

Report of the
Faculty Development Review Committee
Spring 2012

Submitted to

John Bryan, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
Deborah Herman, Executive Director, UC Chapter AAUP

FDRC Members

Susan Boland, Associate Director of Public & Research Services, Robert S. Marx Law Library; AAUP Representative to the Faculty Development Review Committee

Wayne Hall, Professor of English & Comparative Literature; Ex officio chair of the Faculty Development Council, 2004-2011; Administration Representative to the Faculty Development Review Committee

Michael Lieberman, Distinguished Teaching Professor and Interim Vice President and CIO; Administration Representative to the Faculty Development Council; Administration Representative to the Faculty Development Review Committee

Suzanne Masterson, Associate Professor of Management; Administration Representative to Faculty Development Council, 2008-2010; Administration Representative to the Faculty Development Review Committee

Virginia Russell, Associate Professor of Architecture; Horticulture Program Coordinator; Senate Representative to the Faculty Development Council, 2007 – present; AAUP Representative to the Faculty Development Review Committee

Alan Vespie, MEd; Program Director Advanced Medical Imaging; AAUP Representative to the Faculty Development Review Committee

Executive Summary

Charge to the Committee:

The Faculty Development Program that was created through collective bargaining in 1997 is 15 years old. It has evolved to become an institution of cooperation among the Faculty Senate, the AAUP, and the Provost Office. The Faculty Development Council operates flexibly within the outlines of the CBA Article 24 and MOU 5, with a Vice Provost as ex officio chair, three members appointed by the Provost and three members elected as Faculty Senate representatives.

The 2010-2013 Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University of Cincinnati (UC) and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) calls for the creation of a Faculty Development Review Committee (FDRC), whose stated purpose is “to study the effectiveness of current funding levels and approaches to faculty development, to consider alternative approaches, and to make recommendations for alterations to Article 24” (M. 14, p. 167).

The FDRC began meeting in January 2012 and concluded its work in June 2012. Because the prospect of professional development – in all of its forms and for all of its participants – is broad and complex, this report seeks to present a more universal view of professional development than that which affects only the faculty in the Collective Bargaining Unit. This report thus directs its recommendations to the University of Cincinnati community, for enactment and support by its administration; to the Faculty Development Council (FDC); and to the AAUP UC Chapter and its Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The FDRC also sought to align its vision for professional development with UC’s recently published Academic Master Plan (AMP). Repeatedly throughout our discussions, we noted connections between our own recommendations and corresponding recommendations within the AMP. In Appendix B, we have listed a number of passages from the AMP that highlight connections between faculty development and aspects the AMP and would simply emphasize here that all nine of the AMP principles are addressed at some point or other in our recommendations, underscoring the universal importance and implications of a strong faculty development program.

Some key recommendations:

- To the University community:
 - Leverage existing organizations and individuals to identify, coordinate, and integrate faculty development opportunities.
 - Provide additional funding outside of the FDC for universal providers; stabilize URC funding; and provide administrative support for FDC activities.
 - Conduct a detailed audit of FDC awards over the past five years to provide a clearer context for assessment of FDC funding.
- To the Faculty Development Council:
 - Encourage comprehensive faculty and unit development plans by adopting mechanisms in funding decisions that support proposals facilitating a faculty member or a unit’s broader development plans.
 - Encourage faculty development benefits that go beyond the individual or unit.
- For Collective Bargaining Agreement discussions:
 - Combine the current language in MOU 5 with the language in Article 24 for the next bargaining agreement.
 - Implement other contract changes as guided by the recommendations in the FDRC report.
- For the long-term vision of faculty development at UC:
 - Expand professional development beyond the current emphasis on bargaining-unit faculty.
 - Target faculty development towards key constituencies.

Introduction and conceptual overview:

A successful Faculty Development Program

- inspires faculty to higher levels of achievement in teaching, scholarship, and leadership, and requires and supports continuing education in these professional development areas
- provides the means to meet the demands of all phases of career development
- implements the vision of the faculty, the unit, and the university
- promotes constructive and innovative projects
- encourages risk-taking
- assesses performance
- rewards fulfillment and success

To achieve these outcomes, a successful faculty development program will retain the ability to change direction and emphasis in response to changing individual, unit, college, and institutional priorities. Developmental opportunities need to be created and offered in the context of both short-term and long-term planning and implementation. Balanced against this emphasis on flexibility and variety is the value of integration and alignment. A successful faculty development program will support institutional priorities as well as those that are unique to individuals, academic programs, and colleges.

The key to a successful faculty development program, then, is *alignment*, a concept underscored by Sorcinelli, et al, through their emphasis on what they term the current “Age of the Network,” beginning with the first decade of the 21st century. During this period, and with change continuing to accelerate in higher education,

Colleges and universities committed to high productivity and quality will be well advised to situate faculty development at the center of their institutional planning.

Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Ann E. Austin, Pamela L. Eddy, and Andrea L. Beach, *Creating the Future of Faculty Development: Learning From the Past, Understanding the Present* [Boston: Anker, 2006], p. 27

Faculty development should thus emerge out of a clear, coherent, and widely understood vision of the mission and philosophy of UC while helping faculty to do their jobs more effectively and efficiently.

Some challenges to faculty development at UC:

- An excessive reliance on FDC funds and on personal resources
- Contrasting and conflicting views of faculty development
- Difficulties in aligning institutional priorities at the university, unit, and program level with individual faculty goals for teaching, scholarship, and leadership within a flexible and varied set of resources.

In a Fall 2009 survey of AAUP Bargaining Unit Faculty, 60% of respondents reported spending between \$250 and \$1,999 of their own money on faculty development (AAUP Proposal on Professional Development Support for Article 24, Contract Negotiations, May 21, 2010). Currently, Article 24 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between UC and the AAUP provides for \$660,000 – about \$362 per member of the bargaining unit – in faculty development funds to be awarded through the FDC.

This level of funding puts UC behind several of its peer institutions in Ohio. For example, and as noted in this AAUP Proposal on Professional Development Support, the collective bargaining agreement at Wright State University provides each bargaining member a minimum of \$900 annually for professional development. At Cuyahoga Community College, the collective bargaining agreement provides that the “Administration will make every effort to provide funds for travel to professional meetings and other appropriate events” and allots \$850 annually to each bargaining unit member; such funds may accumulate to a maximum of \$2,550 per individual over the three-year span of the agreement. Finally,

while the collective bargaining agreement at Cleveland State University limits access to its Professional Development Fund to tenure-track faculty members, the extent of the funding is significant: \$1,000 annually for each tenure-track faculty member.

At one level, the challenges to faculty development at UC are simple: the resources have not been available to do all of the faculty development activities that would be optimally beneficial for UC. Travel budgets have particularly suffered over many years of budget cuts, putting more pressure on central resources such as the Faculty Development Council (FDC) as well as on the personal resources of individual faculty members to provide support for professional development that might formerly have been covered out of unit-based budgets.

One consequence of the increasing reliance on FDC funds, which are available only to members of the bargaining unit, is to discourage partnerships

- With faculty from other institutions, within a consortial framework, or with such external organizations as the Council on Undergraduate Research
- With UC students (graduate and undergraduate), unrepresented faculty, emeriti, human resources staff, or student affairs staff around faculty development projects
- Between faculty and administration around the development of leadership skills

At another level, challenges emerge out of the Tyranny of Dualistic Thinking, the assumption that we have to choose between two alternatives when perhaps the better approach is a blending of the two. These are some of the dualities that have shaped approaches to faculty development at UC and that chart a variety of spectra defining contrasting views of the key issues:

Faculty development is best defined by the individual faculty themselves -- ("I'll tell you what I need, and then you figure out how best to support me").	Faculty development is best defined by departmental, college, and institutional priorities -- ("In times of limited resources, we need to spend these dollars strategically").
Faculty development initiatives need to be better coordinated between the Faculty Development Council (FDC) and the University Research Council (URC), since they have similar goals of supporting professional development.	Since the URC supports research with an emphasis on expansion of existing research projects, whereas the FDC supports development of new professional skills, it's not necessary or appropriate to link their functions.
Duplication of resources – for technology training, for instance, between what Univ. Libraries does and Instructional Research and Computing does; or for pedagogy programming between what the CET&L does and what the Academy of Fellows for Teaching & Learning (AFTL) does – should be reduced as much as possible for greater efficiencies.	Duplication of resources allows for different perspectives on similar kinds of skills and interests, as well as different venues and schedules, and so this allows these resources to be made more widely available than would otherwise be the case.
Individual faculty development projects should be endorsed by that faculty member's unit head to make sure that resources are appropriately planned within a departmental context.	Individual faculty might sometimes have a conflicted working relationship with a unit head, which might unfairly disadvantage their access to resources if that head capriciously refuses to endorse their proposals.

<p>In approving “universal provider” proposals (from Univ. Libraries, Instr. Research & Computing, or the CET&L, for instance), the FDC should refuse to provide any funding that would go to individual faculty to incentivize their participation. The professional development provided through such initiatives should be incentive enough.</p>	<p>Some “universal provider” initiatives involve faculty involvement over a period of several days or even weeks. If those are to succeed, they need to provide faculty with professional-development support (for conference travel, for instance, or for computer equipment), since faculty otherwise will not participate without such incentives.</p>
<p>No FDC funding should support stipends or honoraria for salaried employees of UC who are providing resources (such as teaching or facilitating) for universal providers.</p>	<p>FDC funding for stipends or honoraria frequently supports work – such as the development and delivery of professional development opportunities that are “above and beyond” normal duties, or that might take place during summer months – and thus should qualify for additional compensation.</p>
<p>Central funding (such as from the FDC) should be available for things like course releases or computers/software.</p>	<p>Course releases and computers or software should be funded out of general funds, not funds specifically designated for professional development.</p>
<p>We should continue and increase our support for the “tried and true” forms of faculty development, especially because support for those have been eroding over the years.</p>	<p>We should support more innovative forms that show promise but that don't yet have a track record or any established niche within UC's culture.</p>

Recommendations addressing the University of Cincinnati’s overall commitment to professional development

As suggested in the Conceptual Overview above, faculty development must be a shared initiative between individual faculty and the institution that should result in the development and growth of faculty in their many roles and at every phase of their careers, as well as in the fulfillment of institutional objectives. At the same time, the professional development of bargaining-unit faculty is inextricably connected to the professional development of many others at UC: to adjunct faculty and graduate teaching assistants, to academic staff and to administrators, to emeriti and to those teachers and researchers no longer included within the bargaining unit. For any and all of these cohorts, the professional development of one group benefits and is important for the professional development of the others. The Faculty Development Review Committee thus urges UC, within the overarching parameters of the Academic Master Plan, to not only provide more extensive resources for the professional development of each of these constituencies, but also to integrate and coordinate those resources in ways that would be mutually reinforcing and mutually beneficial.

More specifically, we recommend:

1. That the University promote an environment that nurtures and stimulates intellectual and social community by providing time and space for faculty to reflect, revitalize, and reshape their research, teaching, learning, and leadership. Providing this time and space, as well as a secure community, will increase productivity, encourage innovation, and revitalize careers. Examples of this type of support might be creating more co-mentoring opportunities, fostering intellectual dialogue through reading and discussion groups, promoting cohort groups, facilitating flexibility in leaves, release time, and teaching assignments, etc.

2. That the University encourage all faculty members to create a comprehensive plan for their own professional development through the annual review process. In consultation with their unit heads, faculty are encouraged to identify multi-year goals, develop plans in accordance with those goals, and pursue resources to implement those plans, using such resources as the information provided on the Faculty Development One-Stop website (described in point 8 below).
3. That the University seek to leverage existing faculty organizations and individuals – e.g., the Academy of Fellows for Teaching and Learning (AFTL), the Graduate Research Fellows, past Faculty Award winners, Provostal advisory groups, the yearly mentoring program, etc. – for the purpose of identifying additional faculty development opportunities. For example, these individuals and organizations may develop and sponsor faculty development activities under the encouragement and funding of the Provost Office.
4. That a new advisory group be constituted – similar to Provostal advisory groups that have developed over the past year – to oversee a more comprehensive, coordinated, and flexible approach to faculty development opportunities and resources at UC than is possible through the FDC. Such a group might contain administration representatives and faculty representatives (elected by Faculty Senate and to include a representative of the part-time/adjunct faculty). Other constituencies to be represented might include University Libraries, UCIT, the Graduate School, International Programs, the Office of Research, Human Resources, Student Affairs, and the graduate student population. This group could serve a valuable function through ongoing monitoring of UC's commitments to faculty development, as well as priorities for improvement, identifying areas where resources are duplicated so as to combine those in more efficient ways, and coordinating the assessment of faculty development by creating guidelines and standards as well as by conducting assessment studies, including monitoring of the work of the FDC.
5. That the University directly support the funding of professional development by universal providers – the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CET&L), the Faculty Technology Resources Center (FTRC), Instructional Research & Computing (IRC), and University Libraries – at robust levels beyond any support for these offices as currently awarded through FDC funding. Enhancements to the budgets of those universal providers will be necessary to address their changing role under the Committee's recommendations below (See FDC recommendation 8, below).
6. That the FDC and University Research Council (URC) collaborate toward the goal of greater integration of awards and greater support for all phases and aspects of a faculty member's development, whether that involves teaching, research/scholarship, creative activity, or leadership. Under such a coordinated system, a faculty member might receive a single but unified award funded in part with FDC funds (for professional development) and in part with URC funds (for research enhancement).
7. That the FDC, the URC, or (ideally) both working together seek to recruit and identify faculty who work towards a multi-year professional-development plan within a significantly more unified and coordinated framework than is the case for current FDC or URC awardees. Such faculty might receive funding for one year but would also be seen – within a "pipeline" model – as setting out on a multi-year path along which they might expect to qualify for additional funding at multiple steps along the way.
8. That the Vice President for Research set aside a pool of money earmarked for URC awards specifically for faculty and at least equal to the annual budget for the FDC. This will provide consistent financial support for URC awards and will assist in greater integration and support of faculty development.
9. That the Provost Office coordinate academic leadership initiatives, outside the range of FDC funding, with the goal of supporting faculty and administrator development in leadership at

various levels: program, department, college, university, discipline, community, and professional organizations.

10. That the Provost Office continue its plans for an integrated website – Faculty Development One-Stop – that will provide a registration portal and catalogue of as wide as possible a range of programs related to faculty development. Besides being a registration portal, this system will eventually allow faculty to import their professional-development activities into their electronic tenure folders. Internal sources to be included: FDC, URC, Taft Foundation, Human Resources, CET&L, FTRC, UC Libraries, etc. However, in order to communicate the maximum range of opportunities and support for faculty development, this website might also capture information or provide links to major external sources of faculty development opportunities (e.g., NIH, NSF, Carnegie, the Academy of Rome Prize, etc.). (Routine opportunities for professional development, such as academic leaves, would not be covered by such a web site.)
11. That the Provost Office provide funding, not just for support for the Faculty Development One-Stop site, but also for administrative-support activities to allow for an expanded range of operations for the FDC. (See FDC recommendations 3, 9, and 10, below).

A later section in this report – Recommendations for Long-Term Agendas – offers further suggestions towards faculty development initiatives. While some of those are appropriate for consideration by the Faculty Development Council, they also have implications for non-FDC initiatives.

Recommendations addressing the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 24/MOU 5) and the Faculty Development Council

Some history and context:

In November 1997, an agreement was signed between the Administration and the AAUP designating \$1.5 million per year for faculty development over the three-year period autumn 1995 – autumn 1998, with retroactive payment for 1995-1996.

With the bargaining contract of autumn 1998 – autumn 2001, the amount designated for faculty development dropped to \$500,000 per year, later increasing until it now stands at \$660,000 per year under the current contract.

In January/February 2006, unspent funds from past FDC awards were scooped back into the central pool, for repurposing. In some cases, faculty submitted individual appeals explaining why their particular funds should be returned, and those appeals were granted in every case. A few months later in that same year, through an agreement between administration and the AAUP, the quasi-endowment was eliminated so as to provide the funding necessary to address salary concerns for bargaining-unit members. One result of this development was the elimination of a 50% FTE administrative-support position that had provided clerical assistance to the FDC since 1998.

These are the typical funding patterns that have emerged since around 2005:

- For an individual round, funding ranges between \$100,000 and \$150,000, with two rounds held per year.
- For a collaborative round (departmental or interdisciplinary), funding ranges from \$125,000 to \$210,000, with one round held per year.
- For the universal providers, funding ranges from \$225,000 to \$300,000, with one round held per year.

Current composition and operations of the Faculty Development Council: The FDC is comprised of three Administrators and three Faculty Members elected by the Faculty Senate, with the Vice Provost for Faculty Development as Ex Officio Chair of the committee.

The FDC encourages comprehensive professional-development plans in all categories of application: individual, departmental, interdisciplinary, and university providers. Within the FDC, the process of reviewing proposals is shaped by the following factors and processes:

- Much of the process is governed by the UC/AAUP Bargaining Agreements, specifically by Article 24.7 and by an accompanying memo of understanding, M.5.2.
- Much of the process is guided by the FDC's sense of past practice as created by earlier Councils. This past practice extends back into earlier Bargaining Agreements.
- Proposals for particular rounds are gathered through RFPs developed by the Council. Once proposals have been collected, the FDC meets for a norming session using a sample of the proposals. At that point, individual proposals are read and reviewed by a team of at least two members of the Council. The divisions are as random as possible, but teams do not consider proposals coming from members of their own colleges.
- Each team consists of at least one member selected from the faculty (by Faculty Senate) and at least one member appointed by the administration. The ex-officio chair of the FDC typically does not serve on any team but is available to help resolve different ratings.
- Proposals succeed or fail on their strength as proposals. The Council thus does not take questions about a particular proposal back to its author for more clarification.
- The FDC has recently taken beneficial steps to publish deadlines further in advance than has been the case in the past, as well as to consider pre-proposals in the case of collaborative projects. The FDC applauds these developments, even while encouraging an even more predictable timetable for future deadlines as well as published rubrics for the evaluation of proposals. (See Recommendation 5 in the next section, below.)

Reports on funded proposals:

Awardees must submit a final report to the FDC explaining the results or outcomes of the project within 30 days of completion. The report should contain the following components:

- a brief outline of the project
- a description of the original proposal's intended goals
- an explanation of changes to those goals found to be necessary during the project
- the outcomes of the project
- an account of how the project benefited the faculty member

Any award of funds is viewed as a contract between the faculty member and the FDC. Projects should be completed within the proposed timeframe (typically within the current or next academic year) and be consistent with the original purpose proposed by the faculty member and authorized by the FDC. Any deviation from the original purpose and/or period must be approved by the FDC first. All unused funds must be returned to the FDC for reallocation via other faculty awards.

Committee recommendations relating to the FDC:

1. That revised bargaining-contract language specify that the FDC increase its current membership from six to eight members, with one additional member appointed by the administration and one additional member elected by Faculty Senate.

2. That the FDC create opportunities for faculty to submit “pop-up proposals” – that is, proposals outside of the normal broad-scope RFP’s and seeking funds for some limited amount of money (such as \$1500 or less) – that would be reviewed by the FDC on a rolling basis.
3. That UC conduct a detailed audit of FDC awards over the past five years to define patterns at multiple levels – assistant professor vs. full professor, for instance, or individual vs. departmental – with the goal of establishing benchmark data for later assessment studies of FDC-funded activities and of better determining the effectiveness of FDC funding generally.
4. That the next round of contract discussions consolidate the language in article 24 with the language in the memo of understanding to produce a unified article.
5. That the FDC set a calendar of award deadlines three years in advance to encourage the development of more integrated and comprehensive faculty development plans.
6. That the FDC support the goal of comprehensive faculty development plans through the adoption of a mechanism in funding decisions that supports those proposals that facilitate faculty members’ broader development plans.
7. That the FDC encourage comprehensive unit-level plans for professional development by funding unit-level awards for projects that benefit that unit. Units would have the option of contracting with universal providers for specific kinds of services, training, and resources. For the purposes of this type of funding, a unit might be a department; a functional group, task force or committee; or a college.
8. That the FDC continue to encourage cross-disciplinary proposals as well as comprehensive universal-provider proposals for professional development.
9. That the FDC maintain a record of achievement by creating a reporting template through which all award recipients will document professional development outcomes achieved through these awards.
10. That the FDC encourage faculty development benefits that go beyond the individual or unit receiving FDC funds through:
 - a. Creating a searchable database capturing information about past award winners and their funded projects, to enable other faculty to identify potential development opportunities and contacts; and
 - b. Adding language to all proposal templates that encourages a “pay it forward” model whereby applicants show the potential benefit beyond the funded party (e.g., through follow-up presentations, seminars, resource repositories, etc.).

The next section in this report – Recommendations for Long-Term Agendas – offers further suggestions towards faculty development initiatives. While some of those are appropriate for consideration as non-FDC initiatives, they also have implications for consideration by the Faculty Development Council.

Recommendations for long-term agendas

The following recommendations are ideas and concepts that have emerged during discussions about faculty development over the past several years. Grouped here within particular categories, they might serve as specific agenda items within future discussions about faculty development, helping to shape or define priorities for particular contexts, groups, and initiatives.

Expand professional development beyond the current emphasis on bargaining-unit faculty

- Graduate students, especially via programs such as Preparing Future Faculty, also need to be more fully integrated into professional development initiatives and resources.
- In a similar fashion, such initiatives and resources also need to include developmental opportunities for full-time, non-bargaining unit faculty, part-time faculty, retired faculty, and academic staff.
- Our graduate and undergraduate students should be engaged as valuable resources in suggesting or even creating faculty development resources (through the structure of a senior-capstone team, for instance). Students might work with faculty to develop a research product or portfolio or might help in assessing professional-development projects and initiatives.

Expand professional development to include attention to personal lives

- Faculty development resources need to address the growing pressure upon the personal lives of faculty. Especially through a greater degree of flexibility, such resources and initiatives need to accommodate the complexity of work-life combinations and help faculty to achieve a more unified blending of the personal and the professional, the social and the academic.
- Those faculty development resources that focus on academic issues need to be more fully coordinated with those offered by Human Resources.

Structure faculty development according to specific themes or delivery formats

- In the context of UC's identity as "the new urban, research university," the concept of the "urban" should be emphasized within professional development initiatives, whether those involve research or teaching, service or administration.
- Faculty development might organize resources for particular years into curricular structures defined by a key "theme of the year" or as the "President's Lecture Series." Topics might include such themes as the environment and global warming, genetic research and the human genome, modern Islam, ethics and human rights in the academy, the future of medicine, etc. Such a curriculum might help to organize various workshops, presentations, and projects, especially ones that cross disciplinary lines.
- Create a dedicated time (such as one day per month) that is set aside for professional-development activities, particularly a broad array within the framework of "faculty helping faculty."
- Opportunities for organizational development and leadership development need to be fostered, particularly ones that are more closely linked to UC's governance and administrative structures.

Use faculty development resources in ways that leverage additional resources

- Faculty development should encourage research commercialization and technology transfer, especially the issues and challenges raised in the National Innovation Act of 2005.
- Funding for faculty development initiatives might be provided as seed money to colleges and for college-specific plans, especially those that could be linked to the RPT rewards system.
- Faculty should be assisted in developing their skills in pursuing outside grants, fellowships, awards, and other professional-development opportunities.
- Faculty development initiatives need to become a focal area for fundraising, with those efforts centered on innovative and ambitious projects with particularly high visibility and “quick win” potential.

Structure resources so as to encourage innovative developments in technology and in classroom teaching

- Faculty development needs to be increasingly attuned to the ways in which technology is changing the nature of teaching and learning. In a similar and related fashion, technology should help to deliver and expand faculty development resources and opportunities, including web-based services, distance-learning support, and centrally supported technology for such needs as student evaluations, eportfolios, and instructional technology.
- Faculty development opportunities should emphasize “21st Century Learning” – experiential learning, service learning, student learning communities, inquiry-based learning, distance learning, internationalization of the curriculum, Integrated Core Learning / General Education, ethics within various disciplinary contexts, undergraduate research, and minority students/faculty.
- Faculty development resources should particularly support those faculty who consistently innovate through the use of new instructional and research technologies.

Target faculty development so as to encourage interdisciplinary activity

- Faculty development initiatives might take shape around interdisciplinary projects built through consortial agreements or through networks and collaborations with scholars and programs at other institutions, especially regional partners such as those within the Greater Cincinnati Consortium of Colleges and Universities.
- In a memo on February 6, 2006, Ann Welsh described “a pedagogical model for field-based, cross-college collaborative projects for corporate partners.” Such projects “present students with a truly distinctive educational experience and are a source of reputation building as this is an arena where UC leads.” While recognizing the major barriers to interdisciplinary and cross-college projects, Welsh’s memo calls for “the formation of a task force to develop a template for managing cross-college collaborations.”

Target faculty development towards key constituencies

- Women and minority faculty, in particular, should have resources specifically focused towards enhancing their professional development.
- Senior faculty should be encouraged to pursue specific programs such as international exchange.
- Emeriti might be involved in faculty development opportunities by which they would serve as mentors for administrative and leadership development.

- Expand orientation and mentoring of new faculty and new department heads into a two- or even three-year process

Summary

This group began its work in January 2012 and concluded in June 2012, with the support of Vice Provost Ryan Hays and AAUP staff Stephanie Spanja. We reviewed the current modes of professional development delivery that are available through various offices of UC, including and beyond the Faculty Development Council. We also made a preliminary review of faculty development at several AAU universities. The recommendations of this report represent the first step toward a more comprehensive, inclusive, visible, accountable, and ultimately more effective program of professional development for the University of Cincinnati.

Appendix A: The history of professional development at UC, also the quasi-endowment, as well as early patterns within funding decisions by the Faculty Development Council

In November 1997, an agreement was signed between the Administration and the AAUP designating \$1.5 million per year for faculty development over the three-year period autumn 1995 – autumn 1998, with retroactive payment for 1995-1996.

For Year One of this agreement (1995-1996), the \$1.5 million was disbursed as follows:

- \$200,000 for the quasi-endowment
- \$463,629 for awards up to \$5000
- \$121,532 for the 1996 Summer Institute
- \$5000 for operating costs.

The remainder (\$709,839) was rolled into the quasi-endowment.

For Year Two of the agreement (1996-1997), the \$1.5 million was disbursed as follows:

- \$200,000 for the quasi-endowment
- \$409,500 for fall 1996 awards up to \$100,000
- \$313,432 for fall 1996 awards up to \$5,000
- \$297,603 for spring 1997 awards up to \$5000
- \$188,000 for the 1997 Summer Institute
- \$17,000 for operating costs

The remainder (\$74,465) was rolled into the quasi-endowment.

For Year Three of the agreement (1997-1998), the \$1.5 million was disbursed as follows:

- \$200,000 for the quasi-endowment
- \$503,448 for fall 1997 awards up to \$100,000
- \$215,527 for fall 1997 awards up to \$5000
- \$204,850 for winter 1998 dept. awards up to \$100,000
- \$10,000 for operating expenses
- \$122,570 for the technology workshop series
- \$188,000 for the 1998 Summer Institute

The remainder (\$55,605) was rolled into the quasi-endowment.

With the bargaining contract of autumn 1998 – autumn 2001, the amount designated for faculty development dropped to \$500,000 per year, later increasing until it now stands at \$660,000 per year under the current contract.

The above totals for amounts rolled into the quasi-endowment (3 X \$200,000 plus the three “remainder” figures above plus revenue generated) brought the quasi-endowment up to \$1,556,239 at the beginning of the 1998-99 fiscal year. The quasi-endowment principal generated revenue through investments and interest. The investment revenue remained in the quasi-endowment, while the interest went into a fund for operating expenses.

A further agreement between the Administration and the AAUP, approved in late March 1999, moved \$529,642 out of the quasi-endowment “to cover AAUP increase.” By the end of fiscal year 1998-99, the quasi-endowment stood at \$1,227,010. Here is the status of the quasi-endowment over this period:

- June 30, 1998: \$1,556,239
- June 30, 1999: \$1,227,010
- June 30, 2000: \$1,440,847
- June 30, 2001: \$1,336,201
- June 30, 2002: \$1,163,275
- June 30, 2003: \$1,020,488
- June 30, 2004: \$1,012,270
- June 30: 2005 \$1,036,437

The following table indicates the income generated by the quasi-endowment over five fiscal years.

- FY01 \$64,961.12
- FY02 \$71,766.76
- FY03 \$67,810.47
- FY04 \$54,088.27
- FY05 \$61,917.54

The first list, showing the total in the quasi-endowment, reflects fluctuations in revenue from investments of the principal. In some years, those investments did well (and generate additional revenue), and in others, they did not. The second table shows the income interest generated by the quasi-endowment principal.

In January/February 2006, unspent funds from past FDC awards were scooped back into the central pool, for repurposing. In some cases, faculty submitted individual appeals explaining why their particular funds should be returned, and those appeals were granted in every case. A few months later in that same year, through an agreement between administration and the AAUP, the quasi-endowment was eliminated so as to provide the funding necessary to address salary concerns for bargaining-unit members. One result of this development was the elimination of a 50% FTE administrative-support position that had provided clerical assistance to the FDC since 1998.

These are the typical patterns that have emerged since around 2005:

- For an individual round, funding ranges between \$100,000 and \$150,000, with two rounds held per year.
- For a collaborative round (departmental or interdisciplinary), funding ranges from \$125,000 to \$210,000, with one round held per year.
- For the universal providers, funding ranges from \$225,000 to \$300,000, with one round held per year.

Appendix B: The Academic Master Plan

The following recommendations within the Academic Master Plan (Phase 2: Action Steps) are ones that we believe to be directly supported by the recommendations within this Committee report:

From **Principle #1: Learning**

- Transform learning with real-world experience
 - Aim for 100% of graduates to have participated in experiential learning.
 - Increase the number of students engaged in multi-/inter-disciplinary capstones with study abroad components.
 - Ensure that existing models of experiential learning are of the highest quality
- Ensure excellent teaching throughout the university.
 - Foster and incentivize excellent teaching.
 - Create one-stop model for faculty development and support.
 - Develop innovative and cutting-edge, online course evaluation systems.
 - Identify areas for improvement in teaching, provide appropriate resources for support, and use assessment results for continuous quality improvement.
- Develop innovative pedagogical techniques.
 - Expand funding to aid in the promotion of innovative instructional technologies and to provide professional development and assistance for faculty.
 - Become recognized as a leader in the application of technology within and beyond the classroom.
- Provide students with 21st-century learning tools.
 - Use cutting-edge technologies to expand students' abilities to engage in problem solving and critical thinking.
- Achieve greater integration in university curricula.
 - Fully achieve and assess integration of Integrated Core Learning (ICL) in undergraduate curricula.
 - Explore ways to integrate ICL into graduate curricula.
 - Develop a plan to implement and resource UC Forward.
- Improve the way we measure student learning.
 - Leverage e-portfolios to improve the quality of student learning.
 - Implement innovative assessment systems to improve student learning.

From **Principle #2: Discovery**

- Enhance resources and support for faculty research.
 - Expand internal funding to match desired outcomes in research expansion.
 - Increase support for University Research Council Program for multi-/inter-disciplinary and entrepreneurial research.
- Build more robust platforms for research.
 - Diversify research portfolio.
 - Institutionalize a system for faculty to apply for National Academies and national awards.
 - Build centers of excellence around multi-/inter-disciplinary models.
- Reward innovation in teaching, research, and service.
 - Encourage units to expand RPT, merit, workload, and other faculty assessment documents to make them consistent with AMP goals.
- Develop strategies for retaining the highest quality faculty and staff.

- Develop better proactive mechanisms to incentivize retention of excellent faculty and staff (e.g., merit pay, working conditions, professional development, access to resources and research support, leaves, etc.).
- Strengthen annual performance review processes (e.g., define clear goals for new hires, develop clear pathways for mid-career employees, promote collegiality, address institutional barriers, etc.).
- Develop an integrated university-wide plan for leadership development.
- Partner with the community to solve real-world problems.

From **Principle #3: Community**

- Eliminate internal barriers that inhibit cross-college conversations and internal collaborations.
 - Strengthen and increase number of multi-/inter-disciplinary programs and courses.
 - Define “multi-/inter-disciplinary program” and “multi-/inter-disciplinary course.”
 - Structure Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB) system to reward multi-/inter-disciplinary efforts and seek to expand RPT documents to reflect importance of multi-/inter-disciplinary courses and programs.
 - Improve institutional support for multi-/inter-disciplinary programs.
 - Promote collaboration among colleges, academic service units, and student affairs units to promote student learning and life-skill development.
 - Identify enterprise-wide systems and platforms to increase efficiency and effectiveness (e.g., eliminate duplication of resources, streamline services, increase collaboration, etc.).

From **Principle #4: Economy**

- Establish UC as an economic driver through intellectual activity.
 - Catalyze UC’s expertise in innovation to impact economic development.
 - Expand UC’s economic impact through multi-disciplinary efforts that interface with industry.
 - Build on the UC Forward initiative to incorporate sponsored research into coursework.
 - Cultivate distance learning in targeted sectors to serve continuing professional development needs of industry.

From **Principle #5: Sustainability**

- Integrate sustainability into educational programs, research, report, and community outreach.
 - Advance educational outreach and programming.
 - Pilot multi-/inter-disciplinary global course with a sustainability focus in UHP. Create courses in the study of “sustainability,” using various models and within multiple disciplines.
- Promote and expand existing efforts and strengths around sustainability.
 - Develop a global strategy for commercialization efforts tied to the issue of sustainability.

From **Principle #6: Global Engagement**

- Increase the number of students enrolled in globally-engaged courses.
 - Designate courses that have a global content and create a coordinated curriculum for globally-engaged students.
 - Leverage interdisciplinary curricula to anchor more globally-engaged certificates and minors.
 - Create opportunities for synchronized multinational classrooms.
 - Link courses and projects across the globe through emerging technology.

From **Principle #7: Diversity**

- UC will create and support a learning and work environment that reflects the university's mission, which includes a commitment to excellence and diversity.
 - Increase education and professional development related to diversity and inclusion for students, faculty, and staff.
 - Improve quality and scope of communications plan regarding diversity initiatives.
 - Develop and maintain systemic climate assessment processes and tools to monitor and improve departmental, college, and university climate.

From **Principle #8: Mission-Based Health Care**

- Promote and incentivize wellness within the UC community.
 - Create multiple health and wellness programs across the university supported by multi-/inter-disciplinary teams in medicine, pharmacy, nursing, and allied health.
 - Capitalize on experiential learning opportunities to promote wellness programs.

From **Principle #9: Collaboration**

- Establish a campus-wide culture of collaboration based on an expanded definition of collaboration.
 - Aim for 100% of graduates to have participated in experiential learning.
 - Recognize and reward collaboration.
 - Identify and promote timely unifying themes that cross college lines to shape curricula, teaching, research, and other mission-based activities.
 - Increase participation in UC Forward and related multi-/inter-disciplinary courses.
- Create opportunities for collaborative work with industry and non-industry research.
 - Increase opportunities and create institutional support mechanism for collaboration with industry partners.
 - Increase opportunities for collaboration with non-industry research partners.