

College of Liberal Arts
Executive Council Retreat
August 14, 2008
8:00 a.m. -3:00 p.m.

Dean Johnson opened the retreat with comments about its importance in generating ideas and fostering leadership. An updated chart tracking faculty on the tenure track and retirements by department showed variation across departments but consistency in the increase in the rate of faculty hiring: 185 faculty have been hired since 1998 (with 184 prior to 1998). Three-fourths to two-thirds of faculty will have been hired in the last decade; departments will soon have a majority of faculty hired since 1998, as is the case with some departments now. Retirements are unpredictable. The increase in rate of tenure-track hires raises issues for the College, among them supporting diversity, sustaining interdisciplinarity, improving retention, and post-tenure faculty development.

The retreat progressed with one-hour sessions led by teams of department heads who addressed mentoring, diversity, interdisciplinarity, and faculty development (pre- and post-tenure).

Department Approaches to Mentoring. Pat Hurley (Assoc. Dean, former head of Political Science) and Walter Buenger (History).

Walter began with attitudes toward mentoring: don't be patronizing or monitor too closely, be flexible and sensitive to differences, include new faculty in the department's intellectual community. He noted that some senior faculty will have a fixed perspective, which may need to be loosened. Mentoring is a learning process for mentors as well as mentees. Mentoring should be a seamless process and consistent, expectations should be conveyed consistently, mentoring should continue at least through year three after promotion and retention should be monitored. Walter also expressed the hope that by year three, faculty should still have internal motivation and should still consider academics a joy, a profession with intrinsic value, the work done for its own sake. He observed that we are in a profession that does not have the kinds of external rewards of other professions. Hence, heads should be careful not to kill internal motivation. He advised heads to prepare a packet for new people with every possible detail about the department, university, and environs based on what other new people have needed to know.

Pat Hurley continued with specifics about successful mentoring in Political Science and what doesn't work. She began with what works. Assistant professors need more than one mentor. Views of promotion and tenure might differ. Mentors should come from different sub-fields, and should be able to address different aspects of the process (teaching, work-life balance, etc.). Some mentoring might need to be outside the mentee's comfort zone. Individual

mentoring relationships can be augmented with departmental workshops based on what junior faculty say they need and want to know, with junior faculty generating the topics. It is vital that junior faculty receive very clear, focused and precise written feedback from department heads at annual review. Mentoring can be by example or context, and a context of highly motivated senior faculty raises the expectation.

Pat shifted to what doesn't work. Some mentees are unwilling to be mentored because they don't want advice, think they don't need it, or simply don't follow important advice such as "stop doing x, y, z so you can focus on a, b, c." Even the best, most well-intended mentoring cannot ameliorate a junior faculty member with a different agenda than that of the College or Department. The best mentoring in these cases might be to help them recognize that there is a mismatch. (These are also things to watch for in hiring). She raised the issue of tracking outcome measures – how do we know when, if, and how mentoring is working.

Discussion took many directions. A central concern is the tendency for faculty to lose connection with their internal motivation to work and enjoyment of the process. Research studies do show that emphasis on external motivations can inhibit people's enjoyment of what they do. Walter wondered if something in the tenure and promotion system does kill the desire and love for research, writing, and thinking. If the number of associate professors who stop working is an indication, there may indeed be counterproductive pressures and incentives. If that's so, looser mentoring that does not impose demands or make demands and expectations may be more effective. The History department has annual meetings with faculty by rank and follow-up lunches with assistant professors in the spring.

Dean Johnson asked if annual evaluations recognize good mentoring. Rick Street (Communication) asks junior faculty what kinds of mentors were helpful, or not, and why. Dean Johnson asked if this factors into merit raises. Les Morey (Psychology) awards small internal grants for collaborative development, with priority based on how far apart in rank and field the collaborators were. The effort was to get faculty to seek each other out.

Discussion reinforced these issues by example and anecdote. Full faculty need to include junior faculty, and formal mentoring can help with this. A drawback is that some senior mentors might try to impose their own strategies inappropriately on junior faculty, which is why multiple mentors are important. The English department assigns transitional mentors in junior faculty's first year, which gives people a chance to get to know and choose mentors. Problems were also discussed. Euro has one senior faculty member who is an exceptional mentor and too much in demand. If there are senior faculty whose tactics are grounded in arrogance and model that behavior, or who are out of touch and isolated can be detrimental. Departmental culture is among the toughest thing to change,

especially if there are senior faculty who set a particular tone of arrogance, isolation. One problem has been resistance from senior faculty to stopping the clock for pregnancy for junior faculty.

The university is flux on many levels, which presents a challenge to creating intellectual community. Senior faculty members' identity may be tied to a particular kind of departmental culture and they may be resistant to change. If that behavior is modeled, junior faculty may choose isolation. In discussion, the Glasscock Center and the interdisciplinary programs emerged as vital sites for intellectual community, collegiality, sharing research, and social exchange. There are two models in the English Department -- communitarian/participatory and individualistic. The latter -- "I'm going to go home and do my work"-- is more rewarded. Some of the most successful scholars are not grounded in intellectual community of the department or centers but in their professional disciplines. People in mid-career (8-10 year range) need mentoring to keep moving through the middle of their careers.

Stagnation at the associate level emerged as a major issue around concerns such as: How can heads re-energize burned-out faculty? Are standards too high? Are we not hiring people who can sustain productivity? Or do we need to mentor them through a down cycle when enthusiasm wanes?

There needs to be something in the reward system to keep these people motivated. The evaluation process may be part of what is "killing" people's enthusiasm for research. While the reward structure acknowledges individual merit, faculty are also in competition with their colleagues. Within any department there are stars, which presents a challenge for keeping non-stars feeling part of the community. The senior people need to be made to understand that they are part of a whole -- that their leaves require extra work on the part of others. What can be done with colleagues who for whatever reason are simply not going to achieve in a research context -- how can their contributions be acknowledged? The observation was made that assistant professors are critical readers of social and political cultures: structural expectations need to be made so that those who are not producing are part of a community. Work-life balance comes into play here. There are factors beyond the university that might affect people's participation in intellectual life and scholarly contributions to national prominence. One perspective is to offer the stick rather than carrot. That is, if people want the rewards of the job, they have to do the work. If you are not publishing, you teach more (some universities track people in research and teaching).

Dean Johnson summarized specifics that heads can take to their executive committees:

1. treating mentoring as a ten-year process to and beyond tenure
2. appointing transitional, 1 year mentors
3. discussion in departments about formal and informal mentoring
4. holding department meetings by rank and follow-up lunches
5. funding opportunities to encourage junior-senior research collaboration

6. developing a departmental culture that emphasizes senior responsibility
7. appointing multiple mentors and mentors outside junior faculty comfort zones
8. provide clear, precise written feedback at annual review
9. develop mechanisms for assessment, talking with mentees
10. focus on the mentee/mentor dyad -- develop a departmental culture of collaboration, collegiality, productivity in life context requires broad buy-in from faculty at all ranks
11. circulate readings, perhaps use the online resource "Academics Anonymous"

Dean Johnson asked what the College can do to assist with mentoring. One suggestion was to bring mentors together from different departments to share. The Department of Sociology brings in former members of the DAC to meet with junior faculty.

Fostering Diversity. Mark Fosset (Sociology) and Dan Conway (Philosophy).

Dean Johnson complimented the heads for their efforts to foster diversity. The next session focused on the next steps in sustaining a culturally and academically diverse College. He called attention to the sheet on demographics and the coming opportunities to hire new faculty from diverse pools, with the awareness that candidates from underrepresented groups will want to know what efforts are made and sustained in diversity.

Dan Conway and Mark Fosset distributed a handout with bullet points to serve as talking points.

Dan began by talking about the role of the department diversity committee. He noted that he works with the Philosophy Department diversity committee to improve the department's programs and curriculum, gives the committee authority (for example, to overrule choices of other committees), and gives the committee a budget. The result has been measurable success in changing the department culture. A second area is using the anecdotes put together by Rick Street (Communication). Dan asked for advice on managing faculty resentment (usually around salary) and educating faculty about diversity, noting that people who complain the most about diversity efforts are often the people who put themselves on the margins of departmental culture. It is important to call in the marginal faculty members who simply don't understand the importance of diversity (and other things) for the college and university. Leadership is crucial. Heads have to demonstrate the commitment to diversity and the simultaneous commitment to hiring the best people possible. Dan asked for advice on this issue as well.

Mark Fosset spoke about the importance of a core of faculty who can take a committed leadership role in recruitment, retention, mentoring. Hiring the best also means having a top department. The thorniest issues are retention,

recruitment, and salary structure. People need to understand how the market works. In Sociology, most of the key players recognize that efforts in diversity enhance the good of the department and can subordinate the desire “to have everything pretty in the salary structure.” In the long term salaries will improve across the board as departments improve. It can be difficult when people try to block efforts to hire for diversity. Resources have been forthcoming from the College.

Other heads are having the same problems with faculty who complain about the salary structure. Promoting diversity is “the right thing to do,” but this does not always appear a strong argument to people who argue that the “right” thing to do is equalize the salary structure apart from market forces.

One solution is having people work together on common processes and projects. Diversity often prompts an emotional rather than intellectual response. Sometimes diversity requires attention to the emotional component of creating community when the intellectual culture is isolationist. One hindrance has been thinking that just bringing in people of “difference” is sufficient, without attention to building intellectual community. Retention is an issue. In this vein, another significant issue in recruitment and retention is that cosmopolitan faculty often experience shock at the provinciality and narrow-mindedness of the students. The “Bryan-College Station metroplex” can make new faculty want to be elsewhere and makes retention difficult.

Diversity has a tendency to be top-down. The Department of Communication takes a survey of students through focus groups. One comment is that faculty are uncomfortable talking about race and don’t know how to handle it in the classroom. Perhaps as a result, students often assume that “diversity” means “political correctness.” (The survey report will be circulated among the department heads.) One comment heard frequently from minority faculty is that some faculty in their own departments “don’t get it” and don’t understand why minority faculty might have difficulty.

Faculty groups are in place to assist – the committee on intellectual climate and diversity and college diversity committee provide excellent networks and information. Heads can use the support networks available in the college and through the DOF to negotiate issues.

Dean Johnson asked what heads thought about the article “Intergroup Dialogue Promoted as Using Racial Tension to Teach” from the Chronicle of Higher Education. If a faculty member wanted to address diversity – what would heads need to help? Mark Fosset noted that some fields such as sociology invest in research on diversity. Also that there needs to be a safe environment for dialogue so that conversations happen, rather than shouting matches. He advocated internal workshops on teaching in departments. Walter Beunger noted that he has hired in specific areas, such as border studies (which is where

the profession is going), to introduce diversity into the department's intellectual climate. This approach to diversifying raised a different set of concerns about research and course content. These research areas can become niches. In contrast to this observation, the point was made that everything is a niche, that what we think of as normative research in a discipline is really a niche (just a bigger one). Research on areas in Africana studies, for example, are sometimes labeled niches. It was noted that A&M is 10-15 years behind the national curve. At other major institutions, minority faculty are less visible as special and their research areas not necessarily labeled as specialized niches. At A&M, being a minority faculty member who teaches in research areas that are cross-cultural, multicultural, or localized in non-western cultures affects classroom can affect the experience of teaching, as well as ghettoize courses. Even the structure of the curriculum reinforces the marginalization – students have to take a course on diversity that are marked as distinctive from the rest of the curriculum.

The ASA workshop mentioned by Mark Fosset earlier addressed specifically the non-niche effort – that diversity must be spread across all courses as intellectual content. The courses are more meaningful, and the sense of compartmentalization went away when diversity is part of the course content. Training for faculty who want to do this is crucial and it would be helpful to monitor courses and faculty who integrate diversity into their standard courses. One department head noted that some faculty have been taken out of required courses when there is not sensitivity to or willingness to deal with broadening out of “niche” mentality.

The move from “niche” to interdisciplinarity might be helped by an institute for diversity. The assumptions about what authority looks like, and what a niche research field is, continue to go unchallenged. In this way A&M requires extra effort. The burden for this will fall on junior members who are also trying to get tenure. This is a practical problem – the individualistic nature of productivity and commitment to diversity are in conflict with time spent. The cognitive load on minority faculty is intense.

Heads made several suggestions. Don't overburden minority and women is the first step; approach Charlie with requests to hire at the senior level; team teach to offer multiple perspectives in intellectual work and life experience; be aware that people may think they are emphasizing diversity when in fact they are not; explore modes of collaboration such as reading groups, workshops, syllabus writing, peer review. Pam Matthews noted that diversity needs to be built into assessment plans. American Studies has been trying to globalize with the result that there has to be an intellectual apparatus for including diversity in each course. Dean Johnson expressed a wish to hire senior faculty and President Murano has expressed desire to hire 20-40 senior star faculty, both of which imply diversifying the faculty. The suggestion made to contact the Multi-University Intergroup Dialogue.

Dean Johnson identified the next steps in fostering diversity:

1. define the role of diversity committee
2. use vignettes for teaching and assisting faculty understanding diversity
3. build diversity into core committees and curriculum
4. focus groups that involve students in diversity concerns
5. develop tools to help faculty assess classes and approach to diversity; professional association statements might help define diversity within a department
6. give thought to how to not marginalize race and gender scholarship; reframe the curriculum to draw on interdisciplinarity.
7. create team taught courses, carefully select who teaches required courses
8. build diversity into assessment tools
9. the college could create a venue for discussion
10. hold internal workshops to help faculty deal with diversity
11. recognize the cognitive load on minority faculty in teaching, research

Coming to Terms with Interdisciplinarity. Rick Street (Communication),
Claudia Nelson (Women's Studies)

Dean Johnson introduced interdisciplinarity in the context of Vision 2020. The college has created interdisciplinary programs, and has established an oversight committee on the development of programs. Focus is on nurturing faculty who have interdisciplinary interests.

Claudia noted that faculty who are not interdisciplinary hires may be interdisciplinary in their thinking. Interdisciplinarity has a role in mentoring. What if a faculty member is assigned to one department but wants to publish outside the "disciplinary" journals – what effect does that have on someone who wants to "color outside the lines"? Faculty of Generation X will be psychologically different from those of the Baby Boom generation and more intellectually flexible. The college's receptivity to this generational shift needs to be stressed. Interdisciplinary programs provide opportunities for people to talk together – they create a lattice structure in which people can talk at the intersections. Claudia noted that A&M's climate is already quite interdisciplinary in comparison with other universities and that this helps with retention and recruitment.

Rick Street noted in the title of the session the phrase, "coming to terms". Structural interdisciplinary is a help to diversity – the two are inextricably entwined in WMST and Africana Studies. Interdisciplinary programs came from disciplinary disenfranchisement. These are more close to humanities than to social sciences. In the Social Science it may be harder for faculty to make connections with alternative modes of knowing. But concerns for gender, race, and ethnicity should be across the boards. Rick encouraged taking on interdisciplinary hires in the social sciences, noting that Communication

embraces both social science and humanities – and that interdisciplinarity is more compatible with humanities faculty. But making these interdisciplinary hires work presents some logistical difficulties: (1) cross-appointed faculty's time is divided, but this is not so different from the time pressures on people who commute, (2) the disciplinary alliances are different – top journals in one field are likely to be secondary in the other. (3) People can be marginalized, which can be used against them.

The “niche” field issue comes back for people in specialized or interdisciplinary fields when second tier or sub-field journals in the major discipline are top journals (and more narrowly focused) for their interdisciplinary program. Finding peers nationally in the field can also be a problem. The Joint Appointment oversight committee raised the importance of discussing article placement and journal rankings when the position description is framed, as well as teaching load, and other promotion and tenure issues. What should never happen is that a new, interdisciplinary hire is made to bear the burden of being a case study on which these issues are hashed out.

Departments can also face this issue. A&M's English department has emerged as an interdisciplinary department, a “grassroots kind of a thing,” which is rather unique nationally. Why this particular department is more invested in interdisciplinarity is a complicated historical and methodological issue.

In Psychology, there is a lot of collaboration with the sciences, and several cross-college appointments. Finding ways to create mechanisms that can serve as catalysts for getting people to work together on grant proposals is one strategy for encouraging cross-college interdisciplinarity. Susan Stabile (American Studies) spoke about the effort to put together an interdisciplinary symposium on recycling and the challenge of getting science people to work on generating ideas, which is one of the hallmarks of the humanities disciplines.

Interdisciplinary programs need buy-in from departments. Kimberly Brown (Africana Studies) spoke to the goal of having interdisciplinary programs develop into departments. Disciplines represent a method, a particular mode of thinking; to the extent that departments come out of disciplines, there are intellectual commitments embedded in the formation of departments. In contrast, interdisciplinary programs create intellectual communities (not proto-departments).

Charlie called attention to the article from *Liberal Education*, *Interdisciplinary Studies*, which calls for intellectual generosity rather than isolationism and narrow professionalization. The article suggests that by definition disciplines limit intellectual generosity. Having departments accept the fact that there are different ways to approach something is key. Charlie opened discussion around the question, What can the college do to foster intellectual generosity? Jimmie Killingsworth noted that the College has become less department-focused. There is potential for interdisciplinary programs not to replicate department disciplinary

department structures. Claudia noted that people are interdisciplinary in different ways. People should be talking to people who have interests in common but different ways of approaching interests, topics, and issues. Interdisciplinarity is sometimes thematic rather than methodological. Expanding where and how interdisciplinarity can play out – intellectual commitments are not limited to race, ethnicity, gender – will be to the College's advantage. There will always be a need for non-department mechanisms to foster collaboration, such as interdisciplinary research centers in the social sciences as well as the humanities. This is a shift in organization of university – a shift from core readings, knowledge, and method, to a thematic orientation, with different methodologies employed. Some departments have had conversations about interdisciplinarity, others have not. It is to departments' advantage to introduce and discuss interdisciplinarity.

Dean Johnson summarized action items from this session.

1. have discussions on publishing venues and evaluations
2. meet the challenge of working with other units across the university
3. address the lack of structure for fostering cross-disciplinary discussion, for example, the need for a nexus in the social sciences (a unit akin to the Glasscock Center for Humanities Research).
4. the indicators of success are department oriented and may need to recognize interdisciplinarity
5. Centers AND Departments can be sites of interdisciplinarity, as well as non-curricular programs.

Over the lunch break, Dean of Faculties Karan Watson spoke to the Council. Karan noted that conversations in the liberal arts are distinctly different than those in the sciences. The reason the liberal arts are at the heart of the university, rather than sciences, is because of the emphasis on communication. Strong science programs form around projects. Humanities, and some social sciences, emphasize dialogue.

Karan noted that many of the programs A&M has in place are now written about in the literature on faculty development and retention. A&M is grounded in the idea that "If they don't connect to the institution, they won't develop." New faculty orientation (for tenure-track, tenured, and non-tenure track) puts people in contact with each other initially, but contact must continue. Workshops that give people skill sets can be useful, but equally (if not more) important are workshops that provide ways for people to get together and talk about what they find difficult. For example, international faculty find one of the hardest aspects of A&M is dealing with the Department of Public Safety. Talking about such difficulties with other faculty is extremely helpful. Karan noted that we have expanded from 12 faculty networks to 35, but that we still lose the most faculty, especially minorities and women, just after tenure.

She then shifted to address the College of Liberal Arts more specifically in this context. Exit interviews show that the CLLA has more people pre-tenure leaving than the other colleges. These faculty haven't been asked to leave, they are leaving by their own choice. CLLA also has more tenure cases turned down than other colleges. CLLA departures show more frustration than in other colleges. Departing faculty talk about how nice people are, but also say they received mixed messages. For example, they say mentoring is largely positive mentoring but that no one was really telling them what isn't going to fly for tenure and promotion. Karan pointed out the difference between advising and mentoring. Mentoring involves professional development, willingness to broker professional situations and helping someone move forward professionally. Part of the problem is senior colleagues who "anti-mentor," and use junior faculty to wage a war within the department or simply reinforce that what they themselves do is all that is important. Just throwing people together and assume they'll work together doesn't always work. Karan reinforced suggestions made earlier, such as setting time limits on mentoring (one year), so that if a relationship does not develop a junior faculty member can work with another mentor after a set period of time.

The College of Liberal Arts has the highest percentage of faculty who report insensitive comments (largely around gender, race, political affiliation, and sexual orientation) than any other college. This could reflect a heightened sensitivity to language. There is general perception from departing faculty is that there are unwritten rules in the College, but at the same time departing faculty also say that departments are extremely rigid. This is part of the mixed message: 46% concerned about unwritten rules, 38% concerned about rigidity. Karan suggested, again reflecting comments earlier in the retreat, making clear what is expected of junior faculty. When there are unwritten rules, people are overstressed they don't make progress. The most important factor seems to be making sure senior faculty behave as mature university citizens. When that is the department culture, there is less need to take care of junior faculty.

There were fewer grievances this year than last in CLLA. Karan cited top factors that make a department head effective: communicating a shared (not personal) vision, handling disagreements in the department, encouraging faculty, maintaining high academic standards across the board, and listening. Larger departments are harder to manage.

Skill workshops requested most often are grantwriting and development, writing for publication, and life balance (how do I rebound from disappointment/how do I reenergize?). Most dissatisfied faculty are associate professors caught between an insane pace of productivity and total shutdown. The people who have lost energy are not the people who are going to go away. The most satisfied are the administrators. Administrators think the system works, whereas associate professors are not sure the system works. Karan observed that CLLA is large but doesn't have a sense that it's important.

Joe Golsan (Euro) asked if exit interviews showed that CLLA faculty who leave have a dimmer view of the Bryan-College Station than those in other colleges. The number one reason for leaving is how colleagues treated them. Pam Matthews asked for kinds of general examples of this. There is a general sense is that despite heavy recruitment there was no welcome when new faculty actually arrived but rather the sense that junior faculty felt they were being used by senior faculty in their departments. Charlie asked if there were particular innovations or initiatives that might help mentoring (for senior or junior faculty). Karan suggested MentorNet, where mentoring is done electronically and the process is systematic.

Larry Oliver brought up stalled associate professors and asked if there are other colleges that track tenured faculty into research or teaching. Karan said there are examples in Engineering, Education, and Geosciences. Engineering has three categories, all of which can earn merit: research active, not research active, and research inactive. "Research active" which warrants a 2/1; teaching load in the "research inactive" category (which basically means research has shut down completely), may go higher. Karan said department heads should not be hesitant to give harsh reviews that indicate clearly what people need to do to achieve merit and other rewards.

Faculty Development Following Tenure Kimmie Killingsworth (English), Larry Oliver (acting Head, Economics and Associate Dean for Diversity)

Dean Johnson introduced the last topic, aspects of which had come up in each of the preceding discussions.

Larry Oliver noted that most of what he would be talking about has been addressed in other sessions. Mentoring is essential for ten years as faculty move through promotion to associate then to full professor. Economics has a meeting about associate professors, and the summary reports go into annual reports (in a three year cycle). These reports are clear and indicate where the person's record stands, and where the individual needs to be in his/her trajectory. Additional resources to help associate professors toward promotion are also in place. Larry noted how different department cultures are. When a department culture is toxic, it may be necessary to get senior faculty to change their behaviors and professional habits. The only other option is to create opportunities for associate professors to get into a healthier culture. The Glasscock Center allows that, as does the Women's Faculty Network. It is more difficult for people in social sciences to find support of this kind. A center or institute for social sciences would be appropriate and would help keep associate professors active by getting them out of a department, into the institution, and meeting people across the college. Service outside departments also gives faculty an outlet. Differential teaching loads are another helpful strategy.

Jimmie Killingsworth said associate professors had approached him about ways to get promoted and observed that this is a national problem. People are usually promoted at a mature time in life when family and other personal issues -- such as divorce, children in late teens, single parenting, and dealing with being single -- make it a difficult time. There may also be factors directly tied to the academic profession -- a feeling of being in mid-career and losing the attention of being a rising star, fear that the second project is not as interesting as one thought. Jimmie observed that if people spend 10 years doing service without an active research agenda, bitterness can develop. Jimmie uses program money to give faculty development grants in two categories: to associate professors on the verge of finishing a book, and seed money for senior faculty who want to write a proposal for major national award. The grants don't compensate for a range of psychological and sociological factors, but it is what a head can do. Jimmie found that annual review letters that were clear but indicated "this is not up to par" did not sit well with recipients. Some people said they needed encouragement, not reality. Jimmie has heard the mixed message complaint Karan Watson identified and strives for balance between encouragement and accuracy.

Joe Golsan talked about adjusting teaching load up and research down where appropriate. He reinforced Karan's report about adjusting teaching and research. It has to be formalized and discussed by faculty. A system that acknowledges research stars and excess teaching can work. Another system is a reduction in teaching with expectation that there is a research product. Joe advocated structural change. Associate professors become the workhorses of the department but find that administrative work curtails the research. He repeated a theme that came up throughout the retreat, that heads need to look at faculty development not as an associate professor problem but as a full professor problem. Full professors need to be actively engaged in the life of the department. Judith Hamera noted that Performance Studies has adjusted research and teaching loads as appropriate.

A vital issue in some departments is the balance of succession planning that goes with administration. Judith observed that faculty are seeing the nature of the demands of department head and administrative positions as incompatible with research. She suggested college-level initiatives to encourage and mentor people with administrative talent without burning them out. She also suggested built-in rejuvenation for department heads. Two year terms for department heads might help prevent burnout and give more people the opportunity to experience the kinds of decisions and pressures heads face (thereby increasing senior faculty's sensitivity).

A lot of administration in departments is being done by associate professors, which holds back promotion. If CLLA promotion guidelines require excellence in two areas, could someone be promoted on a record of primarily teaching and administration (administration as distinct from committee service)? There is a

problem with letting non-productive researchers teach more because they get more money than lecturers. Course reductions are given for administration. Who says research stops when administration begins? We have to enable associate professors to do research or give credit for administration – one or the other. Judith Hamera brought up the practice of appointing “administrative fellows” who are research active but take a high level administrative assignment for a semester. The research expectation does not change, but for a particular period, the person’s primary focus is administration. There is a problem with associate professors who have not done significant research commanding respect as administrators. Pam Mathews noted that teaching and research are not necessarily in competition but often feed each other. Jimmie is concerned with balance between research and teaching. Serving on doctoral committees is a harder issue to address – equalizing this can be difficult.

Dean Johnson asked if heads identify faculty whose research is good but who are not active, developing teachers and if they offer incentives to faculty who are borderline teachers. Technology workshops, for example, could warrant a course release or other release in service of improving teaching.

Dean Johnson summarized issues raised in this session:

1. educate senior faculty to be good departmental citizens
2. create opportunities for associate professors to be productive
3. be clear in review letters about progress toward promotion
4. mentoring beyond third and sixth year
5. differential teaching loads
6. internal faculty development grants
7. administrative succession plans (college level), administrative fellowships, administrative training
8. college level rejuvenation activities for heads and administrators
9. discussion about whether administrative service plays a role in promotion OR making sure we don’t call on associate professors for administration
10. how to support/improve faculty whose teaching may not be up to par

Dean Johnson concluded that the discussion was enlightening and wide-ranging. He suggested a white paper for follow through. He asked for heads’ thoughts about next steps and follow up and what ideas heads will take away from the retreat.

Heads said it was very valuable to hear from department heads in other departments and that it might be helpful for faculty to hear the kinds of discussions department heads have and the issues that come up.

A summary document or white paper was recommended to provide talking points in department or executive committee meetings.

Ben Crouch (Executive Associate Dean) said Karan's comments on exit interviews were very instructive, noting that the statistics were in fairly sharp relief in comparison with other colleges. We often see the solutions, not the problems. We need to let people know what the problems are that the policies are trying to solve. Charlie said he had already set up a meeting with Karan.

Dean Johnson thanked the council, discussion leaders, and Shannon for organizing. Shannon received an enthusiastic round of applause.