

II. POLICY

The faculty development program is dedicated to the maintenance of academic excellence in the University of Wisconsin System. Institutions are expected to dedicate available funds to support an effective and comprehensive program of faculty development tailored to the institution's academic needs. In addition, in keeping with the conditions and intent of the legislation that supports this program, "the purpose of this comprehensive program is to increase the flexibility and effective use of existing faculty personnel in the University of Wisconsin System."

The overall philosophy behind the faculty retraining and renewal program should be to minimize the fiscal implications to the participant, thereby encouraging rather than discouraging participation in the program.

UW System funds will be provided to support the following general categories of activities:

1. Retraining - Development of scholarly resources of faculty members in fields of study allied to those in which they have their primary academic preparation in order to increase the ability of institutions and units to adapt to changing curricular, student, and societal needs and to contribute to the continued professional growth of faculty.
2. Renewal - Continued development and renewal of the expertise of faculty members in their fields of primary academic preparation in order to increase the ability of institutions and units to adapt to changing curricular, student and societal needs.
3. Faculty development - Professional growth of faculty that complements special institutional and System priorities, within the context of the institutional plan, including improvement of teaching skills and/or development of the curriculum, not covered within the definition of retraining or renewal.

Retraining proposals are eligible to receive matching funds from the System faculty development account on the basis of an equal match by institutional funds.

Renewal proposals and faculty development proposals are eligible to receive one-quarter funding from the System faculty development account if matched by three-quarter institutional funding.

III. PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

A. Preparation of an institutional plan

Each institution shall review, assess and update its plan for faculty development to meet its mission requirements and academic program and staff needs in response to ongoing academic program

activities, including programmatic reviews and their resulting recommendations, and in response to anticipated demands of students, society and scholarship as identified in the institution's Ten-Year Academic Plan. Three-year plans will be submitted to the UW System Office of Academic Affairs beginning June 1, 1992_for 1993-96 and every third year thereafter.

Each institutional plan should address the following four program elements in order to make effective and flexible use of faculty personnel:

1. Development of scholarly resources of faculty members in fields of study allied to those in which they have their primary preparation in order to increase the ability of institutions and units to adapt to changing curricular, student and societal needs.
2. Continued development and renewal of the expertise of faculty members in their fields of primary academic preparation.
3. Cooperative interand intra-institutional development of new instructional, evaluation and testing materials and systems.
4. Improvement of teaching skills, including the management of new systems of instruction and instructional support; development of course materials; testing and evaluation techniques; and interpersonal communication in instruction.

In addition, the following guidelines are offered to assist institutions in preparing their faculty development and renewal plans and to facilitate the review and evaluation of the completed institutional plans for selective systemwide funding purposes.

The Office of Academic Affairs uses these guidelines to review the institutional plans. The outline of the guidelines is not intended to serve as a required format for the faculty development plans, but does provide a summary of those major elements that appear to be essential to any effective plan.

1. Identify the areas of need and the objectives to be met by faculty retraining, renewal and development.

[For example, the College of Letters and Sciences may suggest that it needs to increase the ability of faculty members to teach and conduct research on non-Western cultures.]

2. Suggest faculty development activities that will be implemented during those three years in response to needs and objectives.

[For example, the art department might suggest sending two faculty members to summer institutes and workshops to develop expertise in computer graphics in order to meet an identified objective of strengthening faculty expertise in the area of commercial art.]

3. Build upon departmental or academic program strategic staffing plans which project the staffing and curricular needs and objectives for a specified period following the most recent audit and review of the department's program(s).

[For example, the history department might specify that it foresees a faculty retirement in ancient history, but will recruit in Middle East history to meet growing instructional needs, creating need for retraining of existing staff in ancient history.]

4. Identify, insofar as possible, specific program areas of the institution most likely to be involved in responding to the stated need(s).

[For example, the plan might identify an over-staffed, densely tenured physics department as a source of faculty to be retrained to teach additional sections of mathematics in order to meet a new general studies requirement.]

5. Outline the procedures by which each proposed program element of the plan is to be implemented.

[For example, the plan might specify that several approaches would be taken to renew and extend faculty expertise in the nursing program, such as institutional workshops, reduced time for selected individuals to engage in independent study, or a program of formal training for some faculty members at another institution.]

6. Indicate the period during which each program element is to be implemented.

[For example, the plan might specify that a faculty member will be retrained to conduct research into multicultural education. The academic year in which the faculty member will be retrained and when s/he will be prepared to begin research, publications, etc., should be specified.]

7. Indicate the total costs and the source of funding for each program element.

[For example, institutional workshops to update business administration faculty in computer technology might be funded by the dean's office while a program of formal training would be supported by matching institutional and systemwide funds.]

B. Guidelines for Preparation of Faculty Retraining, Renewal and Development Proposals

1. System guidelines

While each institution has its own guidelines, procedures, and protocols, there are a number of more specific System guidelines that individuals must adhere to as they draw up their proposals. Specific institutional policies may add to, or be more restrictive than these System guidelines.

- a. By definition the program is limited to the faculty as defined in Chapter UWS 1.04. Academic staff who have been granted faculty status by the chancellor and faculty governance body are not eligible to submit faculty retraining, renewal or development proposals. (Chapter UWS 1.05)

- b. Only proposals which fit the definitions of retraining, renewal or faculty development in this document (page 2) are eligible at this time for consideration for funding under the program. Institutional faculty development programs may fund programs in other areas.
- c. Because the faculty retraining, renewal and development program is viewed as an important tool in developing institutional instructional flexibility, tenured faculty will normally receive preference over probationary faculty for System funds. Programmatic considerations may override this preference, however.
- d. It is incumbent on the institutions that their faculty development plans clearly reflect institutional needs. Proposals should be designed to meet needs identified in the institutional faculty development plans or, if they do not, clear evidence should be offered on how the proposal will address the changing needs of the institution.
- e. Given the Design for Diversity and its emphasis on minority professional development, priority will also be given to proposals which outline programs which address issues of race and ethnicity or are otherwise designed to improve the multi-cultural environment on campuses.
- f. Proposals may request matching funds for salary support of faculty members at the option of the institution. However, salary support is not provided under this program to individuals who have also received a concurrent full year sabbatical with partial pay.
- g. System faculty development funds will not be used to support faculty proposals whose primary object is to allow an individual to complete a terminal degree.
- h. Proposals may contain requests to pay for fees and tuition for courses at accredited institutions that the faculty member takes as part of a retraining, renewal or development program. A faculty member may also request support to pay for registration fees, participation fees, etc., at professional workshops, seminars, institutes, etc. Retraining proposals may request funds to buy course related books and supplies.
- i. Proposals may contain requests for travel funds within three categories. If the faculty member is within commuting distance, a reasonable amount to cover commuting expenses may be requested. Second, if the location of the program is beyond commuting distance, a faculty member may request one round trip to the location during the period of the project. Other trips must be paid for by the participant. Third, funds for travel may be requested if it can be demonstrated that such travel is a critical component of the retraining, renewal or development project.
- j. Supplies and equipment funds may be requested, if necessary for the successful completion of the project. Ordinarily, capital equipment purchases are not eligible for funding under this program.

- k. If the retraining, renewal or development program takes place at a location beyond commuting distance from the faculty member's home, living expenses may be requested. However, institutional policies may limit the amount granted if the faculty member is also receiving a salary.
- l. Support for travel to and attendance at professional meetings may be requested, if it can be shown that such participation is a required part of the individual's retraining, renewal or development program. System faculty development funds ordinarily will not be used in place of institutional travel money for attendance at professional meetings.

2. Criteria for review

Each institution has established its own procedures leading to the selection of faculty proposals to be submitted to the System for funding. Proposals submitted for consideration at the System level must contain a paragraph abstract of the proposal and the following elements:

- a. Name of the faculty member(s) involved (including rank and tenure status).
- b. In detail, what will the retraining, renewal or development program consist of?
- c. Where will the activity take place? Why must it occur there?
- d. Why is the projected program necessary?
- e. How does the program relate to the institutional faculty development plan?
- f. How will it increase the ability of the institution and unit to adapt to changing curricular, student, and societal needs or contribute to the continuing professional growth of the faculty?
- g. How much will the program cost? What is the source of funds? (Include a summary budget including salary costs and S&E broken down by categories).
- h. How will the program be evaluated?

At the System level institutional proposals will be evaluated on how well they fit within the institution's faculty development plan or, if they do not, then how they clearly reflect changing institutional needs and on the following criteria (not arranged in priority order):

- a. Is institutional need defined?
- b. Does the program clearly address identified needs?
- c. Does the proposal answer the question of who will do what, when, where, why, how and at what cost?
- d. Are evaluative criteria built into the proposal?

- e. What is the institutional priority ranking (if the institution has given a ranking for the proposals it has submitted)?
- f. Is the proposal achievable within the time frame proposed?
- g. What institutional fiscal constraints exist?
- h. Will the proposal lead to an enhancement of individual and institutional resources?
- i. How does the quality of the proposal being evaluated compare to that of the others under consideration?
- j. Is the proposed activity to be conducted within the time frame of the funding period?
- k. Does the proposed activity address any special Systemwide efforts (e.g. focus on minority/ethnic curriculum)?

C. Funding

The types of proposals that can be funded by this program are partially restricted by the terms of the 1977-79 biennial budget. Prior to the 1977-79 budget allocation, there was \$100,000 in the base systemwide account for faculty development. In 1978-79, that figure grew to \$210,400 through the allocation of \$110,400 from the biennial appropriation of \$356,000 for instructional support accounts. Another \$81,000 was added by the legislature in 1979-80 through a DIN request.

The program now provides \$288,100 annually for faculty development:

\$191,400 is governed by the 1977-79 legislative intent and the additional appropriation the following year, and restricted to proposals which fall within the definition of retraining or renewal;

\$96,700 is available for proposals which fall within the broader definition of faculty development as well as to support retraining and renewal proposals.

D. Timetable

January 1 is the deadline for submission of proposals that are scheduled for the following academic year (July 1 - June 30).

Three year institutional plans will be submitted to the Vice President of Academic Affairs on June 1, 1992 and every third year thereafter.

Vice Chancellor comments re ACPS 3.1:

- II.3., p 2 UW-EAU: Definitions of "retraining" and "renewal" unclear; definition of "faculty development" unclear.
- II.3., p 2 UW-LAC: The "category" Faculty Development is a welcome addition. Both "improvement of teaching skills" and the "development of the curriculum" are important opportunities which need to be made available to faculty.
- II.3., p 2 UW-OSH: The need for a new activity is not clear, too vague, lacks distinction. The program should be supporting substantive, well-defined projects that exceed what most institutions typically support. Most substantive projects can be covered under either the renewal or retraining guidelines.
- II.3., p 2 UW-STP: Providing resources for "improvement of teaching skills and/or the development of the curriculum" is commendable; however, doesn't this new initiative within the guidelines overlap with the mission of UTIC? Is this intended? How will faculty distinguish between the goals of this new program and the mirror-image mission statement of UTIC?
- II.e., p 2 UW-STP: Disappointed that System contribution reduced from 50% to 25% of projected costs; will reduce number of teaching improvement/curriculum development proposals submitted to UWS by UW-STP.
- III.A., p. 2 UW-STP: We appreciate having to review our institutional development plan every three years, rather than every other year under the old guidelines.
- III.A., p. 3 UW-LAC: In general, we find the guidelines for preparing the institutional plans require that we be overly specific in projecting needs and objectives.
- III.A.3., p 3 UW-STP: Cooperative interand intra-institutional development is laudable in intent but difficult to implement in practice ... to have the same project proposal approved simultaneously by the bureaucracy of more than one campus.
- III.A., p. 3 UW-STP: Statement in middle has been softened, but still too restrictive, and alternative wording is proposed in paragraphs that follow: 1, identify, not specify; 2, may suggest, not specify, could, not will; 3, might, not should; 5, might, not should; 6, might, not should; 7, might, not should.
- III.A.1. p 3 UW-OSH: 3 and 4 on p 4 should be incorporated into # 1.
- III.B.1., p 5 UW-EAU: First sentence should be kept; perhaps moved to p. 2 in first paragraph of policy statement
- III.B.1.b., p 5 UW-LAC: Needs revising.

- III.B.d., p 5 UW-WWR: Sentences should be reversed and wording revised to read "It is incumbent on the institutions that their faculty development plans clearly reflect institutional needs. Proposals should be designed to meet needs identified in the institutional faculty development plans or, if they do not, then clear evidence should be offered on how the proposal will address the changing needs of the institution.
- III.B.1.e., p 5 UW-EAU: Have all the changes been identified in the draft? We suspect Design for Diversity should be underlined.
- III.B.1.e., p 5 UW-PVL: Design for Diversity is indicated as as area that should be given priority. A similar statement here might indicate that programs that address issues of gender might also be given priority.
- III.B.1.f., p 5 UW-EAU: Opportunity for summer support should be reinserted.
- III.B.1.f., p 5 UW-LAC: Does the revised policy allow using these funds for summer income for faculty members? Compare B.1.f. in the two documents.
- III.B.1.f., p 5 UW-WWR: Change wording to read "... individuals who have received a full year sabbatical with partial pay [will not] will be eligible to receive concurrent salary support under this program.
- III.B.1.g., p 5 UW-STO: Inability to combine these funds with the full-year sabbatical is too restrictive. This option would allow greater flexibility in providing maximum retraining/renewal options. Even if salary dollars are not allowable, there should be an option for persons on sabbatical to access these dollars for travel and/or conferences. This decision should be left to the discretion of the institutions.
- III.B.1.g., p 5 UW-CTR: Too restrictive. It might be better to state that individuals who have received a full year sabbatical with partial pay during the last six years will not be eligible to receive concurrent salary support under this program. Why ban them for a lifetime? Or does it mean the person cannot have both programs at the same time?
- III.B.1.h., p 5 UW-EAU: Funding for terminal degree, should be reconsidered and kept.
- III.B.1.h., p 5 UW-OSH: There has been no effort to change this program so that it might support proposals involving degree completion. Some consideration should be given to "grow our own" which could further the Design for Diversity initiative. Recruiting faculty,

particularly in areas of high demand, will continue to be a significant challenge for the System and this kind of program could definitely help address these concerns.

- III.B.1.h., p 5 UW-PLV: Exceptions to this rule might be considered for minority and other under represented categories of faculty.
- III.B.1.h., p 5 UW-RIV: Wish that the guidelines could be changed so that completion of a Ph.D. was a legitimate use of these funds, given the problems that are going to face us in regard to faculty hiring, current problems in high cost areas, along with our commitment to increasing the number of minority faculty members.
- III.B.1.h., p 5 UW-STP: I'm still not sure why we won't allow individuals to pursue a terminal degree under this program, particularly since demographics would indicate that in the near future we'll be forced to hire more individuals without the terminal degree and "grow our own." Removing this restriction would seem to be especially important as we aggressively recruit more women and minorities.
- III.B.1.h., p 5 Why can't we give assistance to people in need of the terminal degree? All of the UW institutions will experience difficulty in recruiting faculty with the appropriate terminal degree. Why not help those who are already with us an opportunity to complete the degree.
- III.B.2.h., p 6 UW-PLV: Consider adding a new element that would have institutions that submit multiple proposals rank those proposals based on their institutional priorities.
- III.B.2., p 6 UW-WWR: Revise explanatory paragraph to read "At the system level institutional proposals will be evaluated on how well they fit within the institution's faculty development plan or, if they do not, then how they clearly reflect changing institutional needs and on the following criteria which are not arranged in priority order."
- III.D., p. 8 UW-LAC: No objection to three-year rather than two-year plan, but June 1991 should be changed to June 1992, since there is not time now to complete this task.
- III.D., p. 8 UW-STO: Often specific training opportunities and locations are not known at the time of deadlines. It would be helpful to have a minimum of two submission dates per year as currently possible for the academic staff proposals: if possible, quarterly submission deadlines would provide even greater flexibility.

III.D., p. 8

UW-EXT: UW-EXT faculty senate recommends that there be quarterly deadlines for submissions of proposals, thereby providing for shorter leadtimes.

UW-LAC: Some suggest greater authority be placed on individual campuses to make appropriate faculty development determinations, allocating the \$288,100 to institutions and then holding them accountable. Vice Chancellors have, in the past, looked upon this as unwise, leading probably to the use of these funds for other purposes.

UW-STP: Less than acceptable proposals are not forwarded for further consideration. We shall therefore continue to send our retraining/renewal proposals to System unranked.