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Supporting Mid-Career Faculty

Preventing and Addressing Promotion Stalls for Associate Professors at UMass Amherst

Michelle Budig
Senior Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs
**COACHE Highlights**

**Areas of Strength**

- 71% believe expectations are reasonable for promotion
- 66% think department culture encourages promotion

**Areas for Growth**

- 42% have clarity on their own likelihood of promotion
- 21% said they received formal feedback on progress toward full
- 54% expect to submit their dossier in the next five years

* = AREA UMASS OUTSHINES PEERS AND COHORTS
Why Faculty Get Stuck at Mid-Career & Impacts

"Waiting" faculty – waiting to be tapped on the shoulder, lack confidence that they have "enough,“ have colleagues resist "early" promotion. There is no early promotion!

“Discouraged” faculty with little post-tenure mentoring, unclear about criteria for promotion, interrupted funding, experienced burnout, research is undervalued. How to support?

“Selfless Citizen” faculty who deeply contribute to service and teaching missions but are largely unrewarded for this work. Notably, their efforts support the research trajectories of colleagues. How to recognize/credit their accomplishments?

“Legacy” faculty whose research profiles are not competitive with newer faculty and have low involvement in teaching or service. How to incentivize?
Preventative Measures

- Greater clarity of promotion criteria at departmental, college, and campus levels
- Voluntary & formative 4th year review of associates
- Stronger mentoring structures
- Individual planning support

Clearer Post-Tenure Guidelines
- Departmental conversations
- Non-binding Cultural documents
- College and campus level workshops

Tailored Mentoring Plan for Promotion
- Conducted by a mentoring committee
- Outcomes: promotion recommendations, resource commitments, action plan

Mentoring Resources
- Dept/College mentoring programs
- Faculty Development Workshops (sabbatical planning/post-tenure kickstart) & consultations with individual faculty
- ADVANCE Mentoring recognition/awards
Intervention Measures

• Mid-Career Research Leaves, RA support, Seed Grant
• Release/support for service

Mid-Career Research Leaves

• Targeted to long-term associates
• Awarded on competitive basis after a mentoring review
• Flexible – teaching release or RA or seed money

Accommodations for Service

• Teaching release for major service roles (UPD, GPD)
• RA or seed money for major service
• Dept. inventory of equitable service and sensitivity to mid-career research needs

Broader Assessments

• Encourage cases where accomplishments are more heaving weighted toward teaching and service/engagement achievements

Crediting Broader and Inclusive Achievements for Promotion

• Teaching emphasis
• Leadership/service emphasis
Assessments weighted more heavily toward teaching and service achievements.

**Personnel policies:**
allow for evaluations to be weighted toward teaching & engagement

**Communication:**
describe relative weighting in Provost’s Annual Tenure & Promotion Memo

**Important for any area of achievement:**
Establishing a reputation "on and off campus" (professional associations, community partners, etc.)

**Guidance on external letters:**
Highly placed "scholars or professionals" who can speak to the value of the work and accomplishments
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

• Scholarly research on teaching in one’s disciplinary field

• SoTL is methodologically rigorous, peer reviewed, and made public.

• SoTL research may include research on pedagogy in peer reviewed outlets and/or in the development, submission, and receiving of instructional or pedagogical grants.

• Helpful guidelines:

Performance of Teaching
Disciplinary Service / Public Engagement
University Service / Leadership

Sustained contributions in roles such as …

- Founder or long-term director of a high-impact institute or center
- High-level leadership positions in the Faculty Senate or Faculty Union
- Sustained, high-impact leadership at the level of the department, college, or university campus

Sustained contributions in activities such as…

- Obtaining significant external funding to support DEIJB initiatives
- Creating and launching new degree programs
- Establishing endowed scholarships, chairs, programs
- Leading one’s department to high and visible disciplinary standing
Next Project: Inclusive Scholarship @ UMass Amherst

Following recommendations of the NSF PTIE report and guidelines…

- Provost committee is investigating barriers to crediting innovative, entrepreneurial, and public engagement activities as scholarly outputs
- Focus groups with junior faculty and stakeholder survey
- Goal: incorporate guidance into 2024 Provost Annual Tenure & Promotion Memorandum

Call Out: University of Arizona’s Inclusive Scholarship
Voluntary Mid-Career Mentoring Plan Process

Mentoring team: faculty mentors, senior colleagues, chair

Identifies barriers and recommends resources for overcoming them

Guidance, resource requests, and departmental commitments are shared with the Dean

* Not a part of the personnel record
* Not a guarantee of promotion outcome or timeframe

For each of research/creative activity, teaching, and service...

Is this associate professor meeting _____ benchmarks in order to progress toward promotion in a timely fashion?

What are the specific strengths and weaknesses of the current record?

What actions should the faculty member take to strengthen the _____ record?

Recommended Supports/Commitments

• Detail department provided actions/resources
• Detail extra-departmental resources/services
Candidates for promotion to professor are required to demonstrate “a record of achievement sufficient to have gained substantial recognition on and off campus from scholars or professionals” and “significant potential for continuing professional achievement.”

**Article 4, Section 4.1** High professional standards must be the basis for all personnel decisions. Personnel recommendations and decisions shall be made only after a review of all of the qualifications and all the contributions of the individual in the areas of teaching; of research, creative or professional activity; and of service. All three areas must be considered, but *the relative weight to be given to each may be determined in the light of the duties of the faculty member.* [Emphasis added.]
PENN STATE
Assessing Teaching Effectiveness
Implementation of the Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework

Ann Clements, Asst. Vice Provost Faculty Affairs - Faculty Development
acc13@psu.edu
Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework (2021)

“A more developmental assessment of teaching effectiveness that reflects more than one data point (currently thought to be Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness) to decrease the potential for bias in all aspects of the assessment process.”

**Goal 1**
Reduce the potential for bias.

**Goal 2**
Provide a more well-rounded assessment.
Implementation Timeline
This began in 2019.

Senate Report
Fall 2019- Fall 2021
Framework created.

Implementation Taskforce
Spring 2022 - Spring 2023
Framework reviewed.

Implementation I & II
Fall 2023; Fall 2024
Framework implemented in two stages.
Implementation Challenges

Formative vs. Summative
Inconsistent design in assessment.

Peer Review
Confusion over what is peer review vs. "observation".

Not Scalable
Reliant on only open-ended student feedback.

Reduce Bias?
Unsure if it went far enough to reduce bias.

Different Criteria
Lack of definition of what effective teaching is at Penn State.
Elements of Effective Teaching
Opportunity to define effective teaching.

**Effective Design**
Well-designed courses (lessons/modules) provide a variety of student-centered learning and assessment tasks that align with course objectives. Scaffolded and transparent design of learning and assessment tasks as well as clearly structured, accessible, and relevant materials, provide appropriate challenge and support for student development and learning.

**Effective Instruction**
Effective instruction provides a clear structure to students that supports the process of learning. It takes cognitive and non-cognitive aspects of learning into consideration and on creates positive learning environments.

**Inclusive and Ethical Pedagogy**
Inclusive and ethical pedagogy is the explicit inclusion of all learners, the attention to accessibility, and the removal of barriers to learning. The instructor’s ability to understand their own assumptions, critically reflect on their knowledge and practices, and cultivate a sense of belonging lays the foundation for full participation by all students.

**Reflective and Evolving Practice**
Reflective and evolving practice involves examining one’s beliefs about teaching and learning (and mentoring and advising, if appropriate) and considering changes based on our experiences and our own learning. Reflective practice and an understanding of research-informed pedagogical techniques guide modifications to course design and instruction. The evolution of instructional practices is informed by feedback from students and enhanced through our interaction with peers and professional development opportunities.
Faculty Teaching Assessment Framework

- Peer Review
- Student Feedback
- Self-Reflection
• Units maintain their own best practices.

• Emphasis on content beyond an observation.

• Development of a "handbook" of best practices based on reducing bias that utilizes effective teaching elements.
• The addition of a mid-semester survey for students in all classes.
  • Results are only available to the instructor (not administrators).
  • Results cannot be used in the promotion and tenure process.

• Change the focus of the questions from "rate the quality of the instructor and the course" to asking students to assess their own learning.
• What has been the most helpful for your learning in this course so far? Please consider course materials/resources, activities/assignments, interactions with peers and faculty, or any other aspects that have helped you learn. (OE)

• I am confident that I understand what I am expected to learn in this course. [Likert]

• The instructor creates a welcoming and inclusive environment. [Likert] In the space provided, please provide an explanation for your rating. (OE)

• Do you know how to contact your instructor? [yes/no]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Effective Teaching</th>
<th>JIT Mid-Semester Feedback Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Design</td>
<td>Questions 1, 2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Instruction</td>
<td>Question 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive and Ethical Pedagogy</td>
<td>Questions 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective and Evolving Practice</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• In a few sentences, please provide feedback on your learning experience in this course. Consider the assignments and feedback you received, materials, learning activities and interactions with peers, your interactions with the instructor and other aspects related to your learning experience that you want to mention. (OE)

• The overall structure of the course (content and materials, assignments, activities) promoted a meaningful learning experience for me. [Likert]

• The instructor created a welcoming and inclusive environment. [Likert] In the space provided, please provide an explanation for your rating. (OE)

• If your course required materials, which materials or resources enhanced your learning? How? (OE, Instructor only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Effective Teaching</th>
<th>JIT Semester End Feedback Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Design</td>
<td>Questions 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Instruction</td>
<td>Questions 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive and Ethical Pedagogy</td>
<td>Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective and Evolving Practice</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• What are the most important things you learned in this course? (OE, Instructor only)

• Do you have any recommendations for this course? (OE, Instructor only)
Numerical and open-ended responses in the end-of-semester survey will not be shared with P&T committees...

Instead, the dossier will include a report on student feedback prepared by the Student Feedback Review Committee.

1. Chairperson (elected)
2. Member selected by candidate
3. Member selected by chairperson from list created by administrator
• Integrated into the annual review process (not in P&T Dossier).

• Units maintain their own best practices.

• Units must provide templates or rubrics (samples are provided).

• 1,000-word limit.
Thank you for listening!

Contact us

acc13@psu.edu
vpfa.psu.edu
Faculty Annual Evaluations: Framework and Practice

Elizabeth Weeks
Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
Charles H. Kirbo Chair in Law
Framework
University of Georgia

- Founded 1785
- 5 campuses
- 18 schools and colleges
  - 75 PTUs
  - 16 CAPUs
- 40,118 total enrollment
  - 30,166 undergraduate
  - 9,952 graduate
- 3,130 FT faculty
  - 1,708 T/TT
  - 1,422 NTT
- 4 NCAA football national titles
University System of Georgia

- 159 counties
- 26 institutions
  - 4 research universities
  - 4 comprehensive universities
  - 9 state universities
  - 9 state colleges
  - Georgia Public Library Service
- 334,459 total enrollment
- 74,446 degrees conferred
- 19-member BOR
  - 14 from state congressional districts
  - 5 appointed at-large
  - 7-year terms
  - BOR elects Chancellor
Faculty Tracks at UGA

7 Promotion Tracks
• Academic Rank (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor)
• Clinical Track (Clinical Prof, Clinical Assoc Prof, Clinical Asst Prof, Clinical Instructor)
• Lecturer (Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer)
• Research Scientist (Assistant RS, Associate RS, Senior RS)
• Academic (AP Associate, AP, Senior AP)
• Public Service & Outreach (PS Assistant, PS Associate, Senior PS Associate)
• Librarian/Archivist (I – IV)

Other Faculty Types
• Administrative A
• Staff Physicians
• Limited-term
• Part-time
• Adjunct
• Emeritus
Faculty Review Stages

- Annual Evaluation
- Third-year Review
- P&T Review
- Promotion Review
- Post-tenure Review
1.06 Evaluation

Evaluation of faculty members includes written annual reviews and feedback from peers. Evaluations also include a thorough review for assistant professors during the third year of appointment at the University of Georgia and a review every five years following the award of tenure.

1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation

Each faculty member at the University of Georgia, regardless of rank or responsibilities, must receive a written annual evaluation of his or her performance. All annual evaluations of faculty performance must be supported by an annual activity report from UGA Elements. Each evaluation must address the components outlined in the following framework. However, evaluators may use their own format and include additional components if they wish. Some units may have unique needs that require an adjustment to some component of the annual evaluation letter. Units should work directly with their dean for approval of any adjustments and to ensure that all faculty members in their units are fully informed. A faculty member may or may not respond to his/her annual evaluation in writing; any such response will become part of the record. An editable copy of the evaluation framework is posted at the Office of Faculty Affairs website.
Elements Upgrade to Version 6

On Monday, 26 April 2021, UGA Elements will be upgraded to v6.2. Elements v6.2 is a significant departure from the current version so we have provided a video introduction to how to navigate the new interface.

Experts@UGA

Upcoming Launch of Faculty Expertise Portal

Over the next several months, a team of faculty and administrators will design and configure a new faculty expertise portal that will provide the public with information about the research, scholarship, and creative endeavors of UGA faculty members in a clear and engaging way.
SCHOLARLY & CREATIVE WORKS

BOOK
The Law of American Health Care, Third Edition
10 Feb 2023
Weeks E, Outterson K, Huberfeld N... 1 more

CHAPTER
Feminist Judgments: Health Law Rewritten
22 Dec 2022 • Cambridge University Press

PROFESSIONAL/SCHOLARLY PRESENTATION [UNPUBLISHED]
Federal COVID Mandates
27 Oct 2022 • UGA College of Public Health 11th Annual State of the Public’s Health Conference

PROFESSIONAL/SCHOLARLY PRESENTATION [UNPUBLISHED]
Federal COVID Mandates, Panel on Then & Now: The Constitution & Vaccine Mandates
16 Sep 2022 • National Vaccine Law Conference

CHAPTER
Private Insurance Limits and Responses
23 Mar 2021 • Assessing Legal Responses to COVID-19: Legal Recommendations for a Safer, More Equitable Future • 88-95
Faculty Evaluation Policy Revision Timeline

- September 2020: USG PTR Working Group charged
- June 2021: USG PTR Working Group Report issued
- September 2021: BOR meeting, policies presented
- October 2021: BOR meeting, policies approved
- November 2021: FEPP Working Group charged
- February 2022: USG Handbook revisions finalized; FEPP recharged
- April 2022: University Council approved Annual Eval and SSA
- September 2022: University Council approved remaining policies
- October 2022: USG approved all UGA revised policies
- December 2022: UGA PTU Annual Evaluation revisions due
Annual Evaluation Revisions

• Five-point evaluation scale

• Evaluation of student success activities within existing areas of allocated effort

• Evaluator 1:1 meeting with faculty member
  • Faculty member signs statement acknowledging receipt of evaluation
  • Faculty member rebuttal allowed; evaluator response required

• Annual evaluations included in third-year review, P&T, and PTR

• All faculty, score of 1 or 2 → 1-year Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)
  • PRP must be approved by the dean and filed with Faculty Affairs/Provost’s Office
  • Four PRP progress report meetings (spring, fall, fall, and spring)

• Tenured faculty, 2 consecutive years of score of 1 or 2 → Accelerated PTR
  • Faculty-driven, comprehensive review
  • Otherwise, 5-year periodic PTR, periodic Review of Administrators
8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel

8.3.5.1 Faculty

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with Board of Regents’ policies, the Academic and Student Affairs Handbook and the statutes of the institution, against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The criteria shall include evaluation of instruction, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service as is appropriate to the faculty member’s institution, school or college, and department, and responsibilities. The criteria shall be submitted to the USG Chief Academic Officer for review and approval.

Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness and student learning as the main focus of these student evaluations. The evaluation procedures may also utilize a system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the faculty member’s professional development across the scope of their responsibilities. In those cases, in which a faculty member’s primary responsibilities do not include teaching, the evaluation should focus on excellence in those areas (e.g., research, administration, and elements of student success) where the individual’s major responsibilities lie. While a faculty member’s performance evaluation may be deemed as “Not Meeting Expectations” for other reasons, they must be so assessed if a majority of their work responsibilities are assessed as “Not Meeting Expectations”.

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution shall conduct in-depth pre-tenure reviews of all faculty in their third year of progress toward tenure with a focus on the criteria established for promotion and tenure, emphasizing excellence in teaching and involvement in student success activities. The institution shall develop pre-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions.

The result of the faculty member’s annual evaluations will be utilized as a part of subsequent pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews as well as retention, promotion, and tenure decisions.
Written evaluation includes effort allocation

This constitutes your annual written evaluation required by Section 8.3.5.1 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual and Section 4.4, Faculty Evaluation Systems, of the University System of Georgia Academic and Student Affairs Handbook. Your assigned allocation of effort this year was [x%] scholarship, [y%] teaching, [z%] service, and [zz%] administration (or other).

The following 5-point scale describes the scores in each category below:

1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
2 – Needs Improvement
3 – Meets Expectations
4 – Exceeds Expectations
5 – Exemplary

[The faculty member should be evaluated in each category below and should include involvement in student success activities, as defined in Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.10-10, in a particular area, or across the four, area(s) of effort. Faculty should be evaluated based upon their Promotion
1.10-10 Student Success Activities

As specified in University System of Georgia Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3, Additional Policies for Faculty, teaching faculty reviews, including annual evaluations, third-year review, and post-tenure review, as well as University and discipline-specific criteria for promotion and tenure, shall include evaluation of teaching faculty members’ involvement in student success activities.

Student success activities is a comprehensive term for teaching faculty effort expended to support the short- and long-term academic and professional achievements of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees. Student success is supported by in class as well as outside of class efforts. Involvement in student success activities is not predicated upon additional allocation of effort but is included within the faculty member’s allocation of effort in instruction, research/scholarship/creative work, service, and administration, as applicable. Units are responsible for further specification of student success activities in their criteria for all review processes as relevant to their disciplines and practices.

Consistent with the USG Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, Section 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems, and recognizing that faculty members can promote student success in a variety of ways, assessment should focus on documenting a faculty member’s quality involvement in a small number of student success activities to maximize effectiveness and engagement.

Examples of student success activities, by area of effort, may include but are not limited to, the following:
Annual Evaluation

P&T Review

Promotion Review

Third-year Review

Post-tenure Review
Practice
# Department Head Roles: Faculty Developer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>% Reporting High Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recruit and select faculty</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Represent dept. to administration and the field</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluate faculty performance</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encourage faculty research and publication</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reduce conflict among faculty</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Manage department resources</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Encourage professional development of faculty</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Develop and initiate long-range dept. goals</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Remain current within academic discipline</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provide informal faculty leadership</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prepare and propose budgets</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Solicit ideas to improve the department</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STEPS within annual evaluation session . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listen</th>
<th>Review faculty annual report together and listen to comments from faculty member.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identify | Identify their unique contributions and qualities. Express gratitude.  
Help them recognize their strengths and meaning/purpose of their work for unit. |
| Ask   | Ask about goals and action plans going forward to create vision for success within their faculty responsibilities. |
| Coach | Coach them with questions and paraphrasing of their ideas.  
Help them find ways to support unit goals on their own path and solutions. |
| Mentor | Mentor with sharing resources, insights, and personal vignettes. |
Key takeaway:
Finalize written evaluation after conversation.
Thank you!