

FACULTY CAREER ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE

FINAL REPORT

Submitted to

Karen A. Holbrook, President

Barbara R. Snyder, Executive Vice President & Provost

Philip T.K. Daniel, Faculty Council Chair

Anthony Mughan, Senate Steering Committee Chair

NOVEMBER 2005

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the result of a request by President Holbrook, Provost Snyder, Faculty Council Chair Chism, and Senate Steering Committee Chair Pinsky in spring 2004 that a committee of faculty review what the University currently does to enhance the careers of its faculty and propose ways it might do that better. The committee acknowledges that the University has made important strides in providing such support, but it also believes more should be done. The report details the committee's varied recommendations for such improvement, presented in their relationship to 10 core principles that the committee thinks are fundamental to any discussion of faculty career enhancement. Those principles are:

- Faculty are primarily responsible for the advancement of their own careers, but department chairs (and, in some colleges, section and division heads) have to play a pivotal role in that activity.
- Advancing the careers of associate professors is critical to the progress of the University.
- The University should more clearly recognize the ways faculty careers evolve and differ by better aligning the reward system with what faculty actually do.
- The University should explicitly acknowledge that faculty members' personal and professional lives intertwine.
- The University should better publicize its current faculty leave programs and make them more flexible.
- Advancing the careers of both women faculty and faculty of color is crucial to the progress of the University.
- Interdisciplinary activity should be promoted as an often important stimulus to faculty members' careers.
- The University should do all it can to provide faculty members what they repeatedly ask for, a more collegial environment.
- The University should develop a mentoring culture campuswide.
- This and other committees' recommendations regarding faculty career enhancement should be monitored for implementation and effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION

In spring 2004, President Karen Holbrook, Provost Barbara Snyder, Faculty Council Chair Grady Chism, and University Senate Steering Committee Chair Stephen Pinsky convened an all-faculty committee of 12 colleagues from 9 colleges and charged it with reviewing what the University currently does to enhance the careers of its faculty and with proposing ways it might do that better. This report responds to that charge, recommending actions and procedures that we think could improve the professional lives of faculty in all aspects of their academic work—teaching, research and creative activity, and service—and during all phases of their careers.

The report reflects our committee’s consultations with faculty and administrators across campus and with other OSU officers and organizations concerned about the issue, a review of past related reports, a survey of associate professors (conducted by the Office of Institutional Research & Planning) that tried to probe their views more deeply than past surveys, an updated poll of department chairs, wide reading, and a year of discussion among ourselves. Throughout the report we prefer to speak of “enhancement” rather than “development” of faculty in order to avoid the imputation that any faculty are “undeveloped” and to acknowledge the fact that, while more needs to be done, the University already provides significant support for the enhancement of faculty careers (offering, for example, programs and policies that support dual career hiring, paid parental leave, vacation donation, domestic partners and sponsored dependent health benefits, a first-year experience for new deans, Faculty and TA Development’s midcareer support, a second onsite child care center, part-time tenure-track appointments, and a faculty leadership institute). Some colleges and departments support faculty careers either by targeting for faculty enhancement new funding secured through awards or by negotiating redirection of funding. However, as this report will indicate, while some of the recommended actions require the further commitment of resources, financial and otherwise, those are investments we believe will ultimately return dividends in the form of higher levels of academic excellence at Ohio State.

The committee recommends that readers also study the American Council on Education’s recent report, *Flexibility for Nourishing Tenure-Track Faculty Careers*, 2005 (<http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pubInfo.cfm?pubID=330>), whose co-authors include OSU’s current president, two of her predecessors, and a former OSU dean. This report has strongly influenced ours in its focus on four urgent needs—for innovative efforts at faculty recruitment, for improving career satisfaction as well as retention and advancement, for bettering the climate for everyone at the university, and for developing incentives for faculty retirement. Our report echoes especially the ACE report’s recommendations regarding associate professors, emeriti, women faculty, faculty of color, collegiality, mentoring, and worklife concerns.

DEFINING CAREER ENHANCEMENT

Faculty career enhancement is a positive, future-oriented process that addresses all aspects and stages of faculty careers and worklife—helping faculty remain productive, satisfied with their work, significantly connected to their university and its mission, and supported in the conduct of their interdependent professional and personal lives. It should not be thought of as merely a means to assist faculty in meeting criteria for promotion and tenure. An outstanding faculty

comes about from recruiting the best candidates and then assuring that they have the opportunities to succeed, and so career enhancement ought to begin at the time of hiring and extend fully across faculty members' careers—even, for active colleagues, into retirement.

There is no doubt that faculty career enhancement is a major concern at universities everywhere, among faculty as well as administrators. At Ohio State, its importance has been highlighted in the University's Academic Plan and Leadership Agenda. Since faculty are the heart of any college or university, the continual competition in the academy to gather superlative faculty makes it essential for OSU to be vigilant in the retention and advancement of its own. With all that in mind, in recent years the University and its colleges and departments have made notable strides in providing start-up and seed funding for beginning faculty, and many departments have reduced the service responsibilities of assistant professors as they start their careers. More attention now should be paid to the support of the careers of mid-career and other senior faculty. And although the University will continue to hire 'superstars,' it should be sure to commit resources that give all current faculty the help to advance their careers.

Our committee has found it instructive to echo several other recent OSU reports whose recommendations also have focused on issues vital to career enhancement. These include the reports from:

- the Commission on Faculty Development and Careers, 1999 (<http://oaa.osu.edu/speeches/comfacdevel.html>)—many of whose sixteen proposals our committee repeats;
- the Research Commission, 1999;
- the Stanford Research Institute, 2000 (<http://www.stanford.edu/home/research/>);
- the Faculty Cohort Project, begun in 2002; the Faculty Work Environment and WorkLife Quality Committee, 2003, and its implementation report, 2004 (<http://senate.osu.edu/WorkLifeDraft.pdf>);
- the Status Report on Women at The Ohio State University, 2004 (<http://womensplace.osu.edu/publications.htm>);
- the Committee on Barriers to Interdisciplinarity, 2004 (www.senate.osu.edu/reports/FCEC/InterdiscRptfinal.pdf);
- the report of the President's Council on Women's Issues concerning Flexible Work Loads for Tenure-Track Faculty, 2005 (<http://womensplace.osu.edu/publications.htm>); and
- the annual reports of the University Diversity Council (<http://www.osu.edu/diversity/reports.php>).

Again and again these reports draw attention to similar faculty desires and needs, and the convergence of their recommendations strongly underscores how necessary it is for OSU to be more attentive to the enhancement of faculty careers. Our report frequently invokes or quotes from these other reports.

As President Holbrook observed this past March in assessing the results of the SRI, Faculty Cohort, and Faculty Work Environment reports, "these studies indicate that compensation—particularly equity—remains an important issue, but equally or more important is the ability to successfully integrate professional pursuits, personal relationships/family, and community

involvement. Flexible options for tenure and for valuing different contributions in different areas of life are clearly needed.” Since a number of recommendations in these previous reports have yet to be put into effect, ours (in its final section, J) takes advantage of this occasion to recommend creation of a continuing committee that would identify offices and units that seem well suited to implement them as well as ways of encouraging and monitoring University progress on our and other recommendations.

What follows are our elaborations on 10 core principles that the committee believes are fundamental to any discussion of faculty career enhancement, along with particular recommendations interwoven at appropriate points in our discussion of the principles. The recommendations are variously addressed to department chairs, directors, deans, the Office of Research, the Office of Human Resources, and the Office of Academic Affairs. (We are still identifying ‘Existing Practices’ from Ohio State and other institutions relevant to faculty career enhancement; these are being collected and will be made available later this year for distribution to the campus community.) Our report makes a number of recommendations because we think that the wide variety of issues we have identified need addressing in a variety of ways.

PRINCIPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Faculty are primarily responsible for the advancement of their own careers, but department chairs (and, in some colleges, section and division heads) have to play a pivotal role in that activity.

The formulation of career needs and goals is mainly--as 80% of our faculty told the 1999 Commission on Faculty Development and Careers--the responsibility of the individual faculty member, who should take the initiative to put together a plan and generate departmental endorsement of it. Counseling and guidance from colleagues are also important, but department chairs, as direct supervisors for most faculty, must play a prominent role in career enhancement.

Chairs are familiar with both the range of career trajectories and professional needs specific to a discipline or interdisciplinary field (including the role played by external and internal funding in faculty support) as well as with the evolving needs of the individual faculty in their departments. They pay personal attention to their faculty, serve as mentors and evaluators, help determine the climate and direction of the department, and allocate resources; and they have the responsibility for drafting patterns of administration, which may directly address departmental practices of professional development. Through their actions, chairs can point faculty to professional career-enhancing opportunities and potentially beneficial intellectual partnerships, and they can encourage a local environment conducive to faculty support and collegiality. Chairs can be held accountable, in annual reviews and in the college budgeting process, for developing programs that enhance faculty careers in ways that can dynamically affect them. And while committee work constitutes an important part of faculty governance of the University, chairs (and other college officers) should be helpful advisers to their faculty, especially women faculty and faculty of color, about how to appropriately balance commitments to service, teaching, and research/creative activity.

To accomplish the University's goals, chairs (and deans in colleges that lack departments) must be adequately trained in faculty career enhancement—educated about resources available at the University, existing practices in other departments, and the features of successful mentoring programs. Chairs must also be provided with the resources necessary for effective programs of career enhancement. These will vary by discipline, and in accordance with the resources available from other sources, but they should meet minimum criteria to ensure university-wide opportunities for professional development. Finally, if chairs are to be held accountable for innovative and effective practices, they should also be recognized and rewarded for them.

Our committee's survey of department chairs, like the 1999 Research Commission survey, reveals dramatic disparities in one kind of faculty support--funding available for travel to deliver papers at professional meetings and for other professional purposes. Some departments pay for an unlimited number of trips but some offer no funds for professional travel. The lack of funds for this is the obstacle to faculty career enhancement most frequently cited by chairs, because conference attendance and participation are generally deemed professionally valuable. Chairs in some parts of the University cite heavy teaching assignments as an obstacle, though here, too, there are dramatic disparities. Some departments have experimented with flexible assignments (reducing teaching, for example, for active researchers), while others adhere to a more or less rigid policy on assignments and responsibilities.

Recommendation A-1

Chairs should require all faculty to develop and regularly update plans for their career enhancement (including desired mentoring) in annual review dossiers, and should reward meaningful activity. The OAA dossier outline should be modified to obtain this information from faculty.

Recommendation A-2

In their annual review letters and meetings, chairs should identify resources available to faculty for career enhancement; they also should address faculty career enhancement in departmental patterns of administration and, where appropriate, in their APT documents. When a department chair is appointed, the dean should reserve funds that the department can use for faculty enhancement.

Recommendation A-3

Deans should require chairs to report on faculty career enhancement efforts in their annual reports to the college, and the Provost should require deans to report on faculty enhancement efforts in their reports. And, as the Research Commission report of 1999 recommended, performance reviews of chairs and deans should include evaluations of their support for faculty career enhancement.

Recommendation A-4

Deans should establish minimum expectations for departments' funding support of faculty members' scholarly work (including travel to conferences) and report annually on the levels of such support to the Provost.

Recommendation A-5

Existing Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) and Human Resources (HR) workshops for chairs should in part be devoted to faculty career enhancement, should pay special attention to the importance of flexible career paths (as the President's Council on Women's Issues recently urged in its report on flexible workloads), and give faculty and administrators opportunities there to share best practices.

B. Advancing the careers of associate professors is critical to the progress of the University.

It is important that faculty at every phase of their careers be encouraged to follow a path rather than simply fulfill a job description. Nowhere is this more evident than at the rank of associate professor, particularly among those who have held that rank for a long period of time. Associate professors, both men and women, are often at a stage in their lives when they face a variety of demands and choices. It is a time, for instance, when many have familial obligations to children living at home or to aging parents. Many would like to investigate new aspects of scholarship or revitalize their teaching but are frustrated in their attempts to do so. Some relish the opportunity to become more involved in service and expand their networks within the University, while others find that service duties impinge on their research and teaching time or that they are inequitably distributed among faculty. Those who do offer service often feel that there are insufficient rewards for the labor they provide. Our survey of associate professors revealed a fact that the University should note—namely, that all faculty in that rank altruistically identified “my interest in the advancement of the University” as the factor that most influenced their satisfaction with service work. Finally, once the glow of receiving tenure wears off, many find themselves isolated in mid-career with insufficient direction, mentoring, or peer support to balance the many demands placed upon them. There is much, then, that the University can and should do to ameliorate and promote the careers of associate professors.

The response rate to our survey of associate professors was an impressive 41%. The survey and results can be found at <http://oaa.osu.edu/irp/final%20zacher%20report.pdf>, but the key findings of the survey can be summarized this way.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF 2004-05 SURVEY OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

Concerning Research

- 1. Associate Professors less than 10 years in rank were more likely to report that they engaged in research and were satisfied with their research than those with 10 or more years in rank.*
- 2. Associate Professors reported that the factors that influenced their level of satisfaction with their research included time (sufficient time to devote to research and access to research leave time), recognition (by colleagues and administration and through promotion and tenure), and funding.*

Concerning Teaching

1. Associate Professors less than 10 years in rank and with 10 or more years in rank were equally likely to report that they were engaged with their teaching.
2. Associate Professors less than 10 years in rank were less likely to report that they were satisfied with their teaching than those with 10 or more years in rank.
3. Associate Professors reported that the factors that influenced their level of satisfaction with their teaching included quality of students (graduate/professional, and to a lesser extent, undergraduates), recognition (by colleagues and administration and through promotion and tenure), and time (sufficient time to devote to teaching).

Concerning Service

1. Associate Professors less than 10 years in rank and with 10 or more years in rank were equally likely to report that they were engaged in service activities.
Exceptions: Female Associate Professors less than 10 years in rank were more likely to report that they were engaged in service activities than their male counterparts.
2. Associate Professors less than 10 years in rank were less likely to report that they were satisfied with their service than those with 10 or more years in rank.
Exceptions: Regional Campus Associate Professors less than 10 years in rank were more likely to report that they were satisfied with their service activities.
3. Associate Professors reported that the factors that influenced their level of satisfaction with their service activities included their level of interest in the advancement of the University, recognition (by colleagues and administration), and time (sufficient time to devote to service).

Concerning Engagement

1. In terms of engagement, there were no significant differences between those less than 10 years in rank and those with 10 or more years in rank.

Perceived Barriers to Career Enhancement

1. Associate Professors with less than 10 years in rank were more likely than their colleagues to find the following to be barriers to career enhancement: service obligations, suboptimal facilities, household and childcare responsibilities, and lack of technical, administrative or computer support.
2. Associate Professors with 10 or more years in rank were more likely than their colleagues to find the following to be barriers to career enhancement: research or publishing requirements of their college, discrimination, lack of colleagues' or administrators'

support or interest, lack of mentoring, and care of an elderly parent.

Career Enhancement Programs

1. When asked for the most valuable career enhancement program experienced or known of, over one-third of responding Associate Professors reported workshops and other learning opportunities, with about half of those related to improving teaching. Associate Professors also reported that leave time or course reduction, mentoring, and funding were valuable to their careers.

2. When asked for a career enhancement program that they would like to see implemented, one-quarter of Associate Professors reported that they would like more resources or support, with over one quarter of those responses relating to a desire for grants or research support. Other types of support desired included having more faculty or staff and travel/conference funds.

3. One quarter of Associate Professors also responded that they would like more time, frequently explained as leave time, teaching load reduction or course release. The desire for more time was often mentioned as being related to research needs. Other desired career enhancement programs were learning opportunities, mentoring, and recognition.

Our committee would stress that a key finding from the survey is that the longer faculty hold the rank of Associate Professor, and particularly after 10 years in rank, the more likely it is for them to experience career dissatisfaction. The dissatisfaction arises primarily in the research aspect of their duties, with too little time for research as their most often stated source of dissatisfaction. Thus, there is a need for faculty, in consultation with their chairs and mentors, to do long-range planning early in their terms as associate professors, planning which should include annually reviewing one's dossier and cataloguing and re-assessing career objectives.

Recommendation B-1

Departments should make mid-career expectations clear to faculty approaching promotion to associate professor and encourage long-range planning, so that they can be better prepared for the challenges and rewards ahead. Departments should encourage newly promoted associate professors to develop multi-year plans for career enhancement.

Recommendation B-2

The Office of Research and individual colleges should provide financial support to associate professors for carrying on research during gaps between major extramural grants, and associate professors should be encouraged to take more advantage of SRAs and FPL than they now do.

Recommendation B-3

Department chairs should be encouraged to support tenured faculty who take on brand new scholarly interests (imitating programs like the University of Georgia's 'Second Discipline'), even if that decision leads to a hiatus in a colleague's scholarly output.

Recommendation B-4

In order to address the feeling of isolation that many faculty feel at the mid-career stage, the University should:

- (a) continue to encourage, honor, and reward interdisciplinary activity that brings together scholars from disparate departments and colleges, participation in faculty governance at the college and university level that increases associate professor connectivity with the university community, and achievements in teaching and pedagogy;
- (b) conduct mid-career workshops for associate professors (like the UC Berkeley program for faculty in that rank) and publicize FTAD's midcareer growth program;
- (c) regularly evaluate levels of satisfaction among associate professors in order to address the causes of dissatisfaction.

C. The University should more clearly recognize the ways careers evolve and differ by better aligning the faculty reward system with what faculty actually do.

The amount of time faculty spend on teaching, research and creative work, and service varies across the campus and it also can change in the course of a career. It is in the University's best interest to accommodate--and facilitate--the shifting emphases of faculty assignments and responsibilities, for such support ensures that all of the work of the institution gets done and that faculty feel greater satisfaction in their contributions. Unfortunately, the reward system does not always support the changing, multifaceted work of the faculty; there is an abiding preference, local and national, for rewarding research—and extramurally funded research, at that—regardless of what individuals' job descriptions might say about their true distribution of effort.

As the ACE report argues, this imbalance between faculty effort and the rewards realized for it is inimical to the integrity of any academic institution. Moreover, the work of the faculty seems to grow every year. In addition to teaching, research and service, faculty now are being urged to participate in guiding such activities as undergraduate research, internships, study abroad programs, and freshman book seminars, to name just a few—all worthy but often unrewarded additions to faculty activity. While the work of the faculty continues to expand, the reward system continues to contract along the single dimension of extramurally funded research.

Recommendation C-1

Throughout the University, faculty should be allowed at different points in their careers to change—in a manner consistent with their unit's mission--the percentage of time they variously devote to teaching/service/research/other activities.

Recommendation C-2

As the recent Work Group Report on Flexible Work Loads for Tenure-Track Faculty recommended, the University should encourage flexible career paths in all patterns of administration and in its APT procedures, greater flexibility in rewards to match the varied work

of the faculty, and recognition that many forms of scholarly accomplishment should lead to promotion to full professor.

Recommendation C-3

Colleges and departments with implemented APT and POA documents that recognize and reward the varying career paths of faculty (such as that of our Department of Dance) should be identified and shared as models for other colleges as they revise their documents.

Recommendation C-4

OAA should provide faculty members early in their careers (and following their tenure) counsel on how to document for P&T dossiers the ways that scholarly work may vary in emphasis on teaching, research and creative activity, and service; OAA should also work with departmental P&T chairs to share dossiers of faculty who successfully demonstrate differing career paths.

Recommendation C-5

The University, following the model of other universities, should create a clearinghouse of interested emeritus faculty who would be invited to draw on their experiences to do special university work—for example, serve on committees, advise and mentor students and faculty, assist with fundraising, engage in community outreach, offer public lectures, and do occasional teaching.

D. The University at all levels should explicitly acknowledge that faculty members' personal and professional lives intertwine.

The professional and personal lives of faculty intertwine, and—like the emphases of many faculty members' interests—they evolve over the course of a career. Thus, when discussing career enhancement one cannot ignore the effects that personal lives and professional lives have on each other. Faculty members more and more seek greater flexibility in their career paths, flexibility that recognizes developing professional interests but also the changing dynamics of personal life. Friends, family, and partners can be sources of support, but they also can be sources of stress and demanding responsibility; the 2003 Faculty Work Environment survey, for instance, found that 40% of OSU faculty were concerned about their future need to care for an adult. The University should continuously consider whether job demands on faculty time are reasonable and whether they allow for satisfying personal or family lives. Such consideration is likely to increase productivity and decrease stress-related problems. According to the Higher Education Research Institute 2001- 2002 survey of OSU faculty, reports of the Faculty Cohort Project, and numerous other sources as well, these work/life conflicts are specially stressful for women. The Work Group Report on Flexible Work Loads for Tenure-Track Faculty suggests how academe could learn from the legal profession ways of helping women faculty balance work and life commitments (through such means as part-time appointments that lead to fulltime employment).

Recommendation D-1

OAA should help chairs learn to be alert to the pressures that faculty members' personal lives exert on their professional lives and to communicate that awareness to their faculty.

Recommendation D-2

The University should support Human Resources' consideration of further dual career hiring efforts on and off campus (as outlined in an HR memo to this committee, appendix A).

Recommendation D-3

The University should offer to coordinate the advertising of OSU's Columbus and regional campus vacant faculty positions with hiring opportunities at nearby Ohio colleges/universities in order to widen employment possibilities for all hires who have academic partners.

Recommendation D-4

OAA should better publicize internally and to potential faculty the provision that already exists for part-time tenure-track faculty appointments (Rule 3335-6-03 (F)).

Recommendation D-5

The University should make emergency drop-in and snow day daycare as well as eldercare (or at least eldercare referrals) available to faculty.

Recommendation D-6

Since faculty also do academic work at home, the University should insure that they have the technological access in their home workspace that they have at their campus office.

Recommendation D-7

The University should create a system that permits gradual retirement that might encourage some faculty to consider retiring sooner (from some if not all aspects of an appointment) and that would assist faculty members in making gradual transitions to retirement.

E. The University should better publicize its current faculty leave programs and make them more flexible.

Productive faculty need large blocks of uninterrupted time to develop and complete their work (e.g., new courses, research agendas, creative work, and service contributions). The University provides internal opportunities to maximize scholarly productivity in the form of SRAs and FPLs, but in comparison with faculty elsewhere, particularly CIC and benchmark institutions, far too few OSU faculty make use of these benefits (as was also evident six years ago to the Commission on Faculty Development and Careers), largely because of concerns related to teaching responsibilities and the financial sacrifice usually involved). The University should commit itself to making it easier for faculty to obtain SRAs and FPLs; these opportunities should be more widely publicized; SRAs should be made particularly accessible to faculty in their pre-tenure years; and FPLs should not be cost-prohibitive to faculty in low-paying departments and colleges.

Recommendation E-1

Applications for faculty leave—time away from academic responsibilities—should be a routine part of each faculty member's career enhancement plans, and chairs should regularly encourage faculty to apply for both SRAs and FPLs. The 1999 Research Commission found that half of the

OSU faculty surveyed said that applying for SRAs was not something discussed by or with their chairs.

Recommendation E-2

Faculty should be routinely notified when they are about to become eligible for FPLs.

Recommendation E-3

OAA should investigate whether it is possible for FPLs to be taken for shorter periods of time but (as, for example, at the University of Iowa) more frequently. Similarly, to acquire the time needed to complete new and ongoing projects that can enhance one's career, departments and colleges should be encouraged to permit faculty to combine an SRA with an FPL, thereby enabling faculty to accumulate extended leave time with reduced financial liability.

Recommendation E-4

Given salary disparities among colleges across campus, faculty who are paid 25% less than the mean university salaries at each rank should be able to commit to two- and three-quarter FPLs at no cost to themselves (i.e., without taking a reduction in salary).

Recommendation E-5

OAA should facilitate leaves by maintaining an informational website with appropriate links that assist in the mechanics of a leave (e.g., connect faculty applying for leaves with new hires and visiting scholars looking for housing).

Recommendation E-6

OAA should remind all colleges that there is no longer a 10%-of-faculty limit on SRAs per college.

Recommendation E-7

Faculty should be encouraged to take SRAs for teaching purposes and for major outreach/engagement projects as well as for research.

F. Advancing the careers of both women faculty and faculty of color is crucial to the progress of the University.

Special emphasis must continue to be given to the enhancement of the careers of women faculty and faculty members of color, who live and work in an academic world still characterized chiefly by the experiences and ethos of white male colleagues. The University should continue to acknowledge that, in such an environment, women and faculty members of color often must contend with subtle and indirect obstacles that impede their progress toward tenure, promotion, or other forms of reward and recognition in the academy. The 2000 SRI report, which studied factors affecting the retention of women and minority faculty/staff at OSU, pointed to similar obstacles. So too have the reports of the Faculty Cohort Project, the 2003 Faculty Work Environment, and the President's Council on Women's Issues (in particular, its 2004 status report).

While many women and faculty of color choose and successfully follow conventional paths through academic careers in their disciplines, others make different choices. Because of their own life experiences as "outsiders," many women faculty and faculty of color commit themselves to conducting scholarship that they hope will help lead to societal change. They may choose areas of research that are unconventional, report their findings and conclusions in nontraditional forms or formats and forums, orient their scholarship toward the practical, and emphasize the political implications of their work. Entrenched faculty, with an unwitting bias towards colleagues that resemble them and towards academic work that resembles their own, often do not understand or value such work and, under the guise of applying standards of excellence or maintaining academic rigor or protecting the reputation of the department or the University, dismiss or devalue work that does not conform to the traditional.

With this in mind, the University should commit itself to confront the challenges and eliminate the artificial obstacles that impede the advancement of women and faculty of color. A first step would be adequate academic mentoring and socializing of women faculty and faculty of color in their own departments. A further step would be to educate and socialize established faculty by acquainting them with fair and reasonable criteria for recognizing and evaluating excellence in scholarship that does not conform to conventional expectations, and for valuing career orientations that lean towards the practical.

In its support of their careers, the University should also encourage women faculty and colleagues of color to take up more University leadership positions and to participate in faculty governance (and be relieved of other responsibilities when they do so). At the same time, faculty from these groups should be protected from excessive service assignments, as should faculty with demanding family or other care responsibilities. The 2004 report of the University Senate Diversity Committee, for instance, noted that women were proportionally underrepresented in Faculty Council, but it is also true that women and minority faculty are too often called upon in the interest of diversity to serve on committees. Thus, on behalf of women and minority faculty the University must strive for a balance between adequate representation and appropriate assignments and responsibilities.

Recommendation F-1

OSU should implement the recommendations pertinent to faculty career enhancement made by the President's Council on Women's Issues (2004), the Faculty Cohort Project (2002-), the University Senate Diversity Committee, and the University Diversity Council.

Recommendation F-2

We recommend that OAA regularly assess job satisfaction levels of minority faculty and women faculty.

Recommendation F-3

Chairs should develop and support mentoring programs that are particularly sensitive to the academic challenges faced by women faculty and faculty of color in their departments.

Recommendation F-4

Departments should sponsor forums in which faculty can learn about each other's work, with a view toward developing a culture that recognizes and values newer approaches to a discipline and accepts expanded criteria for excellence.

Recommendation F-5

The University should continue programs such as the President's and Provost's Leadership Institute (managed by The Women's Place and the Office of Human Resources) and encourage chairs to recognize and support active and time-consuming leadership activities by relieving faculty of other responsibilities during their terms of leadership.

G. Interdisciplinary activity should be promoted as an often important stimulus to faculty members' careers.

Interdisciplinary activity can serve as a positive stimulus to a faculty member's career and an aid both to re-energizing one's work and to re-tooling in order to pursue new interests. Disciplines are central to a university, but it is noticeable that the intellectual world of the university has become more and more interdisciplinary; faculty often find that colleagues outside their departments are the ones who best challenge their thinking about subjects they are pursuing. Through interaction with such campus neighbors, faculty can discover added recognition and support, secure new research and teaching opportunities, learn new ways of disseminating their work, and through such engagement experience greater satisfaction.

Although interdisciplinary programs have the support of the central administration and are seen as valuable by the faculty at large, formidable barriers still exist which hinder participation in interdisciplinary work. The Research Commission report of 1999 argued that the overall climate for interdisciplinary work at OSU needed improvement, and the report of the Committee on Barriers to Interdisciplinarity in 2004 described those obstacles. One of the limitations of responsibility-centered budgeting is reflected in the current system for apportioning fiscal resources and credit for expended effort, which can generate conflicts between participants in interdisciplinary programs (faculty and center directors), on the one hand, and departmental chairs on the other, and thus impede faculty interdisciplinary interests and efforts.

Recommendation G-1

The University should develop programs to facilitate and catalyze contact between faculty interested in interdisciplinary efforts. Such programs could be identified by OAA and the Office of Research (OR) and utilize those offices' expertise. Specifically, OR should develop a list of faculty interested in collaborating with others from across campus and at the regional campuses. A program officer could then facilitate the development of collaborative projects. Ideally, at least one of the faculty members would be extramurally funded, this funding providing a driving force for the collaboration.

Recommendation G-2

The University should develop a system for apportioning credit for faculty interdisciplinary activity that is more supportive of that activity than PA005. Participating faculty should be given back any funds raised by them through salary recovery and, in addition, receive a portion of the indirect cost recovery.

Recommendation G-3

Chairs should promote, acknowledge, and reward faculty interdisciplinary activities. Departmental research facilities should be made available to the collaborating faculty members.

Recommendation G-4

The University should pursue its plans for a multidisciplinary building on campus that would serve all fields of study, and the University should support multi- and interdisciplinary activity everywhere.

H. The University should do all it can to provide faculty members what they repeatedly ask for, a more collegial environment.

As surveys here and elsewhere continue to show, faculty place a high value on the recognition and respect they receive for what they contribute to their departments and professions and for the ties they develop with one another across the campus, relationships that help make a university a community. They desire more opportunities for sharing the results of their work and receiving feedback from colleagues in an atmosphere of cooperation. In the best universities, colleges, and departments, faculty are meaningfully involved in governance, for, like cross-disciplinary faculty relationships across the institution, participation in governance helps preserve an environment in which collegiality and collaboration thrive. Expressions of collegial interest, moreover, lead to the development of a mentoring culture.

The Commission on Faculty Development and Careers survey of OSU faculty in 1999 highlighted the importance of interaction with colleagues to a faculty member's professional growth. That report did not identify why collegial interactions promoted—or the lack of them hindered—productivity, but it speculated from anecdotal evidence that faculty interest in each other's work and the provision of mutual assistance is a generally positive experience that promotes productivity.

This finding seems to us to have a more fundamental explanation. The importance of one's university colleagues rests in the peer review system, a central part of academic life that makes the work relationship among colleagues in an academic environment different from that in other work environments. While faculty may receive periodic evaluations from their chairs/directors, the core of these evaluations comes from peers. It is national as well as local peers who determine whether scholarly work gets published and where and who review proposals for funding. The most important evaluation of all, that for promotion and tenure, is made primarily by one's OSU peers. These facts of academic life make faculty very sensitive to the actions of their colleagues. While the peer review system should not be changed, much more can be done to make faculty members feel valued, and the peer review system can be better used to help all faculty members be more productive. At every rank, a supportive approach to colleagues is in the best interest of the University. The Work/Life survey, in fact, reported that more than three-

fourths of the faculty feel that being respected by their faculty colleagues, staff, and students was their top consideration in decisions to stay at OSU. Support by Columbus department colleagues is especially important to regional campus faculty, who tend to be more isolated from colleagues in their immediate research areas.

Another aspect of faculty life that affects relationships with colleagues is the need to depend on peers when one has to be away from campus. Often no formal system for doing this exists, and one simply has to ask colleagues for help. Even when there is a system for re-assigning responsibilities, as in various leave programs, faculty members are often made to feel responsible for the added work of their colleagues. With regard to personal or family needs, even though over half of the faculty in the Work/Life survey said their chairs/directors and colleagues were supportive of family care responsibilities, many faculty reported that they would value greater assistance from their chair/director when such needs arise. It would appear to be a problem if nearly half of the faculty have difficulty finding help to cover their responsibilities when they are in need.

Recommendation H-1

Departments and interdisciplinary centers should create forums in which faculty present their work.

Recommendation H-2

It is important as a way of developing, maintaining, and improving collegial relationships that departmental activities be generated that include all faculty. It is especially important to include faculty who often work at home and also regional faculty in these and other activities.

Recommendation H-3

Departments should have written procedures describing how teaching responsibilities are to be covered when a faculty member is on leave or ill.

I. The University should develop a mentoring culture campuswide.

Many other universities do a better job than OSU of supporting a variety of mentoring efforts, some focused on special interest groups, such as graduate students, women, or faculty of color. All appear directed toward assisting current (and future) faculty to define and reach significant career goals, enhance their career satisfaction, and improve their scholarly productivity and academic achievement.

Mentors are supposed to be wise and trusted teachers or counselors, typically more senior, who take junior colleagues under their wing as caring friends and help them move forward in their careers. Today, mentoring has become more than a one-on-one experience. An individual may want or need to seek out more than one mentor; mentoring is frequently made available to more than only junior faculty; some departments assign new faculty their mentors. We see a need to promote a mentoring culture throughout the University that attends to career-long professional development of all faculty. At the core of this culture should be respect and support for programs and networks of faculty, in both formal and informal mentoring relationships. Moreover, the

mentor as a caring friend or concerned colleague may help in more than one area, since work and life inevitably interact, presenting sometimes challenging problems in both areas.

Results from the Faculty Work Environment report (2003) indicate that OSU faculty place great stock in effective mentoring programs. Indeed, one of the most important factors in promoting positive work/life integration is the personal supportiveness of one's department chair and immediate colleagues. All of these issues can be effectively addressed by creating a mentoring culture all across the campus and in individual units. For some groups of faculty (especially minorities and women) the mentoring culture may also need to extend across units.

Recommendations from the Commission on Faculty Development and Careers (1999) clearly recognize the importance of career-long mentoring. For new faculty, mentoring can occur through formal programs, and its success depends on the support of the chair and one's colleagues. For senior faculty, rather than creating a professional relationship between mentor and protégé, mentoring fosters a departmental culture characterized by informal but regular discussions among faculty about their short- and long-range academic plans and goals. The act of mentoring younger colleagues has been known to re-invigorate senior faculty. Emeritus faculty also can play a valuable role in mentoring junior and senior faculty.

Faculty and administration (led by the Provost and the chair of Faculty Council) should work together to raise campus awareness of the importance of developing a career-long mentoring culture and implement the following recommendations.

Recommendation I-1

OAA should establish campus-wide workshops (based on the successful experiences of other universities and various OSU colleges and offices) in order to:

- a. Train chairs and faculty (including emeritus faculty) as mentors.
- b. Help units design effective career-long mentoring programs appropriate for their particular environments. These programs should be both formal and informal; have clearly defined goals, responsibilities, and means of assessing effectiveness; be sensitive to the needs of women and faculty of color; include incentives for faculty to develop more collegial environments in which all faculty in a unit (including emeritus faculty) are urged to mentor colleagues; encourage units to recognize and reward outstanding mentors (matching the awards given for outstanding teaching and research); explore creative ideas for developing mentoring "circles" and networks; and lead to the compilation of a mentoring handbook to be distributed to all faculty.

Recommendation I-2

Units should be encouraged to share information about mentoring programs and cultures with one another on an ongoing basis. The patterns of administration of each college, school, and department should contain a description of existing mentoring programs for faculty at all ranks and at all campuses.

Recommendation I-3

Central resources should be provided to units that develop distinctive or model proposals for improving the mentoring cultures in their units.

Recommendation I-4

The University should make what works widely visible in the mentoring community at OSU; identify OSU offices/units that are expert on mentoring and involve them in educating the whole faculty; and establish a mentoring place where mentors can go regularly to compare notes.

J. Our and other committees' recommendations regarding faculty career enhancement should be monitored for implementation and effectiveness.

From time to time, universities focus their attention on the enhancement of faculty careers, but such attention needs to be regular and constant, because faculty constitute the University's chief, longest-term investment. To underscore that fact and to help insure the implementation of recommendations of our committee as well as those of previous, related committees that this report has cited, we urge that a subset of our committee be asked to remain in place for at least three years, overseeing the completed collection of and distribution of "Existing Practices" monitoring the progress of our recommendations and related ones through appropriate offices, and reporting on this progress to Faculty Council, the Provost, and the President.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Rudine Sims Bishop, School of Teaching and Learning

Karen S. Bruns, OSU Extension

Gerald P. Chubb, Department of Aviation

Susan W. Fisher, Department of Entomology (and former Secretary of the University Senate)

Terri D. Fisher, Department of Psychology, Mansfield Campus

Timothy A. Gerber, School of Music

David G. Horn, Department of Comparative Studies (and 2004-05 Senate Steering Committee Chair)

Jeffrey McKee, Department of Anthropology

Stephen S. Pinsky, Department of Physics

Jack A. Rall, Department of Physiology and Cell Biology (and 2004-05 Faculty Council Chair)

Andrej Rotter, Department of Pharmacology

Christian Zacher, Department of English (Committee Chair)



Office of Human Resources

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX A

Dual-Career Hiring Information for Faculty Career Enhancement Committee April 15, 2005

Background

A key objective of the university's academic plan is to recruit and retain world class faculty and staff. In February 2003, a faculty work/life survey was conducted to assess the needs of current OSU faculty members. The study revealed a direct correlation between university work/life support programs, policies and services and faculty commitment and satisfaction. As part of the survey, faculty were asked to select various programs that were most important to them and not currently offered on a university-wide basis. Assistance with spouse/partner employment opportunities was listed as one of the programs that would be "of great value" to them.

A recommendation was made by the President's Council on Women's Issues in 2002/2003 for services to support spousal/partner hiring. Those recommendations included a relocation assistance program, links with local colleges and universities to share employment opportunities, and a hiring and retention resources web page.

In March 2004, the Office of Human Resources (OHR) developed a strategic work/life action plan that included the establishment of a dual-career placement program for new university hires and Deans Alluto, Freeman, Herbers, and Dr. Juhas presented Provost Snyder with a recommendation for a faculty spousal hiring proposal at the urging of the working group on ADVANCE.

What has been accomplished?

The Office of Academic Affairs developed a dual career hiring policy for faculty in November 2004. This policy encourages the collaboration of deans and department chairs when a targeted candidate has been identified. In an effort to achieve the successful recruitment of a candidate, the policy states that the other half of the academic couple may be hired provided the same quality standards as candidates in the receiving department are met. Costs are shared in three ways:

- the unit hiring the target candidate;
- the unit hiring the partner; and
- the Office of Academic Affairs

To support the hiring of a new faculty member when their spouse/partner is interested in seeking staff employment options, the Office of Human Resources provides services upon request of the hiring College/VP unit. Services include:

- a face-to-face or telephonic meeting to discuss individuals background and experiences as well as desired employment interest,
- review and critique of resume,
- advice and instruction in applying for university vacancies,
- verbal discussion with hiring managers about the proposed candidate,
- negotiating issues/concerns between departments to ensure successful employment arrangement; and
- establishing career exploration interviews

What is being considered?¹

While the university has made progress this past year with dual career hiring efforts, there are additional options being considered. These include:

- Establishing a dedicated person for supporting multiple facets of a dual career program² (e.g., relocation assistance, assisting accompanying spouse/partner with finding employment in the community, developing guidelines/parameters for wide-spread program)
- Identifying and building relationships with local employment resources and corporations, networks and associations for sharing candidate resumes
- Determining any written or electronic marketing and communication vehicles that need developed
- Developing a client tracking and evaluation system for measurement purposes

Other ideas for elevating OSU into a position of strategic advantage

- Create an inviting website for interested candidates that showcase our resources, programs, and why Ohio State is the place to be. Must be easy to find and understand. Items for consideration: testimonials from other dual-career couples, Columbus and surrounding area statistics and information (e.g., top corporations), relocation information, on-going OSU events, campus community and professional organizations and contact information, and links with relevant sites (e.g., The Women's Place, OHR Benefits & Work/Life).
- Assign a career counselor to each spouse/partner to help spouse/partner network

¹ Drafted by the Office of Human Resources from benchmarking analysis, but not yet forwarded to the Provost

² Colleges currently offering dual-career programs include: Purdue, University of Michigan, University of Iowa, University of Minnesota, Indiana University, Cornell, University of Nebraska, University of Iowa, Texas A&M, University of Arkansas, Northern Arizona University, and University of Toronto.

- Establish a comprehensive intake process for identifying needs of the candidate and accompanying spouse/partner and then provide a pool of OSU faculty/staff resources (experts) to respond to concerns brought forward
- Develop a pool of faculty/staff for placement in community (e.g., Columbus Public Schools, local universities) among the accompanying spouse/partner as part of our outreach and engagement mission
- Establish “immediate communities” or support groups for individuals based upon interest (e.g., starting one’s own business, consulting groups, working from home mom or dad) to integrate into the community