

**Idaho State University
College of Arts & Sciences**

Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Retention and Recruitment

Final Report and Recommendations

Committee Chair: Brian Norman (English); Members: Patrick Brooks (Music), Erika Kuhlman (History), Shannon Lynch (Psychology), Shannon Novak (Anthropology), René Rodriguez (Chemistry), Rosemary Smith (Biology), Michael Thomas (Biology)

Submitted to: John Kijinski, Dean, College of Arts & Sciences

April 18, 2006
8AM, First Security Room, BA Building

**Final Report and Recommendations
Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Retention and Recruitment
April 17, 2006**

Table of Contents

Mission	2
Key Findings	3
History	4
Information Gathering Process	5
Recommendations	6
<i>Recommendation Area One: Compensation (Salary and Benefits)</i>	6
Specific Compensation Recommendations	7
<i>Recommendation Area Two: Administration-Faculty Relations</i>	9
Specific Administrative-Faculty Relations Recommendations	10
<i>Recommendation Area Three: Professional Development and Excellence in Teaching and Research/Creative Activity</i>	11
Specific Professional Development Recommendations	11
Specific Excellence in Teaching and Research/Creative Activity Recommendations	13
<i>Recommendation Area Four: Workload</i>	14
Specific Workload Recommendations	14
<i>Recommendation Area Five: Family Accommodation</i>	15
Family Accommodation Ideas and Resources Plan (FAIR Plan)	16
<i>Recommendation Area Six: Culture of Recognition</i>	20
Specific Culture of Recognition Recommendations	20
<i>Recommendation Area Seven: ISU-Local Community Relations</i>	21
Specific ISU-Local Community Relations Recommendations	21
Conclusion	23
 <u>Appendices</u>	
A. Open-ended Survey Report	
B. Focus Group Design	
C. Focus Group Notes	
D. Quantitative Survey Design	
E. Quantitative Survey Report	
F. Highlights of 2004 Faculty Workload Survey Report (culled from Dr. Barbara Adamcik's report)	

Mission

This Committee sought to foster, consolidate, and increase faculty retention and recruitment efforts throughout the College of Arts & Sciences (CA&S) at Idaho State University (ISU). In the broader context of the university, we think our work can also inform efforts to address faculty morale, motivation, and recruitment and institutional quality, both within and beyond CA&S.

Faculty retention as a chronic and costly problem

ISU has a strong record in attracting superior candidates able to deliver the high quality teaching, research, and service the students and State of Idaho deserve. This is why, despite salaries well below the market average and heavy workloads, many CA&S faculty have become leaders in their fields, excellent teachers, and productive members of their professional, university, and local communities. However, ISU's record of retaining faculty is not as strong, and there is every reason to believe the problem will persist without a plan and substantive action. In preparation for an Advance Grant supporting female STEM faculty through the NSF, Dr. Maureen Brandon compiled information on faculty retention from 2001-2005. Though neither CA&S nor ISU has a formal exit interview system (we recommend implementation of one), raw numbers still offer some sense of the problem. 52 faculty in sciences, pharmaceutical sciences, & social sciences (STEM) left ISU in 2001-2005, which represents approximately one tenth of those faculty per year. Of those, 19 retired (16 FP, 3 AOP), 3 were denied tenure (AP), and 6 left for other reasons. The remaining 24 left to take positions in other universities (4 FP, 10 AOP, 10 AP). 50% of those who left to other universities are women. In general, faculty stay for many reasons, but the faculty most likely to leave have a strong research profile, are mobile in regards to family situation, and/or have partners who are not fully accommodated in Pocatello/ISU.

Losing faculty after they come to ISU represents a significant loss of invested time, funding, and other resources—both material and intangible. For instance, the average budget for a search committee is around \$7,000 - \$10,000 (which does not include the substantial time and effort expended by search committee members and departments) and the average cost of laboratory start up fees for a new Biology professor has approached \$100,000 (though the exact figure is highly case-specific). More importantly, the cultural or institutional cost is unquantifiable, but definitely much higher and usually more damaging. When CA&S loses a motivated and motivating junior faculty member or a productive early Associate Professor who is just about to become a leader in departmental or college affairs, the college has lost a great deal more than the cost of a new search. The blows to morale, efficiency, identity, and long-term strategic plans are important to keep in mind when making difficult dollar-driven decisions about retaining those faculty who will lead ISU in successfully achieving its aspirations.

Retention as our Primary Focus

The committee focused primarily on faculty retention and its twin: faculty satisfaction. A focus on retention is necessary because the issue is not perfectly coupled with recruitment. A focus on satisfaction is necessary to augment a focus on retention because merely staying at ISU is not an automatic indicator of success. Further, a narrow focus on retention (especially those faculty leaving ISU) may unduly discount the input of colleagues who may not be actively seeking positions elsewhere but who are invested in the quality of life issues our committee addressed. We believe ISU loses faculty not only to other institutions, but also to low morale and fatigue. While it is quite noticeable when the most productive and motivated faculty leave, it is important also to realize that many become demoralized or exhausted while at ISU. Faculty come to ISU for very diverse and often personal reasons in an ever-changing market place; the reasons faculty stay or leave are more identifiable. Therefore, it is useful to separate retention from recruitment issues. Nevertheless, we believe improvement in areas of retention and satisfaction will be key to recruiting the best faculty possible, and keeping them.

Key Findings

The committee identified seven areas that affect retention and satisfaction, ranked in descending order of importance: 1) salaries and benefits ; 2) administrative-faculty relations, 3) professional development and excellence in teaching and research/creative activity, 4) workload, 5) family accommodation, 6) culture of recognition, and 7) ISU relations with the local community. These areas are interconnected; we separated them only insofar as it is useful for isolating specific concerns and generating specific recommendations. Each faculty member's relationship to the above list is different; making headway in one area can go a long way to alleviate grievances or satisfaction associated with another area. Salary issues were the primary, but not the sole areas faculty identified. Very generally, neither CA&S nor ISU overall are perceived to reward excellence, support continued professional development and engagement with one's field, or offer rejuvenating experiences to become re-energized about teaching, service, and especially research. While salary is often the initial area faculty mention, it is rarely the sole or even the primary source of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Salary may be the common ground for us and thus easier to discuss than more elusive and case-specific issues related to retention and satisfaction. Or, salary may be that which exacerbates dissatisfaction in other areas. Also, discussions of salary yielded a more complex set of concerns and recommendations than a mere call for across-the-board increases (though this would certainly make many problems go away!). Namely, there are two interrelated, but distinct components: equity and merit. If a plan addresses only one of these components it is likely to exacerbate as much as alleviate faculty concerns.

Most of our findings are well in-line with similar findings at other colleges, especially regarding concerns regarding low salaries, nurturing faculty, enhancing the research and teaching infrastructure, merit-based compensation systems, and workload. The heading "Low salaries" garnered a mean value of 4.1 (out of 5) indicating that faculty ranked it as a substantially critical factor of their overall current dissatisfaction at ISU. Furthermore, 66% of the faculty selected "Achieve goal of 100% of the mean of national faculty salaries," as one of the five highest priority recommendations. "Merit based pay increases," "nurturing an engaged and motivated faculty," and "enhancing the teaching and research infrastructure" were all ranked quite high. These factors received mean scores between 4.2 and 4.0 meaning they were all ranked as substantially important by the faculty respondents as recommendations that should receive action. More than 42% of the faculty selected these as one of the five highest priority recommendations. "Enhancement of the quality of faculty benefits," "enhancing the quality of the student body," and "development of a fair and flexible workload document" were the next highest ranked priorities." They were selected by more than 30% of the faculty in their priority ranking.

While these problems are not specific to ISU, they may be particularly amplified within an environment of perennial fiscal austerity, a confused mission, a sense of disempowerment through a top-down administrative structure, and a period of transition from a regional teaching college to a Doctoral Extensive university that is raising its profile by emphasizing both good teaching and good research. Again, the responses show that faculty recommend that "enhancement of teaching and research infrastructure," "nurturing engaged and motivated faculty," and "providing a meaningful merit based pay schedule" should be high on the action priority list.

Our findings in the area of what increases faculty satisfaction in their positions may point to assets specific to ISU, assets that CA&S can amplify or harness. For instance, CA&S faculty are happy with a sense of collegiality, a sense of autonomy/flexibility in their positions, and local outdoor opportunities, or location of Pocatello as a small, Western town. "Quality of colleagues" received a mean score of 4.3 indicating that it was a substantial factor in their current level of satisfaction at ISU. "Job autonomy" received the same score. "Programs and facilities," "outdoor opportunities," "location of ISU," and "turning-the-corner perception" received scores between 3.5 and 3.2. A score of 3 means the factor is moderately important.

Perceptions about whether ISU is “turning the corner” may be especially relevant for retention of junior and/or new faculty. Those faculty who sensed that ISU is improving (“turning the corner”), especially in terms of research profile and overall university quality, seemed very excited about being at ISU. Focus groups showed that faculty, who did not sense that ISU is improving, felt that if ISU were improving, that would be a good thing. The quantitative survey provides fairly definitive evidence that it is primarily junior and/or new faculty who are particularly concerned that ISU is “turning a corner.” As the years at ISU and rank increases, faculty no longer sense that ISU is turning the corner, perhaps because they have seen “false starts” before. The mean of faculty whose satisfaction is based on a perception that ISU is turning the corner decreases steadily from Assistant to Full ranks (mean of 3.6 for AP, 3.3 for AOP, and 2.7 for FP), and it decreases quickly following the first three years (mean 3.8 for 1-3 years at ISU, 3.3 for 4-6 years and 7-9 years, 3.2 for 10-15 years, and 2.5 for more than 15 years). So, there is a window of opportunity before junior and/or new faculty give in to burn out and despair, and possibly look for positions elsewhere. This window can be lengthened if CA&S delivers a plan for “turning the corner” and evidences real progress. If not, junior and/or newer faculty may be the most likely to be dissatisfied and/or leave. Put very succinctly in the comment section of the quantitative survey, one respondent said, “ISU must prove to the faculty that it has every intention of becoming a decent and respected university.” Our findings confirm Barbara Adamcik’s 2004 workload survey in which one respondent wrote, “When I was recruited at ISU I was told that the institution was moving to become a research-intensive university. I was lied to.” Another wrote, “Research support is a joke. Administration wants big grants, but won’t offer support for research-intensive efforts.” At the same time, some focus group findings and general conversations suggested that some faculty who came to ISU in a previous era when the focus was more strongly centered on excellence in teaching are concerned that if ISU “turns the corner,” they may be run over if priorities and expectations for higher research productivity change unfairly across the board. The merit-based and research/creative activity support recommendations can address these pervasive and competing concerns, especially among faculty most able to increase CA&S’s profile and research/creative activity productivity.

History

In recent years, many committees, individuals, and offices have sought to address factors underlying the complex issues of faculty retention and recruitment. The genesis of this committee also has a specific history: Brian Norman (English) suggested this ad hoc committee to Dean Kijinski in October 2005 following a disheartening experience during the early stages of the ISU Presidential Search, an experience that confirmed the Faculty Senate’s concern that faculty were not sufficiently represented or heard in this important process central to ISU’s future. Dean Kijinski consulted the Associate and Assistant Deans and decided that such a committee should include a broad representation of motivated CA&S faculty, diverse in field and rank. Dean Kijinski announced the ad hoc committee to Chairs and solicited interested faculty members. Choosing among self-nominated faculty, Dean Kijinski appointed this committee.

The 2005-2006 academic year is a key moment of transition for ISU. ISU successfully searched for and hired its first new president in twenty years; the Faculty Senate led efforts to express extreme concern at the upper administration for its perennial neglect of faculty voice, especially following large pay raises to upper administration officials widely chronicled in the local press; many other upper-level administrative posts are newly vacant or filled by interim appointments; the Idaho State legislature and SBOE are considering a state-wide community college system; a cohort of talented and motivated new faculty maintains a vibrant, loose-knit cross-university social network; and the university’s accreditation report is spurring many calls for accountability and added structure among the many endeavors of the university. The committee believes that this time of transition is the perfect time to consolidate efforts into a coherent and robust plan to recruit and retain the best faculty for a CA&S, one that values excellent teaching, research, and service, and that nurtures and rewards faculty for meeting that challenge.

When the committee first met on November 7, 2005, Dean Kijinski asked for a report by late March or early April. This deadline necessitated an ambitious schedule. The committee proceeded swiftly and with direction. Different committee members were leaders (“gurus”) for each stage, depending on schedule, interest, and expertise. We met five times—for an initial planning meeting and once at each stage outlined below. During the process, committee members learned a great deal about how the university looks from the vantage of other fields and ranks, and we became convinced that the discussion process itself—while not a replacement for substantive progress and higher salaries—is a key part of any effective, sustainable plan of action. Positive comments from faculty, especially in focus groups, confirmed this observation.

Information Gathering Process

The committee gathered information in three steps, with findings from each stage informing the next. Our aim was to be confident that our information was specific to our population (related studies existed, but none specific to CA&S tenure-track and tenured faculty on this issue at ISU) and to provide a grassroots process to convene faculty around this difficult issue. We knew that funding would be a key issue, but we made a good faith effort to also seek creative solutions that could augment calls for increased salaries.

1. Open-ended surveys (late November 2005)

Our first step was an open-ended survey sent to all tenure-track and tenured CA&S faculty. We asked about factors that make faculty excited to be at ISU, that detract from our positions, and that impact whether we look for positions elsewhere. In addition, we consulted other relevant work in this area, most notably Dr. Barbara Adamcik’s report on a university-wide 2004 study on faculty workload and satisfaction (available at www.isu.edu/acadaff/reports/FacultySurvey2004.shtml) and faculty retention data from 2000-2005 within the college and at similar colleges compiled by Dr. Maureen Brandon for an application for an Advance Grant from the NSF to target female STEM faculty. Appendix A details our findings and provides a copy of the survey. Approximately 37% of tenured and tenure-track CA&S faculty participated.

2. Focus groups (February 6-10, 2006)

For our second step we conducted focus groups in early February 2006 to discuss areas identified in the open-ended surveys and to generate possible recommendations. We also consulted examples of how other universities have approached faculty retention issues. Focus group invitations were sent to all CA&S tenure-track and tenured faculty, and individual sessions were scheduled throughout the campus and at varying times to accommodate as many faculty schedules as possible. Appendix B details our findings and provides a copy of the focus group design (created by Shannon Lynch, Psychology). A total of 25 CA&S faculty from various ranks and disciplines participated.

3. Quantitative surveys (March 8-22, 2006)

For our final information-gathering step, Rosemary Smith (Biology) created an electronic survey for faculty to rank the importance of retention and satisfaction factors, as well as rank the importance of specific recommendation areas. The survey was conducted through ITS with the leadership of Lisa Lewis, and with a great deal of guidance from Michael Spall in the ITRC. Invitations were sent to all tenure-track and tenured faculty on March 8, with a reminder sent on March 20. René Rodriguez (Chemistry) worked with campus statistician Teri Peterson to analyze the data for the final report. Appendix C details our findings and provides a copy of the survey. A total of 106 surveys were submitted, which represents a 53.3% response rate.

Recommendation Areas

It was clear from the input in all stages that many faculty want a comprehensive or at least coherent vision for the College's future, rather than a series of disconnected recommendations or policy decisions. This is why we arranged the report in terms of seven recommendation areas (Recs), with more specific recommendations included under each area. That way, CA&S and/or ISU can address a broad issue through a series of initiatives and policies that resonate with core faculty concerns. Also we chose not to focus artificially only on issues and recommendations fully within the purview of CA&S because we wanted an accurate portrayal of the issues, and we hope to foster coordination between CA&S and other units in the university. It is important to note that our swift schedule did not exhaust the bounty of creative, dedicated faculty and administrators who may have other ideas on how to address some of the areas. Therefore, specific recommendations should be seen as only one of many avenues available to CA&S or ISU. So, while we provide specific recommendations, many of which may be implemented relatively easily (e.g. distribute Chairs' meeting minutes to address faculty-administration communication concerns, Rec Two), simply implementing a few specific recommendations here and there may not resonate with faculty as a compelling plan. We are confident that we have identified, described, and ranked areas most crucial to retention and satisfaction; we encourage CA&S to consider specific recommendations while at the same time pursuing other ideas to address each area within an overall plan that will demonstrate CA&S's vision for the future and commitment to faculty retention and recruitment.

Recommendation Area One: Compensation (Salary & Benefits)

Salary concerns are particularly amplified during 2005-2006 in the wake of : 1) large administrative pay raises in Fall 2005 (which precipitated a Faculty Senate vote of no confidence in then-President Richard Bowen, Ken Prolo, and Leo Hermann, and ultimately a rescinding of some of the raises); 2) two rounds of cost of living increases and pay raises from the State, which were largely perceived to be welcome but insufficient; and 3) the administration's attempt to achieve the goal of all meeting at least 85% of market level for salaries, which led to salary increases for some faculty, but also made the faculty more acutely aware that their salaries fall well below market averages, continue to fall further below, and may continue to do so since there is no clear plan in place to catch up.

Faculty immediately and persistently mention salary as a key issue affecting their satisfaction and their decision to leave or remain at ISU. In many of the (fall 2005) open-ended surveys, faculty wrote "SALARY" three times under factors that decrease satisfaction, then "See Above" under factors that make them look for positions elsewhere. During focus group discussions, participants frequently expressed dismay when learning about the various methods used among departments to determine distribution of recent "merit-based" increases (this also indicates the need for more transparency in the decision-making process). While some departments provided increases primarily to senior faculty members, others distributed funds to junior faculty members, or across the board. While any given strategy may be logical, the general sentiment was that our salaries are so far behind that the distribution process was a scramble that had very little resemblance to an actual merit-based salary increase.

In the (spring 2006) quantitative survey, salary issues were by far the more frequent response in every single category involving factors leading to dissatisfaction. For example, in the list of high priority recommendations, "Achieve 100% of the Mean of National Salaries" was mentioned by 71 respondents (67%) as one of their five most critical recommendations. The next most frequently mentioned factors/recommendations were "Nurture Engaged and Motivated Faculty," "Enhance Teaching & Research Infrastructure," and "Provide Meaningful Merit-based Pay" (a 3-way tie with 45 mentions each) and "Enhance Quality of Faculty Benefits (41 mentions)." Salary and benefits comprise three of the top five factors ranked by faculty. In our surveys and focus group discussions, salary and benefit-based "push

factors” clearly outweigh “pull factors” (those that increase satisfaction, such as “quality of colleagues”) when faculty decide whether or not to remain at ISU. This level of dissatisfaction with salaries and benefits was unanimous across faculty by sex, rank, area, and time of service: while other factors tended to vary a bit by individual situation or group.

It is important to distinguish between two interrelated, but distinct components of salary and raises: equity and merit. Equity refers to a horizontal axis of compensation that ensures all faculty receive a fair rate of pay regarding their position, time of service, and market averages. Equity includes cost of living adjustments and salary compression offsets. Merit refers to additional compensation expressly tied to performance and achievement, as measured by transparent criteria appropriate to the field, university, and market. When a chunk of money addresses one in the name of the other, confusion and rancor inevitably ensue. It is important to approach salary issues by attending to both equity and merit, but rigorously distinguishing them. Therefore, we have used these two categories to describe the aim of each specific recommendation. Finally, merit-based incentives with transparent and collectively-generated criteria can speak to what the open-ended surveys identified as a sense by significant faculty that ISU is “turning the corner,” which mostly reflects aspirations for increased university profile and research. There is a widespread perception that seniority is weighed considerably more than merit, and that ISU nurtures what some in the open-ended survey described as a “good old boys’ club” or “culture of mediocrity” that looked almost exclusively at time in the seat over performance. In the open-ended survey, one faculty member stated that there is “a lack of a plan to increase ISU’s national presence as a serious scholarly institution.” For those who despair at the emphasis of seniority over merit and the lack of merit-based considerations (primarily new and junior faculty, see “Key Findings”), this was a driving factor to look for a position elsewhere (see also Red Four).

Specific Compensation Recommendations:

1. Comprehensive Pay Schedule [addresses equity and merit]

Faculty need and deserve the ability to plan for their futures, which must include a reliable sense of their likely salaries based on years of service and level of performance in their fields. All our information pointed to a sense of despair and insecurity that exacerbated low salaries. For instance, when the first cost-of-living increase in years is portrayed as a windfall with no assurance that future cost-of-living adjustments are imminent, faculty become severely demoralized. Therefore, a comprehensive pay schedule similar to that *already adopted by the University of Idaho* (and most other universities) can address both equity and merit. (It is frequently assumed that such a salary schedule is not possible in our State: the UI model serves as an example where our previous administration was simply ineffectual in this regard.) Faculty will have a clear picture of what the university considers valuable in terms of time of service and level of performance in teaching, research, and service. If CA&S wishes to follow the University of Idaho model, faculty begin at 85% of the market average for their fields and ranks (following OK survey data), and they can expect to reach or exceed 100% before promotion, with acceptable performance. Ranges for full professors are calculated differently since there is no rank above Professor. Meritorious performance in the form of excellent and outstanding reviews in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service accelerates the rate of increase. The U of I schedule caps salaries at 125% of market averages for field and rank. Since tenure (currently) reviews come up in the fifth year instead of the sixth at ISU, we suggest recalculating based on six years between ranks. While funding levels are largely outside the College’s control, the Dean has the power to decide pay levels within the college, and it is reasonable for faculty to expect reliability, transparency, and a good faith effort to communicate a coherent compensation plan. The U of I salary schedule contains provisions for how state funding impacts its calculations. In addition, a salary schedule with clear priorities for meritorious performance and an equitable floor for compensation across the board sets us up well to respond to

monies doled out from the State in short time frames (as in January 2006), and to make an argument for the priority of faculty salaries and for increased future funding.

2. Salary Goal: Achieve 100% of Market-Based Salary Studies [addresses equity]

Faculty deserve to be paid at least 100% of their peers. A defeatist administrative posture toward achieving 85% of market averages (measured by CUPA or OK studies) severely demoralizes faculty. Few faculty, if any, note Pocatello's cost of living as an acceptable form of compensation for sub-market rates. If CA&S announces publicly and positively the goal of 100% of market averages, this will increase faculty-administration relations (Rec Three) and communicate to the surrounding community that ISU is a first-rate state university (Red Six, Eight). This public goal should be coupled with some sort of white paper on how CA&S plans to achieve the goal, and what is an acceptable range of salaries in achieving the 100% average number (see above recommendation: the U of I salary schedule uses a range of 85% to 125% for individual salaries within one's field and rank). We suspect that the administration is already pursuing the spirit of this recommendation, but the current public message is that ISU professors are worth 85% of their peers. An acceptable goal and a good-faith plan of action will go a long way to alleviating the pervasive sense of discouragement throughout the faculty.

3. Transparent, Department-Specific Merit-Based Pay Criteria [addresses merit]

Merit-based pay is often a divisive, distracting, and vexing issue. Nonetheless, a culture of recognition (Rec Four) demands that meritorious performance lead to some form of substantive recognition, in part in the form of pay increases. The merit-based component of any salary or raise, especially in a salary schedule suggested above, must be tied to a meaningful performance review system with explicit criteria of evaluation (see Recs Four, Five). Current efforts to articulate tenure and promotion expectations throughout CA&S are a good start in this direction, and speak to the concern expressed in the open-ended and quantitative surveys about "uneven to embarrassingly low tenure and promotion standards." It is important for departments and CA&S to articulate clear criteria at a time when distribution of a specific cache of merit-based funds (such as in January 2006) is not imminent. This way, discussions can be sober and related to professional standards, not individual cases. Further, with clear criteria, faculty can strive to achieve specific performance standards that all agree are valuable and worthy of merit-based compensation. We suggest that meaningful annual performance evaluations be tied to a salary schedule. For instance, superior performance in two out of three areas (teaching, research, and service) would entail a specific, anticipatable pay increase. Alternatively, superior performance in one or more of the areas at tenure and/or promotion would entail a specific pay increase above the standard increase at promotion. This may also precipitate an accountable annual review system that delivers substantive feedback to the individual faculty member and that is tied to tenure and promotion committees' work.

4. Improved Benefits [addresses equity]

Faculty tend to perceive benefits as inadequate or thin, which serves as the kicker to persistently low salaries. Therefore, improving a few specific benefits may help alleviate some of the core grievances around compensation generally. Many of these issues may be restricted by State regulations; however, there are exceptions to every regulation. Some specific suggestions include:

- Health benefits at date of hire. Making faculty wait 90 days beyond the first full-month of hire creates a severely negative first contact experience between faculty and the institution. Many faculty tend to arrive at ISU uninsured, perhaps straight from graduate school, often with families in tow (see also Rec Six), and largely unaware of the 3+ month delay in health insurance coverage. The result is a distressing crap shoot: faculty must choose between exorbitant rates for private market short-term insurance or the gamble of no insurance. Either choice is unacceptable

and begins the faculty member's career at ISU on a feeling of bad faith. CA&S could artificially push back the date of hire without pay so that insurance starts on the contract date, create a fund to cover short-term health insurance, or just change the insulting policy altogether.

- Increase matching retirement funds. Many institutions provide variable matching funds towards retirement. These matches start with the minimum of the 8% that ISU matches now, and increase up to 15%, if the faculty member so chooses. Increasing the match would be a mechanism to assure greater retirement savings, and the subsequent financial security would alleviate some concerns about low salaries.
- Improve health insurance premiums, co-pays, and deductibles. Faculty perceive the coverage of medical fees as insufficient. This is especially galling at a university with a health sciences mission. ISU can draw on in-house connections to negotiate for a better plan, or even a set of ancillary programs, where faculty shoulder less of the cost of medical fees, especially routine wellness services.
- Family-related benefits: See Rec Three.

Recommendation Area Two: Administration/Faculty Relations

Faculty expressed numerous and diverse concerns relating to administration/faculty relations, especially regarding a perception that faculty are devalued within the larger institution. On the quantitative survey, the factor "Poor interactions with administrators" received a score of 3.5 under the heading "Factors that influence the current level of dissatisfaction among faculty ..." This indicates that this factor is of moderately substantial importance to faculty. The other heading of "Lack of experienced administrators," received a score of 2.8 indicating that faculty members were moderately concerned about this issue. There was no significant difference in the mean value between men and women respondents, but the lack of experience of administrators was most dissatisfying to members of the natural sciences and mathematics departments. Recent advances in administrative relations with faculty made by the Gallagher administration, and the expected overhaul that will be initiated by the Vailas administration, will substantially impact faculty/administration relations. Nevertheless, given the level of importance placed on this issue by respondents to our survey, it is important to explore several recommendations. There are three issues that have been identified as problematic in the relations between ISU administrators and faculty: 1) communication between administration and faculty; 2) perceptions of faculty worth; and 3) administrative competence.

First, there has clearly been a communication breakdown. Whether this is caused by an inability to include faculty during planning and implementation of ISU policies, or whether the mechanisms for successful communication are simply lacking, faculty members are frequently left out of the loop. The consequences of this include departure of faculty who perceive no institutional goals and view ISU as a ship adrift. Several examples of this (cited by respondents to our surveys) include frustration at learning about important ISU news through the local paper (rather than from administrators), some administrators seeming unaware of contradictory statements and/or activities of other administrators, and mixed messages about how funds (such as for raises) can be distributed. This committee has requested very basic information (in support of this report) from administrators who simply do not respond, making even the exploration of "communication breakdown" difficult.

Second, there have been some troubling comments by our respondents about the credentials and qualifications of ISU administrators at their time of hire. Into this category of concern, we have lumped a number of statements about talent and competence of upper-level administration. While a few individuals were identified by name, more frequently administrators were painted with broad strokes (see open-ended survey report in the Appendix for examples). This issue is inseparable from other areas of concern, such

as the lack of a culture of excellence and lack of recognition of merit (see RAs One, Three, and Six). When filling a key administrative position (vice president, dean, director, etc), obvious questions about qualifications like, “Is this the most qualified and competent person I can possibly hire for the job?” should be asked. Our respondents indicated that often the answer may be “no,” and faculty cite cases in which the new administrator lacks an appropriate graduate degree, little to no experience in that administrative area, and little to no apparent aptitude for the area to be administered. Some of the upper-level administrators and Directors of Offices specifically mentioned by respondents are “homegrown” in terms of origin and degrees, which generates suspicion of cronyism and favoritism and paints all such administrators with a negative brush regardless of merit. Some faculty members perceive this “inbreeding” problem as inconsistent with acceptable practices at other institutions of comparable size and aspirations.

It should be noted that some administrators were specifically singled out for praise for being well-qualified and talented leaders. Among these were Dean Kijinski and Academic VP Robert Wharton. It should also be noted that many miscellaneous complaints in our surveys and focus groups might be related to specific administrative personnel issues, which can be addressed and avoided through a more accountable hiring and performance review process. Regarding the negative comments about the administration as a whole, though, it is extremely difficult to convey the frustration and agitation felt by many of our respondents. These sentiments have a strong impact on the retention of our faculty. The goal of this report is not merely to vent these sentiments or to suggest pink slips for any specific administrator, but to suggest recommendations that will lead to greater retention of faculty via greater faith in the quality, competence, and accountability of the Administration generally.

Specific Administration-Faculty Relations Recommendations

1. Improve the channels of communication

This improvement has been initiated by interim President Gallagher. It must be continued and expanded by President Vailas, and we have every reason to expect that he will do so. The Dean can also improve in this area by disseminating minutes of CA&S Chair’s meetings, sending out substantial periodic reports to faculty (perhaps monthly) that discuss new and ongoing issues, and initiating a dialog with the faculty about these issues perhaps through periodic breakfast meetings with specific cohorts. The Dean can also foster uniformly open lines of communication with departments by encouraging Chairs to share ideas about best practices for departmental communication. Currently, faculty members perceive the quality of communication as differing greatly by department, which further exacerbates the perception that some faculty are more “in the know” than others.

2. Include faculty in the decision-making process.

The straw that broke the back of the Bowen administration was the lack of concern about input from faculty in the decision-making process. While presidents are hired to make important and difficult decisions (and should be held accountable for these decisions), it is inconceivable to ignore the potential informed input of hundreds of concerned faculty, each of whom has much to gain or lose from the decision. Faculty must be involved in all key decision making processes. Many of the mechanisms are in place already (i.e. the Budget Council), so CA&S and ISU can activate existing mechanisms and use these as models for how to incorporate faculty at an acceptable level in each key decision-making area.

3. Clarify and reform the administrative hiring process.

President Vailas will likely review the credentials of current ISU administrators at all levels to determine their ability to assist him in the implementation of his goals. We encourage him to search broadly when filling open positions – ISU deserves a nation-wide search for any open administrative and academic position – and to include multiple faculty representatives on search committees. Some faculty specifically expressed concerns about the degree and credentials at the time of hire for upper administrative positions. Faculty members will be more likely to remain at ISU if they have faith in this hiring process and are convinced that the person hired has the education and experience necessary to do the job successfully, and is held accountable through meaningful performance reviews.

Recommendation Area Three: Professional Development and Excellence in Teaching and Research/Creative Activity

"Nurturing a culture of engaged and motivated faculty" and "enhancing the infrastructure for teaching and research" were in the top 5 categories cited by the faculty for priority action. Also in the top half were providing more resources for professional development and travel. Clearly, this area requires some action.

This call for a support structure for a “culture of excellence” in teaching and research/creative activity is a necessarily broad amalgamation of several related areas of concern. First, there is concern about a lack of reward for merit (see Rec One) and that faculty achievements go unrecognized. Many respondents were troubled by their perception that no matter how hard they might work, they think that they will be rewarded no more than a colleague who performs merely adequately. Second, there is disappointment about a lack of the “culture of the mind” that is found in many college towns but is not cultivated at ISU or in the community. Third, there is a strong sense that the infrastructure to support research/creative activity is inadequate.

A serious area of concern for respondents is support for professional development, which allows for continued engagement in one’s field and excellence in research/creative activity and teaching. There are two main areas of concern: First, a number of faculty specifically indicated that the Offices of Research and Sponsored Programs do not fulfill their potential in supporting creative and academic endeavors (see Appendix: preliminary survey report). Most comments indicate that the leadership in these offices appears to be inexperienced at running such programs at an institution of ISU’s size and aspirations. Second, faculty generally perceive that funds to support professional development activities are inadequate. These activities include travel to meetings, publication costs, hosting seminar speakers, etc. When support for professional activities are deficient, faculty point out that it is difficult to compete successfully for grants and other professional development endeavors. Currently, department-specific policies regarding research/creative activity and travel support draw from a very limited pool of funds and tend to spread the funds around as thinly and wide as possible. As a result, faculty often have to choose between going to a cheaper, closer conference or attending a key conference while shouldering some of the expense oneself.

Specific Professional Development Recommendations

1. Increase Research/Creative Activity Travel Support

We suggest that travel support hold a higher priority in budgetary decisions than current levels. Increased research- and creative activity-related travel support will provide the resources for faculty to achieve the professional standards as suggested in Recs One and Four, increase the profile of ISU to the outside world as suggested in Recs Four and Seven, and increase faculty morale by supporting professional activities that are often rejuvenating for one’s teaching and research/creative activity. Excellent teaching arises

from continued engagement and activity in one's field. Therefore, research and creative activity funds should be seen as the bridge between research/creative activity and teaching.

2. Develop a Transparent, Qualitative Policy for Funding Distribution

We suggest that allocation of travel funds to support research and creative activity should follow a clearly defined, department-specific, and field-appropriate set of guidelines, that includes a system for prioritizing faculty requests (both within and among departments).

3. Develop a Clear Outline and Procedures for Supplemental Travel Funds

We recommend either a faculty guidebook outlining sources of funding or a single clearinghouse to which requests for professional development funds can be made. Currently, there are disparate sources of extra funds available for special requests relating to research, creative activities, and other professional development activities. These include monies in the Dean's Office, the Office of Research, and other discretionary funds throughout Department, College, and University levels. However, the cumbersome applications (27 copies?!), and locations and distribution processes of these funds are not clear to faculty, which might explain the sense of an unequal distribution of these funds.

4. Improve Responsiveness in Research-Related Support Services

The Dean's Office should nurture a clear, meaningful, and accountable system of communication between faculty and offices whose mission it is to support research/creative activities. In all three information gathering steps, significant faculty members singled out the Office of Research, Office of Sponsored Programs, and/or Grants/Contracts as a source of frustration (see also Rec Three). Concerns ranged from response time for help researching grants to incorrect record keeping for grants held by individual faculty (which jeopardizes the ability to keep current grants and obtain future grants). In some cases the frustration was very high, including comments from the open-ended survey describing these offices as "an unresponsive bureaucracy" and "abysmal." Many connected the bureaucratic structures to a de facto extra workload, adding to what many faculty members described as "crushing" workload (see Rec Four). Specific recommendations might include:

- Hire more academics with strong research backgrounds to key posts in these offices (see also Rec Three and Five);
- Coordinate annual individual meetings between research-active faculty and a staff member of one of these offices. This already happens during first year orientation activities in some departments like Psychology where obtaining grants is directly relevant to tenure, but this process could be formalized more and imbued with accountability;
- Publicly acknowledge key staff members in these offices involved in preparation or maintenance of grants in order to create an incentive to nurture the best relationship possible between faculty grant holders and research/creative activity-related administrative staff (see also Recs Three, Four).
- Promote the reform of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. This will probably occur when the CRO is eliminated in favor of a VP-Research, but it is important to ensure that the new president is aware of the problem.

5. Create Short-Term Administrative Opportunities for Faculty

The opportunity to participate in meaningful, short-term (one or two semesters) administrative appointments can rejuvenate faculty, expose them to a different view of the university, increase faculty-administration understanding (Rec Three), and offer a meaningful professional opportunity for

advancement. We suggest creating some short-term administrative appointments in a few key offices, perhaps the Office of Research, the Graduate School, Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Dean's Office. These appointments may be in service of implementing other specific recommendations, such as the concerns about responsiveness in research/creative activity-related Offices (see above). These appointments might also come at crucial times during a faculty member's career, such as upon promotion to Associate or Full Professor, returning from sabbatical, or at the third year review. Compensation can be in the form of course release, additional salary, or both. Further, creating short-term, rotating appointments can alleviate pervasive concerns about entrenchment and lack of opportunities for advancement. However, it is important to design these short-term administrative opportunities as an opportunity to rejuvenate faculty for returning to successful research/creative activity and teaching careers, lest these opportunities hinder faculty members from progressing from the rank of AOP to Full.

6. Competitive Library Development Grants

Some faculty noted the inadequacy of library collections and services, especially regarding research support, but also regarding instruction and creative activity support. We suggest that the CA&S work to enhance the library holdings and access to both on-line materials and search-engines.

Specific Culture of Excellence in Teaching and Research/Creative Activity Recommendations

1. Reward meritorious careers.

Many of the other Colleges at ISU award their own distinguished Teacher and Researcher awards, and the CA&S could consider doing the same. The Faculty Senate's current initiative to create a "Distinguished Professor" category is another possible avenue to address this recommendation.

2. Recruit High-Performing and Out-of-State students

Recruit high performing and out-of-state students in order to increase the diversity and quality of the student body. In focus groups and in the open-ended survey, many faculty cite the disproportionate amount of time devoted to under-prepared students as demoralizing. Further, one symptom of the perception that ISU lacks a "culture of the mind" involves the makeup of our student body. While most colleges similar to ISU in other ways (size, professional and graduate programs, attractive location, etc) have a large proportion of out-of-state students, ISU remains rather homogeneous: only 5% come from other US states, 3% from outside the USA, and 75% from the 3 local counties. Not only do out-of-state students pay substantially higher tuition and fees, providing resources to implement useful programs and policies, these students are also usually highly motivated, come from more diverse backgrounds, and make a valuable contribute to the intellectual and cultural mix on campus. This recommendation impacts the official focus in the Office of Enrollment Planning on head count irrespective of academic preparation or other measures of student quality. (Plus, it is easier to retain academically-prepared and -motivated students.) Efforts by the Colleges of Pharmacy and Business to improve the quality of their programs and their student body may serve as useful models.

We suggest advertising broadly to students who are looking for a school in the Mountain West (East coasters and midwesterners, as well as California. ISU's out-of-state tuition is competitive with in-state tuition in many states and we may attract students who are turned away from college opportunities in their home states or who wish to take advantage of the recreational opportunities of the area. The increase in recruitment efforts for the Honors Program is a good starting model.

3. Host More Cross-Departmental Engagements

Faculty expressed support for more opportunities to interact with their colleagues outside their departments as professionals. This supports our findings that faculty value collegiality. The CA&S Faculty Research Day provides a good model. The Dean might host monthly CA&S symposia showcasing the cutting-edge work coming out of one department. This sort of event also speaks to a culture of recognition (Rec Four), if this is an explicit effort to showcase prestigious accomplishments or ongoing research and creative projects.

Recommendation Area Four: Workload

While faculty commented positively on the autonomy they have as a function of their work at ISU, they also have consistently expressed concerns about their current workload. In the Adamcik survey, three-quarters of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that faculty workloads should be changed to direct one's efforts toward primarily teaching or primarily research rather than continuing to require the current levels of emphasis on both. In response to the initial open-ended survey we conducted, approximately one third of the respondents (25/73) identified unequal or "crushing" workloads as a reason for current dissatisfaction. Faculty concerns ranged from simple statements concerning the amount of work they are asked to do, particularly due to an increased emphasis on research without adjustments in expectations regarding teaching or service, to specific issues of perceived inequity of workload across departments. Similar themes regarding lack of balance in workloads and unreasonable expectations that faculty will increase their efforts to obtain grants and conduct research while maintaining current teaching and service commitments were raised in the focus groups. Faculty who responded to the quantitative survey rated unrealistic workloads and unequal workloads as moderately critical to their dissatisfaction (3.5 and 3.1 respectively). Female faculty and faculty in the social sciences (e.g., economics, psychology, political science) rated unrealistic workloads as significantly more problematic than male faculty or faculty from other areas within the college. Finally, 30% of the faculty who responded to the quantitative survey prioritized the need for a fair/flexible workload policy that could be applied across the college and that was sensitive to different departmental objectives and needs.

Specific Workload Recommendations

1. Create an equitable workload policy statement.

Any such statement should be developed through comparisons with other institutions – it would be erroneous to assume this is a problem unique to ISU. These comparisons would also help alleviate the perception that ISU faculty are paid less for a greater workload, as well as address faculty desires for equivalent rather than uniform workloads.

2. Flexibility in workload

Formulate a policy (based on comparisons with similar policies at other institutions) to allow faculty members to exercise flexibility in their workload formula. If a faculty member wants to emphasize research or teaching for a period, in line with Departmental and College needs, a flexible workload policy allows for these negotiations to take place transparently and with appropriate measures of accountability tied to annual reviews or tenure and promotion reviews. For example, an increase in research time or for creative work may come with an evaluation of research or creative products produced during Annual Reviews and tenure and promotion decisions. The existing university workload policy already contains the mechanism for individual negotiations for shifts in workloads.

3. Shorten the semester

We recommend that ISU consider a shorter semester, more in line with our peer institutions. Most universities have a 16 week semester, not a 17 week semester. Also, the Fall and Spring semester are of different lengths, which leads to extra work to accommodate the same course offered both semesters.

Recommendation Area Five: Family Accommodation

Family accommodation is an increasingly urgent and widespread concern in the academy. The Committee is very excited and optimistic about the feasibility of a comprehensive family accommodation plan, which may also have a buoying effect for other initiatives. Individual faculty for whom family accommodation is an issue often cite it as the prime factor driving a decision to look for a position elsewhere. On question 7, a mean score of 3.4 was derived for poor quality of faculty benefits, indicating that it was moderately to substantially influencing current dissatisfaction at ISU. Also, 38% of the faculty listed enhancing the quality of faculty benefits as a high priority item. More specifically, tuition benefits for faculty dependents received a score of 25%, developing a clear strategy for domestic partner benefits received a score of 9% and developing the infrastructure to coordinate partner accommodation efforts received a score of 4%. These more specific benefits are likely very important to faculty with concerns in this specific area but that conclusion is at best tentative without more demographic information. For instance, female faculty at ISU are especially concerned about workload and personal leave: the recommendation for a fair/flexible workload policy scored 4.0 for female faculty, 3.6 for male faculty; a recommendation for a personal leave policy scored 3.6 for female faculty, 3.0 for male faculty. These two areas also received greater emphasis by faculty in the fine/performing arts and social sciences.

Historically, ISU has a strong record of piecing together accommodation efforts in individual cases. But because accommodation efforts are isolated, a result of negotiation, and often removed from open public discussion, there is a pervasive sense of uncertainty for how faculty members can draw on ISU's resources for their individual family accommodation needs, wherever appropriate. As a result, faculty may not feel fully supported in the official area of family accommodation even if ISU's unofficial record is strong. New faculty members cannot count on family accommodation efforts, nor can departments use an accommodation policy to present a compelling case to candidates or new faculty for why they should come to or remain at ISU. Therefore, CA&S has a golden opportunity to create a robust, powerful, and highly marketable comprehensive family accommodation plan. Many other institutions are currently addressing the various concerns surrounding family accommodation, so there are numerous models available that are often detailed in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

We recommend a comprehensive response, in the form of a *Family Accommodation Ideas and Resources Plan (FAIR Plan)*. Family accommodation is not synonymous with partner hires, which is only one of many options available when appropriate to the individual case, needs, and qualifications. This is important to note because our information gathering process evidenced strong concerns about past or future partner hires, especially regarding a concern that hires would be thrust upon departments according to standards out of line with common hiring practices to which most faculty are subject. So, CA&S can develop a *FAIR Plan* that comprises many different options and addresses many related concerns: Partner employment, partner hires, dual career couples, partner benefits, childcare, family leave policies, tenure clocks, tuition benefits, housing services, etc. Individual faculty member needs are highly case-specific. A *FAIR Plan* developed from the specific recommendations below will empower individual faculty members, departments, and the college. Together, we can creatively and transparently do what is appropriate and in our power to acknowledge that recruiting and retaining the best faculty requires acknowledging family obligations and extra-academic circumstances.

Collectively, faculty and CA&S could be very proud of a *FAIR Plan*, which we could sing from the hilltops to attract stellar candidates, and retain those outstanding faculty members who might look elsewhere if ISU is perceived as not acknowledging individual family situations. Further, because ISU has a strong record of case-by-case individually-negotiated accommodations, a *FAIR Plan* could in part simply formalize common practice, thereby requiring little extra funding. Because a *FAIR Plan* would have many spokes, only some of which would be applicable to any individual faculty member, CA&S could present itself as committing resources to and supportive of all faculty and family situations. Together, we can figure out how to accommodate individual circumstances in the best and most appropriate manner in line with CA&S's resources, needs, and overall goals. Though the quantitative survey suggests that something like the *FAIR Plan* would target specific segments of the faculty, the open-ended surveys and focus groups indicate that a comprehensive plan could be well received and help strengthen recruitment efforts.

Family Accommodation Ideas and Resources Plan (FAIR Plan)

Spoke 1. Parental/Family leave policy

Currently, ISU has no official parental leave policy, which creates an environment of uncertainty among parents-to-be during an already stressful time. This is amplified for female faculty during pregnancy, and junior faculty nearing tenure review. CA&S should adopt a clear and fair policy to address parental and family leave. Parental leave policies are highly uneven across U.S. universities, though a recent *Chronicle* article notes that most parental leave policies are probably illegal, even if they conform to historical practice in academe (Joan C. William, "Balancing Act," 11 Feb 2005). The article cites a policy at "Harvard Law School, which grants a paid leave to any faculty member who is 'the sole caretaker of his or her newborn or newly adopted child at least 20 hours per week, from Monday through Friday, between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.' Any mother or father can qualify. When requesting the leave, a parent asserts that he or she will be the 'sole caregiver' for the requisite period." Whatever model best fits CA&S or ISU, it is important to draft and disseminate a clear policy so that faculty are clear on expectations, options, and consequences of major familial events. A parental and family leave policy should include provisions regarding tenure clocks (see Tenure clock policy below). Further, a 2004 University of Virginia study on "Parental Leave in Academia" shows that positive parental leave policies, especially paid-parental leave options, are key recruitment tools, especially for women faculty. (<http://faculty.virginia.edu/familyandtenure/institutional%20report.pdf>). This is confirmed by the quantitative survey where ISU female faculty, too, are especially concerned by workload and personal leave policies.

Spoke 2. Tenure clock policy

ISU should adopt a clear and flexible policy regarding tenure and the birth or adoption of children. Currently, there is no official policy for how the birth or adoption of a new child affects faculty member's tenure clocks. As a result, many CA&S faculty, especially women faculty, must cobble together an ad hoc plan and schedule for how to give birth or adopt a child while maintaining their full-time workloads on the way to tenure. Again, this de facto situation exacerbates an already stressful time and can cast a pall over tenure decisions and careers of faculty who have children pre-tenure. Increasingly, many institutions offer policies relating to the tenure clock for new parents. A recent *Chronicle* article details how traditional tenure policies disproportionately hurt women and young faculty (Robin Wilson, "Rigid Tenure System Hurts Young Professors and Women, University Officials Say," 7 Oct 2005). Also, the Alfred P. Sloan foundation is giving \$250,000 in grants to five research universities to increase flexible workload policies for professors with kids. In response, many institutions are adopting policies to stop the tenure clock automatically for new parents, while some policies automatically stop the clock only for

female faculty giving birth and offer all new parents the option by request. This is because some policies that automatically stopped the clock for all new parents had the unintended affect of exacerbating rather than ameliorating gender discrepancies (many male faculty tended to use the time to advance a research agenda while female faculty tended to use the time to give family care). No faculty member would be required to stop the tenure clock, but the automatic option would remove any doubt, uncertainty, or negative perceptions attached to such a request. Further, these policies should be very public to nurture informed conversations around the issue.

Spoke 3. Tuition benefits

CA&S should expand ISU's current tuition benefits program. Currently, ISU offers tuition reduction to spouses, and no tuition benefits to dependents or domestic partners. Most institutions' tuition benefits programs are more generous, and most faculty and candidates expect as much. The Faculty Senate is already on record supporting tuition benefits for dependents, and the issue is now stalled on the desk of the upper administration. Current efforts to extend "hard benefits" to domestic partners would include tuition benefits equivalent to those offered to spouses. Tuition benefits for family members, both dependents and domestic partners, will demonstrate the College's commitment to family accommodation, and it may improve enrollment numbers. Numerous universities offer various models, including combinations of tuition remission and reduction, waiting periods, space available policies, limitations on number of dependents or tuition benefits received in a period, etc. The Committee is not suggesting a specific tuition benefit program, only that the program expand in some way, including extension to domestic partners and dependents. CA&S may adopt a tuition benefits program within the College and request that it be extended to the full University.

Spoke 4. Childcare

CA&S can offer some creative gestures in support of the stressful and difficult process of finding acceptable child care, especially for new parents. For instance, CA&S might negotiate for a few spots in ISU's Early Learning Center (ELC) dedicated to faculty children. Many faculty single out the waiting list at the ELC as a source of frustration. Or, CA&S might coordinate a referral network for quality childcare facilities, which would simply formalize the existing informal advice network and foster cross-currents across departments or social units. Or, CA&S might provide some kind of appropriate subsidy for child care within the first two years as a good faith gesture to encourage faculty to make progress toward tenure and promotion.

Spoke 5. Partner employment (un-, under-)

CA&S and ISU should do what is appropriate and in its power to draw on its resources to address the chronic issue of un- and under-employed partners. Many faculty members arrive at ISU with a partner with professional credentials and experience. But Pocatello's size and economy do not easily support meaningful employment for a significant number of faculty partners. Faculty often turn to the College or University for partner hires, which may or may not be the best and most appropriate option in line with College or University needs and resources or partner qualifications (see partner hire policy below). When a partner is un- or under-employed, faculty are very likely to look for a position elsewhere or remain dissatisfied in their positions. In question 8, the topic "develop infrastructure to coordinate partner accommodation efforts among dept. and regional employers" received a mean score of 3.0 indicating that the faculty consider it to be moderately important that the administration address this issue. Further, the impact on candidates is probably much greater, because they may not accept or even pursue a position at ISU because of a real or perceived inability for a partner to find meaningful employment. Therefore, partner employment is a key recruitment issue, too. CA&S and ISU can proactively address this issue by:

- Creating a formal network of alumni, department, and university contacts available to newly-arrived partners. ISU already has a strong informal record of matching newly-arrived partners to job opportunities outside and inside ISU. By formalizing this network and making it part of a FAIR Plan, faculty and candidates can be assured that CA&S and ISU acknowledge the importance of partner employment, and draw on their resources to do what is appropriate and best to address individual cases.
- Considering creating an administrative position or duty that coordinates partner employment efforts. An excellent model for this sort of system is the University of Nebraska branch campus system. Formalized partner employment efforts could be very effective and positive recruitment tools. The Committee suggests drafting a brochure for partner employment efforts to be included with search materials during candidate interviews and selection.
- Drafting a clear policy on temporary, adjunct hiring. Many faculty partners tend to look to their Department or the College to accommodate a partner with an advanced degree through temporary, adjunct teaching appointments. The status of these appointments, length, and circumstances of these ad hoc arrangements are often distrusted by other faculty, especially if the partner is not in the same department as the faculty member. CA&S should create an official category of temporary teaching or administrative appointments to buy time for the partner and faculty member to find long-term meaningful employment (see also Partner hire policy below).
- Using the Idaho Falls campus in partner accommodation efforts. As the identity of the Idaho Falls campus continues to develop, and depending on the outcome of the current community college system idea, higher education institutions outside the ISU main campus may play a role in partner employment opportunities and/or a partner hire policy (see below).
- Offering a one-year, one-time fellowship to partners with appropriate professional credentials and/or experience useful to the Department, College, or University. Such a fellowship at the University of Oregon allows professional partners to have a settling in period and to provide a meaningful “landing site” for them to seek long-term employment. While the program at Oregon includes a stipend of just \$10,000, it nonetheless suggests good faith on the part of the hiring institution and recognizes obstacles faced by dual-career couples, especially in the first years.

Spoke 6. Partner hire policy

CA&S should draft a clear policy on partner hires in line with larger College values and goals. Partner hires within a College or Department remain a troubling and sticky issue. CA&S has a strong record of making partner hires at the tenure-track or full-time adjunct levels, but there is not a clear, uniform policy. Such a policy should cover issues related to: when a partner hire is and is not appropriate, including credentials and department need; how and when negotiations take place; tenure and promotion requirements, including circumstances when one half of the couple may not receive tenure; the relation between the tenure line of the original faculty member and that of the partner hire; and how partner hires fit in with overall College goals and standards. Currently, partner hires are subject to individual negotiation. While this is appropriate, a uniform partner hire policy will shed light and transparency onto the case-specific process. This will remove shades of uncertainty and suspicion surrounding the partner hire, and perceptions of differing standards and “inbreeding” surrounding the College. This will also alleviate concerns about the possibility that hires will be thrust upon departments. By creating a uniform policy, CA&S sets the terms of the conversation and it allows individual faculty members to approach the conversation. Otherwise, pre-tenured faculty may be extremely reluctant to be open with a department about partner hire aspirations. Our Committee believes that departments benefit from an open, healthy, and clearly defined conversation around this important and continuing issue. Partner hires at the tenure-track and full-time adjunct level should be distinguished from the pragmatic ability of departments to

provide temporary adjunct teaching and administrative opportunities during the first few years of a faculty member's arrival (see Partner employment above).

Spoke 7. Periodic Panels/Seminars on Dual Career Couples

Dual-career academic couples are an increasing phenomena throughout the academy. Many seminars, books, and articles address the challenges, successes, strategies, and personal issues related to dual career couples. Because the issue is so dependent on individual circumstances and location, CA&S could nurture a positive environment by hosting periodic panels or seminars on dual career couples. This might be in the form of idea sharing, support groups, presentations by outside experts, panels by senior faculty for junior faculty, etc.

Spoke 8. Partner benefits

Faculty with domestic partners without marriage credentials (whether same sex or mixed sex couples) must receive the same benefits and compensation of their married counterparts. This is an issue of equitable compensation. The Committee found that for faculty with domestic partners, this is a key retention and recruitment issue, especially regarding health insurance. In addition, faculty support for this initiative is moderate to substantially important for retention. This topic received a mean score of 3.3 with regard to the importance of addressing the issue as measured by Question 8, and 9.3% of the faculty selected this as one of their 5 high priority areas. Currently, many domestic partners remain un- or under-insured, or they must pay exorbitant private market individual rates. This creates an environment of uncertainty, insecurity, despair, and profound feelings of injustice. Due to Faculty Senate efforts in 2005, "soft benefits" were extended to domestic partners so there is now an administrative mechanism to define the category domestic partner, and to incorporate the domestic partner in administrative systems. If "hard benefits" like health insurance cannot be provided to domestic partners through existing means because it is beyond the power of CA&S, then CA&S must make alternative accommodations on par with the benefits (compensation) offered to faculty spouses. At the same time, CA&S can provide pressure to upper administration or above to extend spousal benefits to domestic partners. Further, because of the structure of ISU's health insurance plan, extending coverage to domestic partner would come at no cost to the university because the university cost of covering a spouse is already included for each faculty member. Therefore, there is no economic or ethical justification for not extending benefits to domestic partners equivalent to current spousal benefits. While many universities are proactively extending benefits to domestic partners, the Montana public-university system recently lost a court case over its policies to withhold benefits to domestic partners on the basis that it is discriminatory. It is possible that the current bill for an anti-domestic union constitutional amendment may make Idaho different from Montana. But the equity issue will remain. ISU/CA&S will soon be in the minority and out of common practice with other institutions if they withhold benefits from domestic partners, and thereby contribute to a negative retention and recruitment.

Spoke 9. Housing services

CA&S can provide some system to coordinate housing searches for arriving or newly-arrived faculty members and their families. ISU already has a strong informal record in this area, but a formalized system could be used as a strong recruitment tool similarly to a brochure on partner employment efforts. Many departments include a real estate tour during campus visits, and CA&S can suggest this to all departments. CA&S may provide some assistance in locating rental housing, such as the database landlord supplied lists of available rentals maintained by Rutgers University for its graduate students through an Off-Campus Housing Office (<http://ruoffcampus.rutgers.edu/>). Or, CA&S may arrange some sort of temporary housing (at market rate) as an option so that new faculty need not shoulder the cost of a house

hunting trip before arrival and before knowing the market. It is important that new faculty arrivals be as smooth and pleasant as possible so that their careers begin with the message that CA&S is committed to doing what it can to assure that they remain at ISU long-term.

Recommendation Area Six: Culture of Recognition

In each phase of our information gathering process, a number of respondents complained about a lack of recognition (and reward) for academic accomplishments during each phase of our information gathering process. Barbara Adamcik's study also supports this finding. In the quantitative survey, poor interactions with administrators and lack of a culture of recognition by the administration for faculty achievement received scores of 3.5 and 3.4 respectively in Category 7, the measure of current dissatisfaction. This indicates that the faculty's dissatisfaction is moderately to substantially influenced by a lack of recognition. In Category 8, where faculty assessed how important it would be to them to have particular concerns addressed, recognition of achievement received a score of 3.8, and showcasing faculty achievements a score of 3.4, indicating that addressing this concern is substantially important to them. (There was a statistically significant difference between how important faculty viewed recognizing faculty achievement; Area 1, Art/pre-architecture, Music, Theatre, Dance scored it higher than the other Areas.)

In Category 9, where faculty selected 5 priorities in a list of recommendations, 16 % of respondents chose "nurture and enhance faculty achievement recognition" as among their five priorities. However, only 6 % chose "showcase faculty accomplishments" as among their five priorities, indicating that that was not the preferred method of rectifying the problem; therefore, we have placed it in a secondary position in our recommendations.

In Question 6, a mean value of 4.3 resulted for the responses to "quality of my colleagues." Faculty recognize that their colleagues are substantially to critically important to their current level of satisfaction. Efforts to recognize faculty achievements (and reward merit, see RA One and Five) can build upon this already positive sense of collegiality. Beyond concerns over salary, faculty generally think that their academic and professional accomplishments go unnoticed, which creates a demoralizing environment where faculty perceive that there is no incentive to achieve since no matter how hard they work there will be no recognition (see Specific Recommendation #1 below). Some faculty pointed out that a culture of recognition is a cheap and collegial way to compensate for inadequate salaries. One respondent wrote this about faculty recognition: "ISU is not a satisfying place to work because it does not value or reward faculty effort and success. Hence, I now put little energy or meaning into promoting ISU and see it as a failing institution."

Specific Culture of Recognition Recommendations

1. Reward excellence in faculty achievement

Reward excellence with prizes for key accomplishments researching and teaching in the CA&S. Consider creating (and perhaps endowing) specific awards for the sciences, social sciences, and arts and humanities. Awards should contain salary increases, not simply one-time bonuses. Knowing that a successful granting and publishing effort could result in a salary increase will be greatly motivating. Since budgets will be thin, CA&S must assure that the evaluation and conferral processes are meaningful and in line with external professional standards. Some faculty expressed concerns about award processes of university level awards, which give an appearance of good-old-boy-ism that must be avoided by CA&S.

2. Recognize faculty achievements more publicly

Recognize achievements through meaningful public announcements. When someone has been awarded a grant, published a paper, or accomplished a similar commendable accomplishment, the Dean should know about it and recognize the achievement in a meaningful venue. Currently, outlets such as *News and Notes*, the College bi-annual newsletter, and University Relations announce some achievements, but the coverage is spotty and largely subject to individual faculty members announcing their own achievements, which may exclude faculty averse to becoming self-promoters. The College should aggressively seek out important faculty achievements, both to recognize faculty internally and to make a case to an external audience that CA&S faculty are productive, engaged, key members of their profession. This could be through a monthly press release, a monthly dinner for grantees, or other public affair. The Dean's College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Research Day in the Performing Arts Center (November 2005) is a good starting model, though it should be tied to celebrating specific achievements of faculty during the previous semester. Since high profile, prestigious faculty achievements are excellent fund raising tools, the Dean may tie such a recognition program into the job description of the CA&S Development Officer.

3. Compile and Disseminate a Public-Oriented Annual Report on Major Faculty Accomplishments

The Dean can work with the Office of Research and Chairs to compile an annual list of important faculty accomplishments. This list should include prestigious grants (e.g. NSF, NIH, NEH), fellowships (e.g. Fulbright, Guggenheim), and publications (e.g. university press monographs), among other prestigious and impressive achievements. The list or report should be geared toward a public audience, including the university, the local community, the SBOE, and our external professions, as well as internal to CA&S. This annual report can also address faculty aspirations for "turning the corner."

Recommendation Area Seven: ISU-Local Community Relations

The quintessential "town-gown" conflicts frequently seem outside the control of individual faculty members or well-meaning committees. However, given the frequency with which this category was cited as a concern for CA&S faculty and as a significant factor in considerations of departure, it seems appropriate to include several recommendations for how ISU can improve its relationship with the local community. It should be noted that this is a long-term issue that cannot be rectified with a simple policy change; if several of the recommendations in other areas of concern are addressed (such as recruitment of out-of-state students) it is possible that town-gown issues will be eased.

The quantitative survey indicated that faculty scored a lack of university community in Pocatello as contributing to their dissatisfaction with ISU fairly highly (mean value = 3.5). A lower number worried that ISU and its surrounding community were "disconnected" (2.7). However, only 4 % of respondents listed recognizing faculty community-based participation as among their five priorities, indicating that interaction between faculty and their community would not contribute substantially to faculty's satisfaction with their jobs at ISU. Focus group participants noted that creating a "university culture" in Pocatello would be a very positive development, however.

Specific ISU-Local Community Recommendations

1. Community-Oriented CA&S Events: PR and Outreach

Increase community participation in our performances and events, including meaningful efforts to convince them of the importance of our work. Primarily, this includes a PR person dedicated to the

CA&S, perhaps tied to efforts to highlight faculty achievements (see also RA Three and Six) that is in direct communication with the Office of University Relations (see also RA Two). To accomplish this, hold more performances and events that provide meaningful cultural opportunities to the community, especially ones that increase our exposure to diverse populations and perspectives. This means that CA&S/ISU should explicitly seek to offer opportunities that differ from readily available offerings outside the university (i.e. don't duplicate cultural offerings with more Disney movies at the Bengal Theater) and that draw on faculty expertise and interests. This will also address concerns about the lack of a local "culture of the mind" (RA Three). Consider hosting more CA&S events at local venues, such as local coffee houses, City Hall, the Portneuf Valley Brewery, local restaurants, and Marshall Public Library.

2. Stunt to Highlight CA&S in the Community

Hold an ISU/CA&S attention-getting stunt that demonstrates our link to, and importance in, the local community. For example, on a given pay-day all CA&S faculty (and staff?) would be paid in part using \$2 bills or Sacagawea dollar coins and encouraged to spend these on pay day Friday or the following weekend in local establishments. This event would draw local media attention and demonstrate to local businesspeople the central and important role played by CA&S faculty (& staff) in the local economy. This will be especially evident as the unusual currency circulates far beyond the hands of ISU employees.

Conclusion

This Committee is very aware that faculty retention and recruitment comprise diverse, difficult, and far-reaching concerns. This should not lead to inaction or piecemeal action, but to a comprehensive effort. The College currently has the talent and many of the resources available to live up to its aspirations for becoming an institution widely known for performing superior research and creative/artistic endeavors while delivering top-notch educations to the students of Idaho and beyond. Recruitment and retention of high quality, dedicated faculty are key components of any plan to live up to that potential. In other words, we need to keep the great folks we already have here, and convince more like them to come here.

We think CA&S can lead the future of ISU and deliver on the sense or hope that ISU is “turning the corner” by substantively and publicly developing a coherent plan to address each of the seven recommendation areas. The specific recommendations may be a part of that response, but any CA&S plan should welcome future ideas, especially as academic, budgetary, and institutional environments change. Also, in order to prepare CA&S to continue to address proactively retention, satisfaction, and recruitment issues, we suggest two administrative mechanisms: 1) Implement an exit interview system, preferably some months after the faculty member has departed so as to diminish the urgency of whatever situation precipitated the departure. 2) Incorporate retention and recruitment efforts oversight into a job description at the Dean’s level. There may be contact people specific to each of the seven areas, or one contact person in charge of faculty retention and recruitment efforts globally. This will demonstrate to the faculty that their retention and recruitment is a priority, and it will allow for a system of reporting and accountability on progress related to each of the seven areas. Finally, because CA&S is in a position to lead the university in a solid direction, we encourage the Dean to meet with incoming President Vailas to discuss this report, especially since many of the concerns and recommendations exceed the parameters of the college. We also encourage the Dean to make this report widely available to initiate dialogue around this issue, in line with President Gallagher’s call to “mind the commons.”

Since our perennially austere budget is probably a given, many will instantly think *money* at the sound of any initiative tackling faculty recruitment and retention. In fact, few would dispute that we are under-paid and that funding is a key component of any effective faculty recruitment and retention plan. However, money is certainly not the sole—and often not the most important—reason we come to ISU, or stay. The faculty comprise an intelligent, creative people group of people. While not letting up pressure on the State to properly fund higher education in Idaho, this Committee believes we delivered a diverse set of innovative, effective, faculty-generated ideas for how to address faculty recruitment and retention. And we are certain that we have not exhausted the creative ideas other and future faculty can bring to these seven areas of concern. Some issues or ideas mentioned in our open-ended survey and focus groups did not receive high rankings in our quantitative survey, such as concerns about poor campus planning and design, praise for the Stephens Performing Arts Center, or concerns that non-professionally-related community service is not adequately valued. So, by identifying areas of concern and calling for a coherent plan to address each area, this creates an opportunity for CA&S to articulate disparate successes and challenges (such as campus planning or the SPAC) within an overall plan to address an issue that resonates widely with faculty.

All of us came here with the energy, motivation, and talent necessary to deliver the best education ISU can offer its students, and the best research and creative/artistic work that ISU can offer our respective professions and the world. We have and must continue to put our heads together to figure out how to achieve this potential without losing our talent to low morale, fatigue, and other universities. Our Committee hopes to create a situation where, when faculty have the choice of leaving, remaining at ISU is a positive option. In the end, this approach may be the most economically sustainable, efficient, and humane to our faculty.