**

Matt Knight, Jennifer Lister, Valerie Parisi, Mark Rains, Sudeep Sarkar, Thom VanderKlipp, Dennis Walpole

### **FACULTY ASSIGNMENT, ASSESSMENT & COMPENSATION SUBCOMMITTEE**

John Bomba, Kiki Caruson, Brett Kemker, Steve Permeth, Jenifer Jasinski Schneider, Steven Surrency

### **FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE**

Vonzell Agosto, Tiffany Chenneville, Terry Chisolm, Sidney Fernandes, Victoria Stuart, Tanya Vomacka, Lillie Wichinsky

### **ACADEMIC STRUCTURES & LEADERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE**

Eric Eisenberg, Michael Gillespie, Moez Limayem, Jamie McHale, Michael Teng

### **FACULTY SUCCESS STRATEGIC INITIATIVE WORKGROUP CO-CHAIRS**

Pritish Mukherjee, Dwayne Smith

DRAFT