Top Tier RRPD Final Report, July 2016

Top Tier RSCA Committee
Subcommittee 4:1 Faculty Recruitment, Retention, Promotion, and Diversification (RRPD)
Revised Report April 2017

Working Group: Brad Donohue, Liam Frink (chair), Katherine Hertlein, Emily Salisbury, Sharon Tettegah, Melva Thompson-Robinson, Stacey Tovino

The charge to this committee is to evaluate and to make recommendations about campus strategies and support for faculty recruitment, retention, promotion, and diversification (RRPD). Understanding how our campus systems and policies influence RRPD is particularly crucial as we advance our Top Tier aspirations. Indeed, UNLV has plans to hire 200 research intensive faculty, and retain, promote, and diversify the composition and interests of existing faculty. This report focuses on administrative-based strategies designed to strengthen our recruitment, retention, and promotion of faculty as well as foster diversification of our faculty and administrators across all UNLV units.

1) Top Tier Administrators and Administrative Units
To achieve Top Tier status, our administrative leaders must investigate the current state-of-faculty at UNLV, provide support to the faculty, facilitate research efforts, and value each aspect of faculty RRPD. This includes Top Tier Administrative support and services. As much as we work to develop our academic faculty we need to understand responsive production, collaboration among units, and best business practices for our Top Tier Administrators and Administrative Units. At UNLV, the expectations are that:

- Top Tier Administration is responsive to faculty issues.
- Top Tier Administration is proactive in advancing best higher education services and practices in all units.
- Top-Tier Administrative units support productive activities of faculty and intentionally advance diversification of faculty.
- Top Tier Administration is highly diversified in its leadership and has at its core diverse leadership approaches and perspectives.
- Top Tier Administration intentionally fosters and supports inter-unit efficiency and collaboration.

Obstacles to RRPD:
There are considerable obstacles in conducting optimum services within Business and Finance. Our campus growth depends on a significant reworking of this unit and services. Some observations:

- There is a significant need to more efficiently and cost-effectively construct labs and purchase lab-related supplies.
- We suggest the problems with our employment and other systems will not disappear simply with more hires.
- We suggest HR data management be reviewed in order to optimize efficiency so that it has the ability to mine essential data sufficiently and provide state-of-the-faculty information.
- The Office of Decision Support is unable to provide timely and accurate data on demographic profiles of our faculty because the data are unavailable from HR or have been changing continuously. (For example, the start date of an individual's particular appointment is not consistent across years.)
New faculty, including underrepresented and international colleagues, have experienced issues with HR during their intake/onboarding process including the submission of job offers, the correct spelling of their names, and assignation of the NSHE numbers. (A faculty member has been assigned 2 NSHE IDs, which causes ongoing complications throughout the university data systems, despite trying to remedy the situation.)

**Recommendations:**

- Faculty increasingly refer to “Finance and Business” as allotting faculty lines or approving retention raises. Assigning the Provost (as the Chief Operating Officer for academic faculty) to lead faculty budgetary strategies and decisions would be helpful, as would clearer communication between the Provost and HR.
- Move HR on to the center part of campus – physical integration is critical for improving services and mitigating separateness of HR staff from campus life and their constituency.
- HR data management should be restructured to be efficient for essential data mining.
- An outside consulting company capable of assessing HR problems and training of HR staff to solve identified problems is strongly recommended.
- Office of Decision Support should provide timely and accurate comprehensive data on demographic profiles of our faculty and administration.
- Create position VP of Administrative Faculty/Staff: Support of our administrative faculty and staff is critical to the RRPD of our faculty. In order to better address the specific needs of the administrative faculty and staff, UNLV should create an office specifically for supporting administrative faculty and staff. This office would better be able to lobby for academic faculty and staff, be responsive in reworking systems that are dysfunctional or do not support our top tier aspirations, design professional development and diversity advancement for administrative faculty and staff; and be a voice at the table when resources are being allocated across campus.
- All administrative units tasked with supporting faculty should be expected to actively seek extramural funding for faculty development (this would be reported in annual evaluations and supported with incentives to units that get extramural funding).
  - Division of Research and Economic Development develops programs for increasing applications for funding by units.
  - VPRED supports and encourages collaborative granting efforts between units, especially in supporting administrators who have few if any experiences in applying for external funding.
- We strongly recommend all administrators be required to report their annual evaluations on Digital Measures.
- Build out evaluation with Top Tier expectations. For instance solicitation of grant funding; efforts and statistics on fostering and supporting diverse faculty; outcomes of collaboration and efficiencies with other units.
College/Unit Recommendations:
- Each college (including those that do not traditionally involve grants) should have an annual report on their efforts to increase and support faculty RRPD research and solicitation of grants. To be reported:
  - Detailed reports on the amount of F&A used to directly support faculty research production
  - Amount F&A generated by and allocated to support faculty research
  - Infrastructure in all colleges to facilitate pre and post award processes
  - Distribution of F&A to Centers, if applicable
  - Annual reports on the research, scholarly, and arts activities of entire unit
  - Hiring report for entire unit including demographic profile and specifics on how departments/units are being diversified and recruitment/outreach activities and initiatives
  - Transparency reporting on departments that are particularly low in diverse faculty
    - In departments with few underrepresented faculty, specifics on how the unit administration is supporting the success of these faculty colleagues (mentoring, course release) and recruiting diverse faculty
  - Associate Deans of Research (ADRs) need to be evaluated on how well they promote and support research, scholarship, arts and solicitation of grant funds
    - ADRs produce annual reports on how they are supporting research and funding opportunities for their faculty constituents—including yearly comparative statistics on unit progress.
    - ADRs assist nominations of national awards for their faculty and in particular for underrepresented faculty; for instance NSF Career Awards – including awards for underrepresented faculty especially in the sciences such as NSF PAESMEM ($10K).
- We strongly recommend that we create and implement retention/exit interviews standardized across units (and annual and aggregate reporting and assessment of results).
- All deans to be required to annually report specific use of F&A expenditures to faculty.
  - These data to be annually reviewed by the President, Provost, and Division of Research and Economic Development.
    - If it is found that F&A is not being used for research (this may be for deferred maintenance or research-based initiatives, but these must be justified as relevant to research), there should be recommendations for changes in unit practices.

RECRUITMENT and HIRING
We recommend that each college create strategic recruitment plans to match the Top Tier initiative for hiring and supporting research-intensive faculty. Thus far in the campus conversation, research-intensive faculty means two primary traits: a) the ability (or potential ability) to successfully get external funding and b) demonstrated (or potential) support of PhD students. (If we remain with this definition, we need to understand how to incorporate colleges that do not have this criteria, i.e., Law.) All PhD-granting departments should form a strategic and intentional plan for hiring faculty who fulfill both of these charges, and terminal degree departments need to focus on the ability or potential ability of recruited faculty to solicit external funding.
Recommendations:
- Create, implement, and analyze the effectiveness of a comprehensive and intentional campus-wide plan for recruitment of research-intensive faculty (3-, 5-, 10-year plans).
- Reduce the increased reliance on FIRs and PTIs; use resources to hire tenure-track research faculty.
- Provost and Deans actively encourage the expectation of hiring faculty who successfully solicit external grants (to some degree, this expectation can be extended to all colleges).
- Intersectional/Interdisciplinary/Center hires: based on a Top Tier-focused local/global issue. To mitigate issues of dual-appointment, each of these research faculty are housed in a center and tenured in a single department.
- Provide resources (both in terms of best practices and financial) for recruitment of Top Tier faculty in all units.
- Top Tier plan includes comprehensive use of space plan for new faculty hires (including labs, studios, office, teaching space).

RETENTION
To best retain our top faculty members, we must build and integrate an *institutional process* that focuses on responding to, instead of reacting to, retention issues with our faculty. There needs to be a standardized process for how the administration interacts with faculty members and how we intervene before we lose faculty. Note that the committee strongly believes in the goal of retention of top faculty members, but recognize there are situations in which retention of a problematic faculty member may not be in the best interest of a department, school, or college, and in such cases, appropriate administrative mediation practices should occur. Currently at UNLV, reactions to retention are informal, non-transparent, and largely ad hoc. Additionally, we need to strengthen and institutionalize our processes intended to identify and respond early to faculty members who are under stress (the expansion of which can be in coordination with the Ombuds Office). Critical to the institutionalization of the retention process, we must assign responsibility to different aspects of advocacy and retention to specific administrative units. All units will report qualitative and quantitative data to better assess the system and ensure that it is working. There are several proposed levels to retention interventions:
- Faculty Advocacy Process
  - The faculty member has some issues with the administration and so cannot “go to the chair” to rectify the situation. This process intervenes before the faculty seeks another position or outright quits, or maybe worse for UNLV, continues on and quits producing after tenure. The process for faculty advocacy is initiated and navigated by the UNLV Ombuds Office.
- Faculty Retention Intervention Process
  - The Faculty Advocacy Process has failed and the faculty member has sought another job because of dissatisfaction. This process is initiated and navigated by the UNLV Ombuds who includes the Chair and Dean.
- Retention Negotiation Process
The faculty member is satisfied with UNLV but has been “told to find a job” to get a raise. We need an institutional process for pay negotiations without having to obtain an outside offer. This process is initiated and navigated by the UNLV Ombuds who includes the Chair and Dean in the discussions. All retention requests eventually go through the UNLV Retention Committee (composed only of UNLV academic faculty and modeled after University of California, Berkeley’s Budget Committee), with recommendations reported to Provost.

- **Exit Interview Process**
  - The faculty member is leaving. This might be *leaving for* or *leaving because*. Process initiated by UNLV Compliance Office, which navigates the entire process (integrating Faculty Affairs and HR). As of now, UNLV has no institutional process to collect essential qualitative and quantitative exit data beyond the faculty member going to the HR website (Separating Faculty and Professional Employees instructions) to close out business accounts. There are many examples of best practices on exit interview data gathering and assessment.

**Recommendations:**
- Most importantly, reestablish the merit pool. Having no opportunities to raise one's pay is completely inconsistent with becoming a Top Tier university. Merit is a significant tool in recruitment of research-intensive high quality candidates.
- Pay raises to assure equity with Tier-One institutions (with particular attention to our junior colleagues).
- Develop methods of assuring faculty pay raises other than requiring faculty members to provide offers from other universities to get a pay raise.
- More comprehensive and campus-wide response plans for relocating faculty members from dysfunctional situations into more functional departments.
- Establish more financial awards to be earned by meritorious faculty, and make these awards financially more significant.
- Encourage Assistant Professors to initiate federal grants under the advisement of well-established senior-level faculty members at UNLV. All colleges must provide competitive salaries to support administrative faculty (professional staff and administrative assistants) to navigate the submission process.
- Establish more faculty-friendly research support. Similar models include those used by University of Illinois “StartMyResearch”, funding workshops, better grant-writers, grants clubs (like that in SoLS), better databases for grant searching such as “Community of Science Workbench”, and financial support for Post-Docs and Graduate Assistants so we can attract best candidates in graduate programs.
- Reduce teaching loads for research faculty *in all units* to be congruent with those of other research institutions.
- Explore a UNLV “Budget Committee” – a best practices example is UC Berkeley. Among other functions this faculty-directed body reviews and makes recommendations directly to the Provost on all retention/pay raises. This ensures equity and transparency across campus.
• Instigate a transparent, comprehensive pay equity study (with comprehensive demographic data collection tailored to academic positions – for instance, inclusion of start-up packages).
  o Release redacted aggregate data from previous surveys.
  o Collect qualitative and quantitative data.
• Create a faculty-led working group to make recommendations on how to get pay increases to junior faculty (2010-2014 hires) especially hit hard by pay furlough and no merit.
• Implement an institutional process and content for retention, intervention, and exit interviews and program for faculty advocacy initiatives.
• Establish a faculty-based committee to re-evaluate faculty retention issues. This committee, the Faculty Separation Committee (or similarly named), would review de-identified results of exit surveys and recommend changes to Provost periodically (perhaps every two years).
• Improving the university’s research infrastructure for grant management will improve attitudes of research-intensive faculty.
• Institute 3rd year sabbatical option for all research-intensive tenure-track faculty (Boyd Law offers this to their tenure-track faculty members). To a great degree, this will require establishing real workload differentials across all of the units.

PROMOTION
UNLV does not successfully promote enough Associate Professors and this compromises our advancement as a Top Tier research institution. We need to better support and incentivize the promotion of Associate Professors to rank of Full Professor. We need a campus-wide strategic plan for supporting Associate Professors to Full and we need to study the reasons why (and compare with our aspirant institutions) a large number of our Associate Professors do not seek promotion to Full Professor (and we need to be able to access the data to understand the composition of our campus, and move beyond anecdote). The committee suggests getting current qualitative and quantitative on our Associate Professors will also help to create strategies to assist our untenured faculty to successfully achieve tenure and continue to be productive researchers and reach Full status. The committee found that finding very basic data about Associate Professors is difficult to attain. Specifically, we need current data on:
  o The average time Assistant Professors get tenured (and become Associate Professors), by school, department, gender, and race/ethnicity.
  o The average time Associate Professors get promoted (and become Full Professors), by the school, department, gender, and race/ethnicity.
  o The attrition rate of instructional faculty from 2009 to 2014, by school, department, gender, race/ethnicity, and rank.

Recommendations:
• Create, administer, and analyze a comprehensive qualitative and quantitative study on Associate Professors.
• Institute level of “master teachers” for faculty who do not move on to full or choose to focus on teaching rather than research/scholarship/performance arts. These master teachers would be assigned a higher teaching load. Of course, this designation can be changed if the faculty returns to sustained research activities.
• Develop campus-wide standard policies for Associate Professors regarding expectations for advancement.
• Address and change the UNLV cultural template (and rewards) that equates service with research production.
• Implement stronger research-based mentoring programs and incentives that pair Associates with research active Full faculty.
• Institute campus-wide limits on hiring Associate Professors into administration leadership positions (including chairs).
• Establish greater rewards for student travel to present their research, and to encourage publication, and grant opportunities. This will inherently influence faculty to up their game to satisfy student interest.
• Provide matches for federal student grants.
• Annually collect, analyze, and share comprehensive data on our associate professors across campus demographics of our campus:
  • This will require HR to provide accurate data so that the Office of Decision Support can provide analysis on an annual basis.
  • Keep track of the progress for all Associate Professors (there must be an administrative home responsible for the aggregate, cross-campus data): conduct interviews similar to the "exit interview" to understand the possible difficulties an associate professor may encounter and the sources of the difficulties.
  • Conduct a survey of Associate Professor and their experiences with promotion.
  • Collect, analyze, and report on required 3-year progress report for all Associate Professors.
    o Faculty Affairs should be analyzing this data and creating programs.
    o Institute incentives for all faculty who are on track to promotion.
    o Faculty who are not research productive assigned higher teaching load to offset lack of production (service does not replace research production expectations).

DIVERSIFICATION OF OUR FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION
The committee maintains that to truly build a diverse faculty across campus, we must include diversification of our administration. In order to understand how and where we need to concentrate our efforts, we need to create a comprehensive demographic profile of our campus administration. However, tracking down reports that highlight the diversity of the faculty, staff, and administration has been challenging for the committee. Older information is relatively easier to find, but current data are not. Being able to discuss the current status of the diversity of faculty, staff, and administration at UNLV is then a muted discussion since recent information is challenging to find and obtain.

Hiring best practices: Working to integrate diversified, collaborative faculty communities
Unit Review and Target Hire Program:
• It is recommended each college report a transparent and comprehensive demographic profile of their student majors, faculty, and administrative support, and how to address
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successes and obstacles in diversifying their faculty and administration, and match Top Tier aspirations and growth.

- High Profile Faculty hires: program targeted at hiring senior faculty, program seeks diverse pool of candidates.
- Junior Target Hires: program focused on hiring promising junior faculty, program seeks a diverse pool of candidates.
- Constellation/Cluster Hires: hire a strata of faculty. This constellation hire would include 2 and preferably 3 hires and all 3 are chosen from a diverse pool of applicants (2 senior, associate and full, and 1 tenure-track). This may be beneficial for departments who have entrenched lack of diversity, cultures of unexamined micro hostilities, and those that do not retain diverse students.

Recommendations:

- We recommend a transparent campus-wide strategy for hiring our 200 new faculty colleagues.
- We recommend a plan that forecasts the number and kinds of administrators needed to support and create new programs and initiatives.
- We recommend a comprehensive and transparent mapping of where our diverse faculty and administrators are located. There is a common misperception that diversification is only a problem in STEM-based fields, but it exists in other departments as well.
  - Two of our administrative divisions that should be leading the way for faculty are the Office of Diversity Initiatives (ODI) and the Office of Faculty Affairs (FA).
    - ODI and FA offices should be actively and intentionally studying our campus and recommending strategies for diversifying our faculty and supporting our underrepresented faculty members. We need a much more proactive administrative approach to RRPD and these two units should be leading the way.
    - National searches for ODI leadership (including VP for Government Affairs, Diversity Initiatives and Compliance, and AVP for Office of Diversity Initiatives/Chief Diversity Officer positions).
- Annual accounting report from ODI and FA offices on RRPD and specific initiatives, assessment of those initiatives, and results.
- Annual report from all Administrative Units on yearly demographics/diversification/hiring and advancement diversity of unit.
  - Create a comprehensive plan on how to diversify our administrative leadership, including a report on the demographic profile of leadership positions across campus (including all deans and chairs).
  - Make annual reports regarding the diversity of faculty, staff, and administration more readily accessible. Such information is essential for creating and assessing our campus climate initiatives and elemental for many grant proposals.
- National survey of academic faculty on the perception of the Rebel mascot and our campus climate and whether this influences recruitment of faculty members.
- Collect, analyze, and report exit data from candidates (faculty and administrators) who have rejected UNLV.
- Administration needs to report on its demography and target areas that have few underrepresented administrators. And these areas then intentionally targeted for focus diversification hires.