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A Perennial Topic with New Urgency
Renewed Focus on Faculty Productivity

Recent Trends Put Increased Pressure on Faculty Productivity

- Financial stresses forcing institutions to look for ways to reduce costs and increase productivity
- Heightened external scrutiny of faculty productivity as the public looks for explanations for the rising cost of higher education
- Faculty hiring freezes requiring existing faculty to take on more responsibilities
- Slow down in faculty retirements reducing the ability to replace late career faculty with new hires
- Ambitious institutional research goals that depend on higher levels of faculty productivity

No Way Out?

“I can’t afford to keep paying faculty who are not productive. But what else can I do with them?”

Provost, Private Research University
# The Myth of the Faculty Leisure Class

## Faculty Shoulder More Hours, More Demands, In More Areas

### Faculty Work Hours Comparable to Higher-Pay Professions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cardiologist</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Associate, Corporate Law Firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Stagnating grant funding makes grant administration increasingly high-stakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Administration</td>
<td>Department chair and dean jobs increasingly professionalized, high-skill (especially as RCM spreads)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Political pressure to increase undergraduate throughput without new funding

### Popular enthusiasm for non-traditional modalities or “competency-based” learning

### Outcomes assessment increasingly time-consuming

1. Anticipating Productivity ‘Stall Points’

2. Engaging Faculty in Student Success

3. Data-Informed Approaches to Instructional Productivity

4. Supporting and Incentivizing Research Productivity
Why Traditional Post-Tenure Review Doesn’t Work

Little Evidence That It Improves Faculty Productivity

- Review happens years after the problem first occurs
- Administrators have few levers to punish under-productive faculty
- Punishing faculty does not make them more productive
- Department chairs rarely willing to impose punitive measures
- Assumes the problem lies entirely with the faculty member

The Empirical Evidence

“The majority of respondents were neutral on questions related to policy effect [on faculty work, professional development, and career planning]... This result matches previous reported findings by researchers:
- post-tenure review does not directly improve faculty performance
- is least effective with low-performing faculty
- and has little measurable impact on the institution or value to faculty.”

Anticipating Productivity Challenges

Common Issues Across the Typical Career Lifecycle

Faculty Productivity “Stall Points”

The Probationary Period
- Clear expectations
- Protected from service obligations
- Multiple support mechanisms

The Post-Tenure Slump
- New teaching, service, and family obligations
- Lack of clear expectations
- Time to ramp up new research program

The Perennial Associate Professor
- Never recovered from post-tenure slump
- Interests shifted away from research
- Frustrated and puzzled at lack of promotion

Retired in Place
- Disengaged from teaching and research
- Waiting for a better retirement package
- Worried about life after retirement
# The “Post-Tenure Slump”

## Challenges

### Distractions from Research
- Increase in administrative responsibilities (committee work)
- Increased national service opportunities (disciplinary societies)
- Increase in teaching responsibilities
- Increased family responsibilities

### Loss of Focus
- Need to recover after intensive effort required for tenure
- Lack of formal mentoring
- Lack of clear expectations for promotion to full professor and annual performance

### Time to Ramp Up New Research
- Takes time to get new research to publication stage
- Need to apply for new grants
- Need resources to restart research
- Need new skills for new, often interdisciplinary research

## Solutions

### Reduce Distractions from Research
- Associate professor training (Michigan State, Yale, Michigan)
- Guidelines for how to choose (and decline) opportunities for service (Chicago)
- Conference Travel Childcare Grants (Northwestern)
- Post-Tenure Sabbatical (Yale)

### Set Clear Expectations
- Create development plan and set date for promotion in first year after tenure (Chicago and Michigan)
- Peer support groups (UNC Charlotte and UNC Chapel Hill)
- Mentoring networks (UNC Chapel Hill, Michigan, Brown)

### Provide Research Resources
- List of resources for new associate professors (Brown)
- Associate Professor Fund (Michigan)
The “Perennial Associate”

Challenges

Never Recovered from Post-Tenure Slump
- Took a few years to decide on next research project
- New research project never took off
- Unable to keep up with changing field
- Little progress made on overly ambitious project

Interests Shifted Away from Research
- Focused on teaching
- Focused on increasingly time-consuming administrative work
- Focused on public service/outreach

Lack of Clear Expectations for Productivity
- Chair failed to communicate expectations for promotion
- No feedback from colleagues on progress
- Annual reviews all positive despite lack of progress

Solutions

Give Credit for Non-Research Activities
- Flexible workload assignments
- Alternative routes to full professor (USC)

Set Clear Expectations for Productivity
- Full professors review all associate professors annually (Chicago, Notre Dame)
- Link post-tenure review process to application for development grants (UMass-Amherst)
The “Retired in Place” Professor

Challenges

Gradual Disengagement from Research and Teaching
• Failure to keep up with changing field
• Failure to update courses
• Unable to maintain excitement after so many years of teaching the same courses
• Lack of connection with students, younger scholars

Resistance to Retirement
• Lack financial means to retire
• Concerned about having nothing to do after retirement

Solutions

Plan for the End
• Start planning for retirement just after promotion
• Create annually updated five year plans (Michigan)
• Phased retirement (Yale, UNC Chapel Hill)
• Retirement contact outside the department (Brown)

Reduce Financial Incentives to Wait
• Standing buyout packages (Yale)
• Retirement packages that reduce with age (Yale)

Preserve Social Ties Post Retirement
• Office space for emeriti
• Emeritus faculty social club (Michigan State, Yale)
# A Critical Component—Effective Reviews

*Principles from HR 101 Rarely Applied to Tenured Faculty*

## Essential Elements of Effective Post-Tenure Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Reviews for Tenured Faculty</th>
<th>More Effective Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vague or shifting productivity expectations</td>
<td>Clearly defined, discipline-specific performance targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward-looking performance reviews</td>
<td>Annually updated five year development plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little constructive feedback from peers</td>
<td>Full professors review all associate professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfunctory reviews from department chair</td>
<td>Training for chairs, review input from broader committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few consequences for poor reviews</td>
<td>Explicit outcomes with tasks for both the faculty member and the department chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources to support research or faculty development</td>
<td>Small development grants linked to review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research output the only path to promotion</td>
<td>Consideration of teaching, service, and outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little feedback from senior administrators</td>
<td>Input and support from deans and other administrators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Anticipating Productivity ‘Stall Points’

2. Engaging Faculty in Student Success

3. Data-Informed Approaches to Instructional Productivity

4. Supporting and Incentivizing Research Productivity
Top-Down Changes Rarely Stick

Faculty Buy-In and Compliance Critical to Organizational Improvement

Reduce and standardize number of credits required by majors for graduation

Create new professional advising roles to help high-risk students navigate early years

Implement early warning system to track attendance and early performance

Hire instructional design staff to help faculty improve assessment design

Program heads perceive as threat to reputation and rigor

Units fear loss of control over curricular advice

Faculty either unaware or view as busywork

Non-innovator faculty feel redesign not worth effort

4-year graduation rate stagnant, students struggle with aid limits and major changes

First-year and undeclared students drop out at high rates, pursue poor-fit programs

Preventable issues go unaddressed, and many students aren’t contacted until withdrawing

High-failure courses hamstring first-year students, forcing repeats and remediation

Unable to enact change without buy-in or approval

Changes enacted, but aren’t complied with or embraced

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Six Roles for Faculty in Student Success

Individual and Collective Responsibilities to Guide Institutional Change

1. Remove Curricular Barriers to Completion
   - Considering student success in each stage of curricular decision-making

2. Redesign Academic Policies
   - Garnering support for student-facing rule changes that promote persistence to degree

3. Support Evolving Advising Models
   - Building buy-in for, confidence in, and collaboration with central and professional advising staff

4. Enhance the Learning Experience
   - Evaluating and scaling high-impact learning innovations across courses and disciplines

5. Flag Signs of Student Risk
   - Equipping faculty with the right tools and techniques to maximize early warning systems

6. Mentor Rising-Risk Student Groups
   - Targeting faculty engagement efforts toward students lacking a strong connection to campus

Sustaining Momentum Through Structured Accountability and Incentives

Determining the right metrics, organizational structures, and incentives to encourage improvement among central administrators, deans, department chairs, and frontline faculty
Six Roles for Faculty in Student Success

Individual and Collective Responsibilities to Guide Institutional Change

Collective Decision-Making

1. **Remove Curricular Barriers to Completion**
   - 1. DIY Enrollment Analysis Platform
   - 2. Enrollment Impact Audits
   - 3. Task-Based Retention Teams
   - 4. Guided Project Management

2. **Redesign Academic Policies**
   - 5. Academic Policy Audit

3. **Support Evolving Advising Models**
   - 6. Faculty-Led Advisor Training
   - 7. Advising Career Ladder
   - 8. Unit Liaison Roles
   - 9. Distributed Support Balancing

Individual Contribution

4. **Enhance the Learning Experience**
   - Scaling Learning Innovations

5. **Flag Signs of Student Risk**
   - 10. Early Warning Design Requirements
   - 11. Adjustable Alert Parameters
   - 12. Effectiveness-Focused Feedback

6. **Mentor Rising-Risk Student Groups**
   - 13. Targeted First-Year Mentor Matching
   - 14. High-Flyer Transfer Intervention

Sustaining Momentum Through Structured Accountability and Incentives

- 15. Leadership Scorecards
- 16. Performance-Based Bonus Funding
- 17. Departmental Performance Dashboard
Support Evolving Advising Models

Unbundling the Advising Process

Dozens of Discrete Problems Require Variety of Roles on Campus

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.

Success Coaches

- "I don't fit in and I'm stressed at work"
- "I can't afford to finish my degree"
- "How many courses should I take?"
- "I need a new ID card"

Faculty

- "Which subfield should I study?"
- "I want to switch majors"
- "I need to pick a major"
- "I need to register for classes"

Self-Service

- "I can't afford to finish my degree"
- "How many courses should I take?"
- "I need to register for classes"

Academic Advisors

- "Which subfield should I study?"
- "I want to switch majors"
- "I need to pick a major"
- "I need to register for classes"

Academic

Non-Academic
Despite Growing Comfort, Hesitation Remains

Most Faculty Familiar with Innovations, But Avoid Trying Them Out

A Growing Comfort with Tech-Enhanced Teaching

60% Of faculty say the LMS is a critical tool to their teaching

78% Of faculty have a growing interest in using tech in teaching

“Professors Know About High-Tech Teaching Methods, but Few Use Them”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Not Familiar</th>
<th>Familiar but haven’t tried</th>
<th>Tried</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clickers and other real-time feedback</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary team-teaching</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid courses</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully online course</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online collaboration tools</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential or service learning</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flipped classroom</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Form of Empowerment

“Faculty are starting to see their own embrace of technology as a form of empowerment.”

Matthew Rascoff, University of North Carolina

Creating Departmental Accountability
Mission-Adjusted Performance Bonuses Push Units to Improve

**Strategic Accountability Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Student Success Metric</th>
<th>Example: Student Credit Hours lost to DFW</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Credit Hours lost to DFW</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Credit Hours lost to DFW</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Metric weight adjusted** according to unit characteristics (Philosophy judged less on internship placements)
- Negotiated by chair, dean, and provost to avoid unjustified alterations to formula

**Department performance evaluated across 18 strategic priorities, including:**

**High-Impact Practices**
1. Internships
2. Intercultural immersion
3. Freshmen degree plans
4. Advisee satisfaction

**Student Progression**
1. Credit hours lost to DFW
2. Midterm grade reports
3. 30 credits first year
4. 60 credits first two years

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Measurement Spurs Grassroots Innovation

Departments Quick to React to Now-Visible Performance Gaps

1 Local Curricular Reforms

- **Aligning pre-requisites with local community colleges:** Biology department adjusted introductory curriculum to better suit transfer students.
- **Revitalizing first-year instruction:** Low-enrollment science programs shifted from “weeding freshmen out” to more engaged pedagogy.

2 Greater Investment in Student Support

- **Increasing instructional support for at-risk groups:** Psychology department added supplemental instruction to address noticeable achievement gap.
- **Requiring four-year degree plans:** Share of all first-year students with complete degree plans grew 45% in first two years of assessment.

3 Lasting Cultural Change

- **Clarifying each unit’s role in contributing to institutional performance goals:** Unprecedented awareness of how the actions of each department add up to ultimate success or failure.
- **Preempting performance-based funding:** Faculty, staff, and unit leaders acclimated to culture of evaluation and focused on continuous improvement, without top-down system dictate.

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
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4. Supporting and Incentivizing Research Productivity
Breaking the Trade-off Between Cost and Quality

Identifying Opportunities to Reallocate Low Impact Resources

- **Space Utilization**
  - Identify course access bottlenecks
  - Better leverage existing space

- **Course Offerings**
  - Consolidate underutilized sections
  - Reduce number of small courses

- **Course Success**
  - Expand bottleneck courses
  - Limit high-DFW courses

- **Curricular Complexity**
  - Simplify degree requirements
  - Reduce niche course offerings

- **Faculty Workload**
  - Maximize capacity utilization
  - Differentiate faculty workloads

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50%</th>
<th>33%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Utilization</td>
<td>Underutilized Sections</td>
<td>Attempted Credits Not Completed</td>
<td>Students Graduating with Excess Credits</td>
<td>Faculty Teaching Less than Standard Load</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Why Haven’t We Done This Already?

### Four Roadblocks to Improved Academic Resource Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Incomplete, Inaccurate Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data related to academic resources spread among multiple ERPs and shadow systems of varying quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Ad Hoc Allocation Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Even when metrics are available, unit leaders struggle to design policy interventions to advance their goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Lack of Unit-Level Incentives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heads (and some deans) skeptical that departments will receive benefits from their efficiency gains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Few Reallocation Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to reallocate specialized faculty from areas of low demand to areas of high demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Business Affairs Forum interviews and analysis.
## Clarifying and Enforcing Expectations

### Academic Resource Utilization Opportunity Analysis

#### Sample Analyses (Illustrative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Scheduling</td>
<td>&gt; 30% of depts courses outside of prime time</td>
<td>• Schedule more courses off-peak • Obtain waiver from dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Standard Class Meeting Pattern</td>
<td>One of six approved meeting patterns</td>
<td>• Use approved meeting pattern • Obtain waiver from dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>&gt; 15 students for undergraduate course</td>
<td>• Cancel small course • Reduce frequency of course offering • Reduce prerequisites • Obtain waiver from dean • Teach off load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Fill Rate</td>
<td>&gt; 60% for multi-section course</td>
<td>• Consolidate non-essential sections • Obtain waiver from dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Utilization</td>
<td>Departmental avg ≥ 360 SCH/faculty</td>
<td>• Reassign adjunct courses to FT faculty • Obtain waiver from dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits Required for Major</td>
<td>= 120</td>
<td>• Reduce non-essential requirements • Obtain waiver from dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Anticipating Productivity ‘Stall Points’
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Aligning Faculty Effort with Institutional Goals

Supporting the University’s Most Precious Resource

Four Key Challenges to Aligning Workload Assignments with Mission

1. **Multidimensional Productivity Analysis**
   - Improved Assessment: Giving faculty credit for all they do

2. **Strategic Research Release Allocation**
   - Research Releases: Targeting releases to the most productive faculty

3. **Specialized Admin/Service Roles**
   - Admin/Service Releases: Reducing time on non-critical activities

4. **Expansion of “Clinical” Professoriate**
   - Specialized Teaching: Ensuring quality teaching while supporting research

Source: EAB interviews and analysis.
Multidimensional Productivity Analysis

Holistic Reports a Starting Point for Workload Allocation, Assessment

Defining Key Indicators…

Teaching
- Courses taught / assigned load
- Undergraduate SCH
- Master’s / PhD SCH
- Independent study SCH
- Lab SCH
- Books, book chapters, & reviews
- Journal articles
- Research expenditures
- Release time (in $)
- Creative compositions
- Exhibitions, performances, keynotes
- Conference/ poster presentations
- Editing books or book chapters
- Independent lectures

Scholarship

Service
- Admin. release time

… For Holistic Assessment

Annual Review of Total Productivity
Dashboards provide single version of the truth for departmental “contribution to mission” meetings with provost’s team deans, chair, and interested faculty.

Avoids Measuring “Hours” or “% Time”
Moves productivity conversation away from irrelevant factors (time inputs) to value-driven factors (outputs, outcomes).

Department-Driven
Central facilitates discussions of dashboard metrics, but departments use local knowledge to decide appropriate workload adjustments.

Adjunct funds re-allocated in A&S based on contribution-to-mission dashboards (~4% of total budget)

$1.7M

Source: Michael McGoff, “Faculty Contributions to Mission: Sine Qua non,” Presentation to SCUP 46 (2011); EAB interviews and analysis
### From Insight to Action

Dashboard Enables “Spot Checks,” Highlights Areas for Further Analysis

#### Tenure-Track Contributions to Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Semesters Available</th>
<th>Sections Taught</th>
<th>Section SCH</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>Lab/Activity SCH</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Book Chapter</th>
<th>Book Review</th>
<th>Journal Article</th>
<th>Conference or Poster</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Individual Lecture, Reading</th>
<th>Keynote, Exhibition, Performance, Curator</th>
<th>Conference or Poster</th>
<th>Release Time</th>
<th>Research Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 1</td>
<td>F Sab</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>285,496</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 5</td>
<td>Exec Asst position</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>390,767</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112,027</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 9</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59,249</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11,997</td>
<td>768,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Departmental Use Case: Faculty Member 11

- **Teaching a reduced load...**
- **... with marginal SCH production compared to colleagues...**
- **... and moderate research productivity.**

#### Considering Next Steps

**Additional Departmental Analysis**
- Was the research high-impact?
- Is 11 teaching particularly intensive labs?
- Is 11 performing service for the discipline (e.g., journal editing?)

Source: EAB interviews and analysis
Bringing Rigor to Research Releases

Two Key Questions to Increase Value of Release Time

**Traditional Allocation**

- **Departmental Benchmarks**
  - **Scattershot**: High-performers often teach same workload as colleagues
  - **Prospective**: Based on promised, not demonstrated, productivity

- **Chair Supervision**
  - **Reallocations Culturally Difficult**: Semi-permanent nature of releases makes chairs unwilling to cut them
  - **Lack of Clear Expectations**: Releases not tied to efficiency or quality standards

**“Metric-Informed” Allocation**

- **Demonstrated Productivity**
  - **Targeted**: Guides scarce release time to high-productivity researchers
  - **Reactive**: Reduces uncertainty of “betting on” increased productivity

- **Renewable Agreements**
  - **“Off-Ramps”**: Frequent renewal provides opportunity to reallocate
  - **Performance Standards**: Grantees expected to produce within a window of time or to a certain quality

Source: EAB interviews and analysis
Faculty-Driven Metrics in Action

Course Release Incentives Can Emphasize Quality Over Quantity

Data-Driven Research Release Policy

- Points earned for every publication over last 5yrs, modified by journal quality...
  - A+: 18 points
  - A: 13 points
  - A-: 10 points
  - B: 8 points
  - C: 3 points

- ... and converted into course releases for the coming year.
  - 15 Points: 1 release
  - 24 Points: 2 releases
  - 36 Points: 3 releases
  - 48 Points: 3 releases + monetary award

Faculty Establish Journal Rankings:
- Faculty advisory committee assigns ranks based on self-selected principles (e.g., acceptance rate, impact factor)

Metrics for Ranking “A” Journals:
- Acceptance rate (e.g., A+ = <13%)
- Impact factor
- Peer-reviewed journal rankings
- Other university journal rankings
- “Reputation” of editorial board members

Total Articles:
- 2009: 131
- 2012: 124

Although total publications declined slightly….

“A” Articles:
- 2009: 22
- 2012: 38

… high-quality publications increased by >70% through 2012.

Source: EAB interviews and analysis
A Shift in the Model

Multiple Tracks for Tenure Creates Tensions, Limits Research Intensivity

Initial “Specialized” Model (All Tenure-Track) (2000)

- Teaching-Track: 4/4 load
- Balanced Track: 3/3 load
- Research Track: 2/2 load (2/1 before tenure)

Refined Model (2010)

- Full-Time Non-TT Clinical Faculty: 4/4 load
- Asst. Professors: 2/2 load (2/1 before tenure)

Planned Faculty Breakdown

- Teaching-Track: 1/3
- Balanced Track: 1/3
- Research Track: 1/3

Political Tensions: Multiple standards for tenure create resentment, research faculty still dominant in admin

Less Specialization, Lower Research Productivity:
Balanced track taught less than teaching track, but too much to compete for high-potential researchers

Source: EAB interviews and analysis