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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the 2014 Fall Convocation University of West Florida Provost Dr. Martha Saunders announced the formation of a task force to examine means by which scholarly activities and research at The University of West Florida could be encouraged, enhanced, and improved. The task force was chaired by Drs. William Huth and Wade Jeffrey. The members of the task force were selected by the provost after consultation and recommendations from the Academic Deans. The initial organization of the task force was founded on results from an open ended questionnaire submitted to the task force members in which they were asked to list up to five things that they would like to see addressed, considered, encouraged, enhanced, or improved to facilitate a culture of scholarly at UWF. Based on the responses to that questionnaire, five ideas were identified as target areas for further study using subcommittees. The five subcommittees were (i) developing a culture of scholarship; (ii) faculty workloads and assignments; (iii) organization and operation of the office of Research and Sponsored Programs; (iv) student involvement in scholarly activities; and (v) compensation and internal support. Recommendations made herein were also supported by a campus-wide faculty survey administered during the Spring 2015 semester using Qualtrics survey research suite. The survey instrument was developed by the task force and sent via email to a list of UWF faculty provided by the Provost’s office. The response rate was 46% and the survey sample demographics statistics were checked with UWF faculty population parameters to insure that the sample was representative.

Developing a culture of scholarship at The University of West Florida formed the basis on which this task force report was constructed and makes all of the subcommittee recommendations possible. Developing this culture at UWF will be both a top down and bottom up process. The administration should recognize, encourage, prioritize, and promote scholarly activities on campus by hiring faculty who excel at scholarly activities and by providing infrastructure, opportunity, and support for those faculty to succeed. Similarly, existing faculty who wish to excel at scholarly activities must also be motivated and supported. Faculty, in turn, must put forth the effort and demonstrate high quality expertise and scholarly productivity that not only adds to the knowledge base but also, simultaneously, supports quality teaching.
The role of scholarly activities and research in the history of the university has been mixed. Since its inception in 1965, UWF has found it difficult to identify and prioritize scholarly activities across the campus. Initial efforts were intended to focus on “research in the service of the teaching process” and as “part of the teaching-learning process.” Research was seen only to support teaching activities and UWF became known as a “teaching institution.” In a 1983 self study, however, faculty were “encouraged to participate in a variety of research and creative activities.” More recently, as UWF has increased enrollment in response to state funding formulas, a campus priority has been on the number of students in seats with minimal emphasis on faculty scholarly activities. Faculty driven scholarly activities are given little emphasis in the mission statements of administrative units across the academic structure at UWF, yet they are the foundation around which new knowledge is created and the best teaching and learning occurs. Scholarly activities are a critical factor, for instance, that distinguishes a university from a state college. Teaching and research are mutually supportive and a faculty “dedicated to the discovery, criticism, and application of ideas though research and other forms of creative activity” provide the best learning experiences for students. To be clear, an increase in the support for scholarly activities does not lessen the role of teaching at UWF, but rather it enhances it. *Mission statements of the University and academic Colleges should be rewritten to demonstrate a commitment to research and scholarly activities.* Quality research and scholarship should be expected, recognized, rewarded, and included in annual evaluations, tenure and promotion, and sustained performance evaluations.

Faculty at a university are expected to participate in the “three-legged stool of academia,” that is, teaching, research, and service. The predominant assignment at UWF is a 3 – 3 teaching load (three courses in each of fall and spring semesters or approximately a 75% assignment). It is abundantly clear that the vast majority of faculty find that this level of teaching commitment precludes generating significant scholarly effort. If 75% of a faculty member’s effort is expected in teaching, after obligatory service duties, there is little time available for scholarly endeavors. The task force approached this topic from many directions, but the overwhelming response was that *there needs to be flexibility in faculty workloads and assignments.* The standard 3 - 3 assignment does not foster scholarly activities. Several alternatives were presented including; (i) 2 - 2 assignments for research focused faculty, both new hires and existing; (ii) course banking (i.e. 4 - 2); (iii) increased availability for course releases for specific scholarly activities; (iv) 4 -
4 assignments for faculty who are not productive in scholarly activities or wish to focus only on teaching; (v) incorporation of efforts involved with student mentoring into assignments; and (vi) increased numbers and support for sabbaticals based on productivity; and (vii) increased approval of courses that are team taught. It is clear that the “one size fits all” approach to assignments, workloads, and expectations does not foster a productive culture of scholarship.

In general, faculty reported that they were not adequately compensated or supported in their scholarly activities. Responses focused on ways to incentivize and provide opportunities for faculty to have the resources needed to pursue their scholarly activities. Merit pay for high productivity, fully funded summer research awards to support faculty scholarship, and SEED account allocations to support new research ideas.

Student involvement is critical to scholarly activities in many disciplines. It is perhaps simplest to examine the issues related to undergraduate and graduate students separately. There has been a noticeable increase in the emphasis on “High Impact Practices” (HIP) for our undergraduate students with increasing support and infrastructure from the Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR). While students have access to funds for expenses and travel, faculty often view student mentoring as burdensome on top of their other assignments and responsibilities. Faculty led directed study courses, for instance, are tuition-generating credits for the university, but are not counted in faculty assignments and efforts. Undergraduate HIPs are often seen as great for the student but with little (or no) benefit to the faculty. The extra effort is often seen as not worth it. Faculty are encouraged to take on students without significant compensation (e.g., SEED allocations, travel support, materials purchased), incentive, or change to their assignments to acknowledge the increased effort put forward. Faculty who mentor undergraduate students should be compensated either financially or with adjusted assignments.

Graduate student involvement suffers some of the same but also different issues. In many disciplines, graduate students are critical to the productivity and completion of faculty research projects. They are also often the link between faculty and undergraduate researchers. Faculty productivity is directly enhanced and supported by mentoring graduate student projects. The effort required to mentor graduate students is similar to what is required for undergraduates and is also not recognized or compensated. The university has stated that it would like to increase its graduate student programs but it is hampered by the embarrassingly low compensation, relative
to other school, that is offered to students. Available data indicates that UWF ranks last among its peer institutions in graduate student compensation. They work more and are paid less. Without adequate support, the best students too often choose other schools for their graduate studies where their financial burden is significantly less. The University’s goal should be to increase the number of high caliber graduate students and improve the quality of graduate programs. UWF cannot attract more graduate students and those of high caliber until it offers competitive financial support. A University goal should be to adequately support those students so that they can devote more of their time to their graduate program (course work and thesis research) and less to teaching demands or securing secondary employment in order to cover living expenses. \textit{UWF should increase graduate student financial support to be competitive with peer institutions}. This can be accomplished by increasing graduate student stipends, providing full tuition waivers, and providing health insurance for those who desire it. Interestingly, other \textit{changes to University policies that provide increased opportunities for faculty to pursue more extramural funding should also result in increased grant-supported undergraduate and graduate students}. Increased numbers of graduate students then can also assist in recruiting and mentoring more undergraduate HIPs.

The role of the Research and Sponsored Programs (RSP) office on campus generated a significant amount of discussion. There appears to be a widely held perception that faculty interactions with RSP are often antagonistic. More than one faculty member described it as a sense that while RSP should be working for faculty, RSP treats faculty as if they work for them. Some of this may be rooted in the policy that the operational budget for RSP is now largely generated from grant indirect costs recovery. As such, faculty perceive that their job is to generate the funds so that RSP can operate, rather than RSP operating to help faculty generate grants. While facts may offer something different (for example faculty are often unaware of legal and administrative requirements), a number of faculty have anecdotally reported that they are reluctant to write proposals because they don’t want to interact with RSP. RSP also appears to have an on-campus reputation of making mistakes in grant submission, grants management, and budgeting. This perception clearly is in need of change and the function of RSP should be to ensure that it is a service office to faculty to facilitate research in general and successful grants applications and management in particular. \textit{The operations of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs must change to become more pro-active and customer service oriented to}
faculty. Critical to this recommendation is filling the vacant position of Director of Sponsored Research with a highly qualified and motivated candidate who understands the grants process. The university should develop and implement a research agenda using peer and aspirant institutions as guidance. RSP can help with the development of programs to assist and incentivize faculty to write and submit more extramural grants. The availability of professional grant writers or at least personnel with technical writing expertise could also help. Incentives for funded grants might include a re-examination of indirect cost (F&A) return allocations with increases to faculty principal and co-principal investigators. At one time, the distribution to faculty was as high as 29% and not it is 10%. Increasing the allocations to faculty, departments, and colleges also gives more control to academic units to use those funds as best supports research in their specific disciplines.

On a broader scale, UWF needs to change it reputation from being simply a “teaching institution” to an emerging research university. The university needs to identify, support, and promote the scholarly activities of the faculty and develop a strategic research agenda incorporating the University’s strengths and comparative advantages. These activities are a large part of what makes an institution a University and not just a place where a student takes classes. The general public is often unaware of the differences in educational opportunities afforded by a university compared to a state college. UWF has not done a good job in conveying this information. By recognizing, encouraging, and promoting the scholarly activities of its faculty, the institution can put the University back into UWF. In addition to acting on the recommendations described above, this can be assisted by creating specific distinguished research faculty either by promoting existing faculty or as an attraction for new faculty. The university could also develop a visiting scholars program to promote research activities and promote UWF.

Finally, two large visionary and related recommendations are to establish a Center for Transdisciplinary Research and Education and implement an interdisciplinary Ph.D. program. Given the action items already recommended the implementation of recommendations across the existing discipline based college structure might be difficult or problematic. A center structure for interdisciplinary (transdisciplinary, multidisciplinary) research and education would hark back to the founding vision for UWF that was expressed 50 years ago in the initial Alpha,
Gamma, Omega organizational structure and provide an opportunity for funding through naming rights. That center would not have a faculty of its own but rather faculty in disciplines across the colleges would be competitively assigned to the center for an academic year or a portion of the academic year including summer and the appointment would include release time and a salary supplement. Senior faculty appointments would include mentor roles and junior faculty would receive support for the pursuit of tenure and promotion; UWF faculty might also even choose a sabbatical year or semester in such a center structure. In addition to internal faculty appointments visiting scholars could be recruited for the academic year and for summers. Executives in residence from industry and government could be attracted as well along with both graduate and undergraduate student appointments that include support (health care, tuition waivers, and compensation). The center structure would also facilitate engaged scholarship from the professional disciplines and serve to support an interdisciplinary doctoral degree. While no department at UWF presently has the depth to support a discipline based doctoral degree, several departments might well be able to support half or a third of one. Interdisciplinary programs are not new and have been successful at many institutions. These two action items would be noteworthy and provide a vehicle with which to rebrand UWF as recognized for both quality teaching and quality scholarship.
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RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP TASK FORCE REPORT

This year, 2015, marks the 50th anniversary of the 1965 groundbreaking for The University of West Florida (UWF) in Escambia County and it is fitting to take a look at the evolution of institutional purpose and goals on this Golden Anniversary of President Crosby’s articulation of the UWF vision, mission, and purpose; especially with an emphasis on research, creative activities, and scholarship. The most recent basic Carnegie classification for UWF is a Doctoral/Research University with balanced arts and sciences/professions at the undergraduate level and a single education doctorate degree. UWF also received the Carnegie Community Engagement classification in 2015 joining a selective list of 240 other institutions across the United States. Similar institutions to UWF given UWF classification dimensions and the Carnegie search engine included East Tennessee State University, East Carolina University, Indiana State University, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, and University of Northern Colorado to name a few.

Research at The University of West Florida

The evolution of the role research has played at The University of West Florida (UWF) is interesting. In Harold B. Crosby’s 1965 report to the Florida Board Regents, the same year in which the groundbreaking ceremony took place, Crosby stated “The proper purpose of a university is to encourage the pursuit of truth…” President Crosby went on to qualify that statement: “The University of West Florida is committed to providing its students a highly individualized education experience and to organize its research activities so that they will be an integral part of the teaching function.” At the outset research and education (teaching) were decoupled with a teaching priority and research, in its apparent subservient role, was expected to be pedagogical in nature. At its inception UWF consisted of three faculties, Arts and Science, Business and Economics, and Education and the “faculties” were organized into a non-traditional structure designed to create living learning units or what might be termed today as learning communities. The structure used to organize academic disciplines included three colleges, Alpha, Gamma, and Omega; each with its own provost and the various academic disciplines were divided (it appeared to be at random) across the three colleges. The degree to which the discipline distribution was not random and directed toward interdisciplinary research prospects
would have been well ahead of its time and is developed as a recommendation explored further below.

The 1973 Self Study for initial accreditation purposes used the Crosby 1965 purpose statement but further delineated four goals: the pursuit of truth, individualization of the learning experience, research in the service of the teaching process, and service to the educational and cultural needs of the community. The 1973 self-study noted that “A discrepancy exists in the definition of research as a function of the university.” That discrepancy was the lack of a definition regarding research that contributed to teaching. The report also suggested that “Research is a legitimate and indeed necessary function of a university; but it should occur as a part of the teaching–learning process. To the extent that a university’s research activities occur in isolation from its teaching function, to that extent has it [sic] abandoned its primary educational mission.” So, early on as evidenced from the first institutional self-study, the UWF mission was focused on teaching with research narrowly defined in a teaching support capacity. The UWF brand was that of a “teaching institution.”

The Alpha, Gamma, Omega structure was discontinued in July 1979 and the University was reorganized into a traditional three college structure: College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business (including Systems Science), and a College of Education. Until 1983 the University contained only an upper division and in that year, a lower division was added. The Institutional Self Study in 1983 indicated that research activity at UWF had become much more integrated into the University culture over the decade since the 1973 study. Where the research standard discussion in the 1973 self-study comprised 2 pages of text, it was 19 pages in 1983. It was noted that National Science Foundation statistics indicated that UWF ranked third among non-Ph.D. granting universities in extracting external monies for purposes of research and training. The study also pointed out that “…faculty is strongly dedicated to the discovery, criticism, and application of ideas through research and other forms of creative activity.” These two self-studies (1973 and 1983) seem to document the nadir and zenith of research emphasis in UWF goals and objectives. The 1983 study opened as follows: “The primary mission of The University of West Florida is high quality education for its students. To accomplish this mission the University has assembled a faculty which is committed to teaching and is encouraged to participate in a variety of research and creative activities.” The research described in the 1983 self-study was wide
ranging and it was clear that the interpretation of the mission was that research and teaching were related as, after a set of research examples were discussed, the following statement was made: “These examples cite but a few of the significant creative contributions made by members of the teaching faculty of the University. Their efforts coexist with the University’s commitment to quality education and illustrate that teaching and research are mutually supportive.” The 1983 study also indicated that the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs was created in 1976 to facilitate research at UWF. A key feature was that an OR&SP purpose included “encouraging and facilitating research regardless of whether external funds are involved.” The study also documented the existence and purpose of a “University Research Committee” designed to promote research and make recommendations regarding its facilitation and management. The study also reported selected results from a faculty research survey and indicated the indirect cost incentive distribution. While the percent distribution did sum to 110% in the report it was interesting to note that 69% was targeted to the academic college, department, and faculty with a faculty share of 29.5%. Today the College, Department, and Faculty distribution is 10% each for a total of 30%.

A decade later UWF experienced another reorganization and Systems Science was split from the College of Business and organized into the Division of Computer Science and shortly after that a four college structure was implemented: College of Arts and Social Sciences, College of Science and Technology, College of Education, and College of Business. That structure was in place for several years until the University was again reorganized back into a three college structure: College of Arts and Sciences, College of Professional Studies, and College of Business. Finally, just this past year another reorganization took place and the University again was expanded to a four college organizational structure with a College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities; a College of Business; a College of Education and Professional Studies; and a College of Science, Engineering, and Health.

A University Research and Scholarship Perspective

The division of faculty labor across the goals and objectives of a university has long been the subject of scholarly inquiry and that discussion continues today (Locke, 1693; Bush, 1945; Rosovsky, 1990; Newman, 1996; Turner, 1996; Duderstadt, 2000; Rhodes, 2001; Ginsberg, 2011; and Crow and Dubars, 2015 provide a historical perspective). Newman over the years
1852 through 1858 took a hard look at the university mission when he was charged with establishing Trinity College in Dublin. Even given that institution’s religious focus he identified the production of knowledge for “its own end” without regard to its utility or usefulness as had been argued earlier by Locke (1693) who suggested that poetry, music, and Romanic languages were wastes of time (Turner, 1996, pp 113-114). Newman suggested that knowledge was not a means but an end and that truth was its object and that “A habit of mind is formed which lasts through life, of which, attributes are, freedom, equitableness, calmness, moderation, and wisdom…This then I would assign as the special fruit of the education furnished at a University.” The University was then a collection of all knowledge domains within which both faculty and students were subsumed. Where Newman argued the value of a broad based “liberal” education, he recognized the attack from those who “…insist that Education should be confined to some particular and narrow end, and should issue in some definite work, which can be weighed and measured. They argue as if everything, as well as every person, had its price; and that where there has been a great outlay, they have a right to expect a return in kind. This they call making Education and Instruction ‘useful’ and ‘Utility’ becomes their watchword.” In the U.S., the Morrill Acts in 1862 and 1890 established Land Grant institutions in the various states with the proviso to “…without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactic, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.” The opening statement was instructive and indicated support for the broad focus on knowledge espoused by Newman. As universities developed in America there was a profound change due to the world wars. Bush (1944) in response to a request from President Roosevelt crafted “Science-The Endless Frontier” in which he proposed the strengthening of federal support for university basic research. To implement that support the national agencies (e.g. National Science Foundation) and institutes were founded and funded to supplement public and private institutional funding for basic research. As Bush stated with regard to universities, “They are the wellsprings of knowledge and understanding. As long as they are free to pursue the truth wherever it may lead, there will be a flow of new scientific knowledge to those who can apply it to practical problems in Government, in industry, or elsewhere.” Bush also highlighted the importance of basic research: “Basic research is performed without thought of practical ends.
It results in general knowledge and an understanding of nature and its laws. This general knowledge provides the means of answering a large number of important practical problems, though it may not give a complete specific answer to any one of them. The function of applied research is to provide such complete answers. The scientist doing basic research may not be at all interested in the practical applications of his work, yet the further progress of industrial development would eventually stagnate if basic scientific research were long neglected.” While Bush had a clear bias towards the hard sciences relative to the social sciences and he is reported to have stated with regard to social sciences and the humanities that "I have a great reservation about these studies where somebody goes out and interviews a bunch of people and reads a lot of stuff and writes a book and puts it on a shelf and nobody ever reads it” (Zachary, 1997), he does indicate that in a federal policy directed at the hard sciences that “It would be a folly to set up a program under which research in the natural sciences and medicine was expanded at the cost of the social sciences, humanities, and other studies so essential to national well-being. Bush went on in higher education to head the Carnegie Foundation that took on, among other activities, the responsibility of classifying higher education institutions.

These statements from Newman and a general philosophical discussion about them has continued and are reinforced by Duderstadt (2000), Rhodes (2001), Smith (2011), and Crow and Dabars (2015). Duderstadt (2000), in a chapter on research and scholarship, noted that public attitudes in the 1990s shifted away from research towards undergraduate education eroding the expectation that universities were both to create knowledge as well as transmit it. He stated that “The concept of professors as teacher-scholars has narrowed to the idea that most university faculty should be confined primarily to the role of teachers,” which is contrary to the conventional wisdom that research and teaching were mutually reinforcing and should be conducted together. He also noted, as did Crow and Dabars (2015), the 1996 National Science Board recognition that: “The integration of research and education is in the national interest and should be a national objective,” and then suggested that research be returned to its former integrated status. Dudenstadt (2000) was also critical of the way that academic disciplines dominated various aspects of the academy and suggested that given trends in knowledge development, “The interdisciplinary momentum is not a fad, but a fundamental and long-term restructuring of the nature of scholarly activity.” He noted that there were some scholars who, rather than being pigeon holed into a discipline, had intellectual spans that crossed departmental
boundaries and served as human connections between isolated disciplines. He suggested these scholars be given university-wide positions to facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration in both teaching and research.

Smith (2011) is a handbook for the research administrator; the importance of maintaining a commitment to research as a strategic priority in the planning process was highlighted. Smith (2011) indicated that a strategic plan should reinforce the importance of research to campus academics and while that seems self-evident, he pointed out that even in a mature research university there are faculty who question that priority with statements like “our job is to educate students,” or “our job is to serve the citizens of the state or the local community.” Smith (2011) also mentioned that in less research intensive institutions there is often a class of faculty who were not expected to do research as a condition of employment and that while their role in the university may be very important and valuable, “…their voices may drown out a call for research.” As Smith (2011) summarized, “It never hurts to reiterate the university’s research mission in every possible forum.” Crow and Dabars (2015) described the reconceptualization effort at Arizona State University and discussed major architectural elements including research and scholarship. The process was described as “…a recasting of the American research university as a complex and adaptive comprehensive knowledge enterprise committed to discovery, creativity, and innovation, accessible to the broadest possible demographic, both socioeconomically and intellectually.” Crow and Dabars (2015) documented the contribution of the American knowledge enterprise economically and their results supported the Kaplan (2015) thesis that is discussed in more detail below. Crow and Debars (2015) also supported the importance of interdisciplinary research as mentioned by Duderstadt (2000) and they pointed out that the key to university reconceptualization as a knowledge enterprise is institutional restructuring that advances a unique set of objectives including interdisciplinarity. Implementation might be facilitated by a matrix structure in which individuals move among discipline based departments that are bridged and linked by interdisciplinary centers, offices, programs, courses, and curricula. The new Arizona State University reconceptualization had the following general guidelines for the academic community:

1. Respond to its cultural, socioeconomic, and physical setting;
2. Become a force for societal transformation;
3. Pursue a culture of academic enterprise and knowledge entrepreneurship;
4. Conduct use-inspired research;
5. Focus on the individual in a milieu of intellectual and cultural diversity;
6. Transcend disciplinary limitations in pursuit of intellectual fusion (transdisciplinarity);
7. Embed the university socially, thereby advancing social enterprise development;
8. Advance global engagement.

While some of this architecture stemmed from The National Academies 2005 report on facilitating interdisciplinary research, the implementation strategy developed at ASU appears to have significantly moved the university forward as evidenced by its global rankings. While Crow and Debars (2015) referred to the ASU reconceptualization in Google[x] speak as a “moonshot” it should be noted that at UWF a more modest “satellite in orbit” goal might be more appropriate and accomplish much, say the implementation of an interdisciplinary knowledge oriented research and education center along with a new doctoral degree. This recommendation is discussed in more detail below.

Ginsberg (2011) examined the increasing administrative infrastructure at higher education institutions and hypothesized an increasing dominance of administration at the expense of the faculty. He suggested that while both camps agree that the “…university is an institution that produces and disseminates knowledge through its teaching, research, public outreach, and other programs…most professors view scholarship and teaching as ends and the university as an institutional means or instrument through which to achieve those ends. For administrators, on the other hand, it is the faculty’s research and teaching enterprise that is the means and not the end and they primarily serve as revenue generators for the institution. This gives credence to the “knowledge factory” view as expressed in Aronowitz (2000) where the federal funding of research has been supplemented by corporate and other private sector funding with economic gain as an end; that is, the value of produced knowledge is in the market place. Ginsberg (2011) pointed out that symptoms of this shift can be evidenced by university administrators “finding it expedient to move a least some of their investment funds away from the academic realm, altogether, toward potentially more lucrative uses of capital such as real estate, athletic facilities, luxurious dormitories, equities, expansion of the campus shopping mall, and even the construction of parking ramps. Aronowitz and Ginsberg both point out shifts in University
objectives and have suggested that a return to the fundamental pursuit of truth through knowledge and the inculcation of a liberal education for students might be well founded. Kaplan (2015) also examined the scope and pace of the growth in artificial intelligence and concluded a dramatic change would take place in labor markets over the next several years as traditional “jobs” are lost to robotics and intelligent machines. These technological disruptions along with many others will induce significant labor market shifts including changes in markets that professional higher education schools serve. Uncoupling health care from employment is also altering the way time is allocated between work and non-work activities with the nature of work redefined. Kaplan (2015) invoked John Maynard Keynes’ 1930 classic (reprinted 1963) “Economic Possibilities for our Grandchildren” where it is argued that “…the economic problem is not-if we look into the future- the permanent problem of the human race.” The economic problem is solved through technology and the accumulation of capital. He further suggested that the time was not yet (1930) but suggested that it would take one hundred years (2030) and, according to Kaplan (2015), that time frame is about right. The view espoused by Keynes and Kaplan is also supported by the recent work on capital and its accumulation over time by Piketty (2014). Piketty’s (2014) conclusions about capital accumulation and its impact on labor markets and income distributional inequality support Kaplan and solutions to the issues that are raised will be grappled with in the socio-politico-economic environment over the next several decades. A university will no longer be a source for job related education but rather revert back to its more basic function of providing students with a general education that supports entrepreneurship and the ability to adapt to a changing economic environment. Kaplan (2015) also suggested the idea of a “flipped classroom” where students watch educational materials and learn online and complete homework at school with teachers and teaching assistants serving as guides and coaches. Kaplan (2015) suggested that the teaching role will diminish but did not indicate the potential for a corresponding increase in importance of the research role as disruptive technologies impact the economy and the academy.

This all portends a shift towards research knowledge creation in higher education institutions. The automation of teaching at undergraduate levels is a serious threat to teaching institutions and it is the research role of the university that may well weather that shift. Professors are not immune as artificial intelligence will impact nearly every professional field including law and medicine (Kaplan, 2015).
Given the UWF mission and composition of disciplines (business, social work, engineering, education, public administration, journalism, health, etc.) with strong concentrations in professional programs, the concept of “engaged scholarship” might well be an important organizational schema. The New England Resource Center for Higher Education defines engaged scholarship as follows:

The term "scholarship of engagement" is an emergent concept first used by Ernest Boyer in a 1996 article by that title. The term redefines faculty scholarly work from application of academic expertise to community engaged scholarship that involves the faculty member in a reciprocal partnership with the community, is interdisciplinary, and integrates faculty roles of teaching, research, and service. While there is variation in current terminology (public scholarship, scholarship of engagement, community-engaged scholarship), engaged scholarship is defined by the collaboration between academics and individuals outside the academy - knowledge professionals and the lay public (local, regional/state, national, global) - for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. The scholarship of engagement includes explicitly democratic dimensions of encouraging the participation of non-academics in ways that enhance and broaden engagement and deliberation about major social issues inside and outside the university. It seeks to facilitate a more active and engaged democracy by bringing affected publics into problem-solving work in ways that advance the public good with and not merely for the public.

Van de Ven and Johnson (2006) and Van de Ven (2007) provided a business school engaged scholarship model and an implementation guide for higher education activities that align with the philosophical basis for engaged scholarship. Van de Ven (2007) suggested that a central mission for scholars in professional schools is to conduct research that both advances a discipline and enlightens practice in a professional domain and that this mission is often not fulfilled due to what is termed a theory-practice gap due to knowledge transfer obstacles. This issue is certainly not new and as mentioned earlier has been much discussed. As Bush (1945) stated, there is a need for applied research and the engaged scholarship model develops a framework within which that application takes place. Van de Ven (2007) proposed a four step process to bridge the gap between theory and practice. The interrelated activities include:

1. Recognizing and situating the problem;
2. Gathering information to ground the problem in its setting;
3. Diagnosing the information to ascertain the characteristics or symptoms of the problem;
4. Deciding on what actions or questions to pursue to resolve the research problem.

So engaged scholarship involves situating, grounding, diagnosing and resolving combined in a research method context that can be implemented in a professional discipline. The model
proposed in Van de Ven and Johnson was not without its critics (McKelvy, 2007) but much of the shortcomings that were identified were addressed in the Van de Ven (2007) book. Still I am reminded of a quote the origin of which is uncertain, “theory without practice is pointless but practice without theory is mindless.” Engaged scholarship is at least an attempt to bridge the knowledge production chasm.

**Current UWF University and College Mission Statements**

**UWF Mission**

The University of West Florida (UWF) is a public university based in Northwest Florida with multiple instructional sites and a strong virtual presence. UWF’s mission is to provide students with access to high-quality, relevant, and affordable undergraduate and graduate learning experiences; to transmit, apply, and discover knowledge through teaching, scholarship, research, and public service; and to engage in community partnerships that respond to mutual concerns and opportunities and that advance the economy and quality of life in the region.

UWF is committed to planning and investing strategically to enhance student access and educational attainment; to build on existing strengths and develop distinctive academic and research programs and services that respond to identified regional and state needs; and to support highly qualified faculty and staff who engage students in rigorous, high-impact, student-oriented learning experiences that enhance personal and professional development and empower alumni to contribute responsibly and creatively to a complex 21st Century global society.

**Individual College Mission Statements**

**College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities**

The College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities at the University of West Florida is committed to the educational enrichment and professional development of students. The college’s mission is to provide:

- distinctive programming that serves quality students through engaging high-impact practice in and beyond the traditional classroom,
- distinctive faculty activity that advances the academic enterprise and enriches the campus discussion, and
- distinctive partnerships that meet local and regional needs and contribute to the intellectual life of the community.

The college supports its faculty and staff through strategically investing its resources, highlighting efforts and successes, soliciting additional sources of funding, broadening and reinforcing its alumni network, and connecting educational effort with student outcomes to showcase UWF as an intellectual and culture center of excellence.
**College of Business**

The mission of the College of Business is to provide a high quality, student-orientated, educational experience to baccalaureate and master’s degree business students primarily from the Northwest Florida region.

With a focused priority on teaching excellence, supported by scholarship and service, the College of Business prepares students for successful careers in business and society and, in doing so, advances the educational and economic development of Northwest Florida.

Note: The latter statement changed from “With focused priorities on teaching excellence, the development and dissemination of applied knowledge, and service to the external communities…”

**College of Education and Professional Studies**

To educate and prepare competent professionals and educators to resolve 21st century problems using the most advanced theoretical, managerial, and technological knowledge, skills, and abilities available.

**College of Science, Engineering and Health**

The mission of the College of Science, Engineering and Health (CSEH) at the University of West Florida is to provide innovative programs of excellence in education, research, and public and professional service at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. CSEH promotes the production of highly competitive graduates as judged by the highest academic standards in the fields of science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM) and health.

The University mission contains language that indicates the importance of research as does the College of Science, Engineering and Health. The College of Education and Professional Studies does not mention research or scholarship at all. The College of Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities does not mention research or scholarship explicitly but does mention “faculty activity” that “advances the academic enterprise” and “enriches the campus discussion” which both might be an implicit reference to research, creative activities, and scholarship. The College of Business explicitly has gone back to a teaching college model with scholarship in a subservient role supporting teaching.
SUMMARIES OF TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEES

Initial organization of the Task Force was founded on results of an open ended questionnaire to the task force members in which they were asked to list up to five things that they would like to see addressed, considered, encouraged, enhanced or improved to facilitate a culture of scholarly activities at UWF. Based the responses to that questionnaire, five target areas were identified to study further with specific subcommittees.

1. Developing a culture of scholarship
2. Faculty workloads and assignments
3. Organization & operation of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
4. Student involvement in scholarly activities
5. Compensation and internal support

Developing a culture of scholarship at The University of West Florida formed the basis on which this task force report was constructed and makes all of the subcommittee recommendations possible. Developing this culture at UWF will be both a top down and bottom up process. The administration should recognize, encourage, prioritize, and promote scholarly activities on campus by hiring faculty who excel at scholarly activities and by providing infrastructure, opportunity, and support for faculty to succeed. Faculty, in turn, must put forth the effort to demonstrate high quality expertise and scholarly productivity.

I. Developing a Culture of Scholarship

This subcommittee immediately noted that faculty driven scholarly activities were given little emphasis in the UWF mission statement, yet they are the foundation around which new knowledge is created and the best teaching and learning occurs. Scholarly activities are a critical factor, for instance, that distinguishes a university from a state college. Much recent emphasis by the University has focused on teaching with comparatively less support for faculty scholarly activities.

Draft Mission Statement

*Through scholarly and creative activities, the UWF faculty is committed to generating and disseminating new knowledge aimed at improving the future of our students, our region and our world. At UWF, we choose to value those activities that carry high impact and high quality knowledge integration, critical analysis, and discovery.*
Scholarly activities are, by definition, discipline specific, and it should be emphasized that while traditional research endeavors are obvious indicators of scholarly activities, other activities and products may have equal relevance. Scholarly and creative activities are related to the faculty member’s discipline but may include significant work that prompts the intellectual advancement of others in areas related to the faculty member’s University appointment. Examples of scholarly and creative activities are included in Appendix I.

Scholarly and creative activities are seen as the culmination of efforts that lead to a high impact, high quality, publicly disseminated, contribution. An important consideration when evaluating scholarly activity production is an appreciation for quality. This may be difficult but is critical, for instance, during tenure, promotion (T&P), and sustained performance evaluations (SPE). It is important that clear guidelines are codified into T&P and SPE expectations at the departmental, college, and university levels. Examples of quality evaluations are included in Appendix II.

In order to improve the culture of scholarship at UWF, these scholarly and creative activities must be encouraged, enhanced, and supported by UWF at the departmental, college, and university levels. Some examples include:

- Codification onto by-laws, T&P and SPE guidelines
- On campus recognition through awards
  - Financial awards
  - Course release
- Internal grant funds
  - Pre-tenure professional development grants
  - Post-tenure fellowships
  - Semester leaves for creation of a product or outcome
  - Sabbaticals
- Incentivize with SEED account strategies
- Priority assistance from academic support centers
- External (e.g., business, industry) internships
- Visiting scholars program

As it develops and grows, a culture of scholarship at UWF must also be promoted and marketed. There should be a formal and energetic effort to promote the accomplishments of faculty and students to the general public. As noted above, scholarly activities are, in a large part, what sets UWF apart from state colleges – yet the general public has little appreciation for the differences in educational opportunities between a university and a state college. What does
that difference in tuition provide? The accomplishments of the University should be communicated through regular external documents and other media to the general public. UWF needs to establish a “brand” that sets it apart from other higher education institutions in the region. Specific recommendations by the subcommittee also included establishing a “scholarly activities presentation day,” inclusion of scholarly activities on the UWF.edu home page in a rotating banner, ads recognizing accomplishments in the Chronicle of Higher Education, the Pace Library’s annual Faculty Publications Reception, and regular announcements on WUWF. It should be noted that since this task force was created, the newly formed Center for Research and Economic Opportunity (CREO) appears to be specifically targeting this need. The College of Science, Engineering and Health has also recently hired a person to handle public relations for the college. While these efforts are useful, a coordinated University-wide approach is also essential.

II. Workloads and Assignments

This subcommittee focused its efforts on developing recommendations related to workloads and assignments that will help develop a stronger culture of research and creative scholarly activities at UWF. The goal of these recommendations is to inspire faculty to further develop their scholarly and creative activities agendas and, ultimately, promote a stronger research culture at UWF. The objective was to identify ways to better motivate faculty – either by rewarding for higher productivity, or by not incentivizing faculty who fail to meet department and college expectations in the area of scholarly and creative activities. Several mechanisms were identified and include:

(1). Course Banking Options. Optional course banking (i.e. loading one semester with more classes so as to free up another semester for research demands) with departmental and college approval. This will improve professional productivity and work-life balance at little-to-no financial cost to the University. Eligibility should be based upon demonstrable research needs (i.e. project deadlines, etc.). The effectiveness of this recommendation would be increased with the further implementation of several of the additional recommendations below.

(2). Merit Based Pay for Raise Pools. Merit pay and other incentives would help establish a culture that facilitates faculty production of high-quality/value scholarship. Merit pay could be determined by an interdisciplinary committee, and based upon departmental definitions of scholarship in each specific discipline. Implementation of merit pay should be carried out at the college-level to ensure effectiveness and allow for tailoring based on each area. In particular, the subcommittee suggested that raise pools should be used to reward productivity, as opposed to across the board non-performance related allocations.
(3). **Summer Research Awards.** Summer research awards based upon productivity should be allocated at the college level and funded in the amount equivalent to teaching two summer classes. These should be competitive awards, requiring specific explanation of the research to be conducted and a full post-term report detailing the results. This would open up additional research time to selected faculty for higher scholarly productivity during the summer term.

(4). **Named Research Professorships.** It is recommended that Named Research Professorships distinct to each discipline be created. The reward for these positions would be added to the base salary in perpetuity. These professorships could be used to incentivize current highly productive faculty or as a recruiting tool for attracting a higher quality candidate when hiring in the future. While the financial investment for this recommendation is high, it has the potential to be a “game-changer” for increasing the long-term quality of our faculty and enhancing our external scholarly visibility.

(5). **Tiered Teaching Loads Based on Research Productivity.** After consideration of many alternatives, a tiered teaching load system is recommended based upon demonstrated research productivity and the faculty member’s desired emphasis. This “sliding scale” could be realized in a 2/2 load, 2/3 load, 3/3 load, 3/4 load or 4/4 load based upon faculty predetermined emphasis and sustained performance. A system change such as this would necessitate a faculty member setting the percentage of teaching vs. scholarship vs. service in their annual evaluation (and supporting this in their CAERS report). The basic idea is that the number of faculty receiving a lower teaching course-load would be offset by the number of faculty receiving a higher course-load. Data results from the faculty survey suggest this option might be attractive to all faculty. Such a system would have to be developed at a college and departmental level to adjust for issues such as resource availability/flexibility and other unforeseen constraints that emerge on a discipline basis.

(6). **Course Release Awards to Facilitate Scholarship.** A University-wide program to provide course releases is encouraged. The releases should be competitive and the number per college should be determined by the size of the college and demonstrated past productivity in the areas of scholarship and creative activities. Distribution within the college would be determined by the Dean, but based upon an open and interdisciplinary definition of “scholarship” (at the college level). Emphasis should be placed on providing reduced course loads (via release) to new hires at the Assistant Professor level.

(7). **Awarding of Sabbaticals Based on Productivity.** A change in policies regarding the awarding of sabbaticals is proposed to one based solely on productivity rather than simply time-served (i.e. sabbatical as a privilege, not a right). Sabbaticals should be used to further professional development and scholarly research or to achieve some other goal of the mission of the University (hence a faculty member with an emphasis on service or teaching could use a sabbatical for professional development rather than a research agenda). Year-long sabbaticals should be funded at a higher percentage than is currently provided (i.e., at least 75% of salary). These changes come with increased expectations of productivity and a more efficient system for monitoring/tracking this productivity should be established.

(8). **Limit Service for Pre-Tenure Faculty.** Facilitating the successful early career development of young faculty is critical. Current policies often make establishment of productive scholarly activities programs for new faculty hires difficult. Teaching assignments and course releases
have been discussed, but there was wide-spread support for reducing service requirements for pre-tenure faculty.

III. The Operations of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (RSP)

There appears to be a widely held perception that faculty interactions with RSP are often antagonistic. One faculty member described it as a sense that while RSP should be working for faculty, RSP treats faculty as if they work for them. Some of this may be rooted in the policy that the operational budget for RSP is now largely generated from indirect cost recovery from grants. As such, faculty perceive that their job is to generate the funds so that RSP can operate, rather than RSP operating to help faculty generate grants. While facts may offer something different (for example faculty are often unaware of RSP legal and other requirements), numerous faculty anecdotally have reported that they were reluctant to write proposals because they don’t want to interact with RSP. RSP also has an on-campus reputation of making mistakes in grant submissions, grants management, and budgeting. This perception needs to be changed and the function of RSP must be to ensure that it is a service office to faculty to facilitate research and successful grants applications. The RSP subcommittee made the following recommendations:

1. Fill the vacant director of RSP position while retaining the Associate Vice President for Research position. There is a current search underway for a Director of Sponsored Research. The transfer of RSP into CREÓ, however, negates some of this recommendation. The success of this new organization is dependent on the successful hiring of a strong and effective Director of Sponsored Research.

2. Pursue organization changes to affect the overall operational culture of RSP to be more proactive and customer-service oriented. An audit of all personnel and operations should be undertaken once the new Director of Sponsored Research is hired. Strengths and weaknesses should be identified and resources allocated to improve the operations of the office.

3. Create an improved program of incentives for faculty to work on external grant writing (See subcommittee II recommendation above).

4. Conduct a thorough analysis, periodically, of UWF’s research capabilities, including its facilities and faculty expertise and interests

5. Contribute to the development, implementation, and promotion of a clearly-focused research agenda for UWF. This relates back to subcommittee I’s recommendation for UWF to increase scholarly activities into its Mission Statement and develop a “Brand” on which it can focus, encourage, and support.

6. Develop a peer and aspirant list with research expenditures (or something similar) as a prime metric. How do we stack up against other similar universities? Are we doing a good job or are we lagging? Identify strengths and weaknesses with peer and aspirant institutions.
IV. Student Involvement with Scholarly Activities

The faculty survey reflected the desire that the approach to teaching and scholarship should be highly integrated at UWF. Student involvement is critical to scholarly activities in many disciplines. As a predominantly undergraduate university, there is a strong (and increasing) recognition for undergraduate research at UWF. While limited, our graduate programs are also important in providing opportunities for students to succeed with advanced training and experiences outside the classroom.

Although faculty at UWF are dedicated to and passionate about undergraduate research, there is a perception that such research is more effective at promoting undergraduate researchers than in producing the type of scholarly output that most often results in promotion and tenure for faculty. Student-involved research is time consuming for faculty. Faculty were asked in the research survey to rank their time spent working with students in five categories. “Assisting with scholarship (conducting research, compiling literature reviews, etc.)” was ranked first by 29.63% and second by 31.85% of faculty. When combined (61.48%), faculty surveyed rank this time assisting with scholarship on par with teaching (60.87%). There is room to increase the number of students in research. More than 52% of the faculty survey responses reported that ideally, their research would involve more students than it currently does, indicating an unmet need for student researchers at UWF.

Across the university, more than 50% of the faculty survey responses indicated that graduate students are crucial to their research productivity. As a result, there appears to be widespread interest in building the UWF graduate program as a way to enhance faculty scholarship, and 60% of surveyed faculty think that improving the graduate student compensation package would increase their research productivity. The same fraction, 60%, of the faculty, say our graduate assistant (GA) pay package makes it difficult for them to recruit quality students compared with peer institutions. Other survey results indicated that faculty often rely on graduate students to train their directed independent study students, so undergraduate participation in research may also be limited by the number of graduate students at the university. Some faculty in Bachelors-only departments expressed a desire for an MS/PhD program.

For faculty without graduate programs, there is a large disparity in how undergraduate research is conducted among departments and labs: in some cases, undergraduate researchers are crucial
to productivity, and in others, training undergraduates is seen as an uncompensated time sink for faculty. Although nearly 40% of surveyed UWF faculty agreed that mentoring undergraduate students is crucial to their research productivity, there were broad concerns about the quality of undergraduate students being recruited to UWF. Suggestions from the survey favored faculty incentives for student mentoring, ideas on how undergraduates already working on campus might be better involved in research for work-study, and increasing funding for undergraduate student research.

The recommendations below reflect the dual nature of scholarship at UWF: #1-2 address how graduate research specifically might be improved at UWF, while #3-5 address student issues in general.

(1) *Raise graduate student compensation* to a competitive level (give all grad students student health insurance, a 100% tuition waiver, and a salary increase).

- UWF is last among peer and aspirant institutions on graduate compensation (see Appendix III), which is seen by faculty as a significant barrier to faculty scholarship. Providing a competitive tuition, compensation and benefits package to graduate students will improve the ability to recruit and admit more graduate students to UWF. Improvement to the graduate program will have a tangible effect on faculty research productivity, as well as increase the UWF score on the Board of Governors’ Performance Funding Model’s Metric 8a; Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis. *Owing to the low support for graduate students, highly qualified and motivated students will often choose another institution because they cannot afford the low compensation provided by UWF.*

- The Affordable Care Act has created confusion and difficulty in Graduate Student Teaching Assistantships. Failure to provide health insurance by UWF to graduate students limits their workable hours per week. It is unclear whether students with their own health insurance can work more hours, but as a result the standard is currently that no student works more than 30 hours per week.

(2) Give faculty *course releases to write grants that will support graduate students*; give new faculty automatic course releases in their first year to recruit graduate students and encourage development of healthy and productive research programs. This would possibly be facilitated by putting course releases, and the ability to award them, in the hands of chairs as opposed to deans.

- New faculty hires are often, first and foremost, assigned duties based on teaching requirements. As a result, the development of research programs, including grant writing with targeted student support takes a back seat. Course releases early in a faculty’s career would allow maintenance of healthy research avenues for which they were hired, resulting in scholarship being produced earlier and larger grants that might include student support.

- A productive scholarly activities program requires graduate students. Support for those students comes primarily from either (i) university assistantships (which are lowest among
peer institutions) or (ii) faculty grants. Both need to increase, but faculty grant writing can only increase if appropriate time is allocated to it.

(3) **Student mentoring** should be included in faculty work assignments and as part of annual evaluations.

- Mentoring students is time consuming, and currently faculty are not compensated nor is their time adequately accounted for dissertation/thesis credits or independent study credits beyond their regularly assigned teaching loads. A consistent process of faculty recognition for mentoring students does not exist among the colleges. While individual departments or programs may recognize mentoring, a university-wide process would emphasize the importance UWF places on student research. Reduction in other assignments or additional compensation (the equivalent of “overload”) for thesis, dissertation, and directed study credits is recommended.

(4) **Increase graduate student and undergraduate student funding for research and travelling to professional conferences and meetings.**

- Student participation in professional meetings is a critical component of education and professional development. Promises of participation may provide an incentive for students to prepare presentable works. Mentoring these students would increase faculty research productivity as faculty would be included on these presentations. Ultimately those presentations should lead to peer reviewed publications.

(5) Match talented undergraduates doing *work study* with faculty mentors so they can assist in research/scholarship.

- Surveyed faculty stated that they would like to see more focus at UWF placed on the recruitment of quality students. While 52% of faculty surveyed said that ideally their research would involve more students, faculty worry about the quality of students being admitted into the university, and would like early identification of the truly talented students so they might be matched with faculty and asked to participate in research.

- Utilizing talented undergraduates who are receiving funds from the U.S. Department of Education’s Federal Work Study (FWS) program has the potential to benefit the student, the faculty member and the university. The student will receive training and experience in their degree field that will give the student a competitive advantage in the job market. The University benefits through score increases on the Board of Governors’ Performance Funding Model’s Metric 1 - Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further 1 Year after Graduation and Metric 2 - Median Average Wages of Undergraduates Employed in Florida 1 Year after Graduation.
V. Compensation and Internal Incentives

Based on the Research Task Force survey of UWF faculty it is clear that the UWF faculty supports the idea that research, creative, and scholarly activities productivity should be linked to various incentives. Based on a scale of 1 (not important) to 5 (very important) faculty provided the following average and median responses regarding their envisioned importance of intellectual contributions to the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Evals</th>
<th>Travel Support</th>
<th>Pay Raises</th>
<th>Teaching Loads</th>
<th>Sabbatical</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Promotion Associate</th>
<th>Promotion Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subcommittee on compensation and internal incentives interviewed all of the UWF academic deans during the 2014-2015 academic year. The academic deans displayed primary interests in increasing the quality, visibility, and impact of future research and creative activities at UWF. Their identifications of scholarly activities impact were diverse and included earning acclaim within a scholar’s field, contributing findings or pieces that allow for improved student experiences, and/or helpful interaction with the local community. The academic deans also called for increased accountability amongst faculty to demonstrate the impacts of their contributions, particularly where increased resources might be utilized to enhance UWF’s culture of scholarship.

As part of the earlier mentioned survey, faculty were also asked to rank eight different focus areas where university, college, and department resources might be targeted in order to encourage an improved culture of scholarship and creativity among UWF faculty. There were 141 complete responses with rankings from 1 (most important) to 8 (least important).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer Funds</th>
<th>Course Releases</th>
<th>Seed Accounts</th>
<th>Merit Raise pool</th>
<th>Travel Support</th>
<th>Course Scheduling</th>
<th>One-time Awards</th>
<th>Sabbaticals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the priorities of UWF faculty, as demonstrated from the survey, and the priorities of the academic deans, as shared in their interviews with the subcommittee on compensation and internal incentives, the following recommendations were developed:
• Create fully paid summer support positions for faculty in order to provide extended time for focus upon scholarly and creative activities. These positions should provide pay equal to a two-course summer teaching load (the standard for full summer pay). Accountability is critical. The positions should be founded on a merit-based application and may include faculty member’s prior scholarly record. Part of the support payments may be withheld until an awardee files whatever documentation is deemed appropriate to demonstrate scholarly progress at the conclusion of the summer term. Decisions on support positions might be made based on input from the college or department level, but should be based on merit (of application and record) rather than a rotational basis. Applications should be encouraged, and academic deans and/or department chairs should not discourage or refuse faculty from applying for summer support positions, nor refuse the funding and implementation of such positions once awarded.

• Flexible teaching loads for regular academic years that encourage and support scholarly activities should be available based on faculty preference and success for intensity in research and scholarly activities versus teaching activities. Faculty wishing a more research-intensive workload at UWF should be able to pursue such agendas, and their annual evaluations, periodic reviews, and applications for promotions and tenure should be held against higher research standards should they so elect. Research-intensive faculty should periodically submit evidence of the increased scholarly productivity generated by their reduced teaching responsibilities. Teaching loads should be adjusted periodically should tenured, research-intensive faculty fail to continue to produce high-impact scholarship. Simultaneously, faculty who desire lower research responsibilities should have fewer demands for scholarly and creative activity productivity, but such faculty should have actual teaching loads increased to the 4/3 or 4/4 level, rather than the de facto 3/3 level commonly used. There may be many faculty willing to consider taking each side of this multi-tracked faculty approach, and thus overall utility and satisfaction of faculty may increase under such a model without great disruption or increase of UWF resources.

• Seed account allocations for meritorious research and creative activities should be awarded to deserving faculty in order to foster a greater culture of scholarship amongst the UWF community. Awards should be based on the quality and impact of scholarship. Strict criteria demonstrating quality and impact should be determined at the college and/or departmental levels (see for example Appendix II). Faculty receiving allocations should be given considerable latitude for the expense of funds on research-based purposes including, but not limited to: data, equipment, manuscripts and materials, submission and registration fees, and travel expenses (including international travel and exploratory travel for the purpose of initiating/enhancing new creative projects).

• Merit pay raises including a continued, strong emphasis on scholarly activities when evaluating faculty for promotion and during Sustained Performance Evaluations. Increases in pay/compensation for UWF faculty should demonstrate incentives for high quality faculty, including in the area of scholarship. Part of the budget for salary increases among UWF faculty should be directed toward faculty demonstrating superior performance, rather than a pure focus on “across the board” pay increases or adjustments for cost-of-living, compression, or inversion scenarios.
• Adequate compensation for overload teaching resulting from extramural funding. While faculty may “buy out” a course release (often 25% of salary per course) due to funded grant activity, the overload compensation (should a faculty agree to teach the course anyway) is often well below 10% of salary.

VI. Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Survey

Several of the subcommittee reports refer to a survey that was developed by task force members within each of the subcommittee areas and administered to the faculty in order that the task force report provide a broader representation of the UWF faculty population. The actual survey is displayed in Appendix VII. A complete list of faculty along with some descriptive statistics was provided to the task force. The survey was created and pilot tested by the task force membership and developed and administered using the Qualtrics survey research software system. All faculty received an email from the Provost with a message expressing the importance of the endeavor to the university and a link to the actual survey. The introductory material to the survey again indicated the purpose of the project and, as a completion incentive, participants were offered the opportunity to participate in a random drawing for several “prizes” for the coming academic year. The survey was administered during the Spring 2015 semester and one follow-up appeal was sent to encourage as much faculty participation as possible. The survey was emailed by the Provost’s office to 385 addresses and a total of 178 usable responses were received for a 46% response rate. Faculty survey sample demographic data was compared to data, provided by the Provost Office, for the population of UWF faculty. For all 386 faculty in the provost database the mean age was 50.6 and for the set of faculty that completed the survey the mean age was 48.8. Similarly the gender distribution in the UWF faculty population was 53.4% male and 46.4% female while for the sample the proportions were 62.2% male and 37.8% female. For the university population the mean number of years at their current academic rank was 6.7 years and for the research sample the same mean value was 6.3 years. Finally the distribution of faculty by college that was obtained from the provost’s office was compared to the distribution of survey research participants in the sample. The College of Science, Engineering, and Health comprises 38.1% of the UWF faculty population and their corresponding representation in the sample was 43.7%. The College of Arts, Social Science, and Humanities is 23.6% of the University faculty and 21.1% of the sample. The College of Education and Professional Studies is 23% of the university and 16.2% of the sample. Finally, the College of Business comprises 15.4% of the
University population of faculty and 17.6% of the sample. So overall, given the parameters from the University population of faculty the sample appeared to be representative. The only caveats might be that with regard to gender females were under and males over represented in the sample but that could be explained by the inclusion of administrative staff in the data that was provided by the provost office. It also appeared that the College of Education and Professional Studies might be underrepresented in the sample which could well be an issue since it houses the only doctoral degree at UWF.

The first two question sets in the survey inquired about the actual composition of faculty time spent in teaching, research, and service and the distribution across the same categories that the faculty member would rather have. The actual questions were: “Please indicate the distribution of your actual work effort at UWF between the following activities over the course of a typical year,” and “Please indicate the work effort distribution that you would prefer to have.” In each case, the work effort activities were teaching, scholarship, and service.

Faculty Distribution of Work Effort: Actual and Desired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N=176</th>
<th>Current Actual (median %)</th>
<th>Desired (median %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty appear to want to decrease their current effort levels devoted to both teaching and service and reallocate the time to scholarship. Note that the median preference still had a 50% effort allocation to teaching. Examining the data a bit further indicated that, concerning the research preference question, 16% of the survey participants wanted to allocate 10% or less of their time to scholarship. The teaching research effort distribution was explored further with the following statements: “If given the opportunity and time flexibility, I would like to pursue a more aggressive research or creative activities agenda,” and “If given the opportunity and flexibility, I would prefer to allocate more of my time to teaching and pedagogy and less of my time to my
research or creative activities.” Participants were asked for their degree of agreement with the statements using a 7 point Likert scale and combining the agree and disagree responses indicated that 74.4% agreed and 13.7% disagreed with the statement indicating increased scholarship while 20.1% agreed and 62.8% disagreed with the statement indicating increased teaching. The results suggest a clear faculty interest in increasing the research and creative scholarly activity level. The responses also suggest that there is a trade off as with regard to teaching there was still 20.1% of the faculty that had a preference for increased teaching which suggests that optimal load reallocations might well be developed that make both groups of faculty better off without significant resource outlays. Finally faculty were given the statement “I would favor adjustable teaching loads where faculty could choose between a teaching emphasis with fewer research expectations or a research emphasis with fewer teaching expectations” and asked for their degree of agreement. The results expressed a clear preference for adjustable teaching loads with 81.7% agreeing and only 5.6% disagreeing with the statement. There were also only 6.3% in the neither agree nor disagree response so that the faculty had a clear preference with respect to favoring adjustable teaching loads.

Several questions were posed that asked how faculty scholarship was valued by the department, college, and university. Research participants agreed (74%) that both their college and department valued the scholarship and creative activities that they provided while 52.5% of the participants agreed that the University valued their scholarship. More effort might be devoted to faculty research and scholarship recognition through media outlets including WUWF where one might get the idea that archeology is the only research activity at UWF; it might well be appropriate to “unearth” some of the other University disciplines on a regular basis. University valuation of faculty scholarship was also examined when research participants were asked for their degree of agreement with the statement “The value placed on scholarship and creative activities at UWF is commensurate with the time spent on those activities,” and 49.4% of the participants disagreed with the statement while 29% agreed. Again faculty appeared to be concerned that their effort in the scholarship domain was undervalued by the University.

Faculty perceptions about resource allocation were also explored in the survey. Faculty were given the statement “I would like to see a portion (10-20%) of potentially new internal research support funding dedicated to resource improvements to attract and support new faculty
scholarship.” Strong support for this was indicated with 72.6% of the faculty in the survey agreeing and 5.6% disagreeing. Faculty were also asked to respond to the statement “Research support funding should be directed toward quality rather than quantity improvements,” and 76.2% agreed with the statement and only 3.8% disagreed. This finding suggests the development of a quality measurement mechanism for scholarship. Finally faculty were given the statement “I think that a faculty advisory council for sponsored research would be useful, and a majority, 56.9%, agreed that faculty interaction with sponsored research would be useful. This structure has been in place historically at UWF and it appeared that the faculty would like to see it continued.

There was a question designed to measure what incentives faculty would prefer regarding scholarly productivity. The specific question was “In general, would you be more interested in scheduling incentives (course releases, more flexible scheduling options, etc.) or compensation incentives (cash bonuses, research merit raises, seed account allocations, etc.) tied to scholarship productivity?” The faculty were split between the two alternatives with scheduling incentives selected by 55.3% and compensation selected by 44.7% indicating that both incentives were important productivity improvement mechanisms. With respect to resources devoted to scholarship support another statement posited: “The amount of resources allocated to faculty production of intellectual contributions and/or creative activities is adequate,” and 68.8% of the surveyed faculty disagreed (11.9% agreed) which indicated broad faculty support that more resources be directed toward research and scholarship at UWF.

Two “Net Promoter Score” (NPS) questions were asked: “On a scale from 0-10, how likely are you to recommend UWF to a friend or colleague interested in teaching?” and “On a scale from 0-10, how likely are you to recommend UWF to a friend or colleague interested in research and scholarship?” Typically these questions are asked to consumers of products or services as a measure of consumer loyalty but they are also used in employment settings as well. Responses are grouped into three categories, promoters (9 and 10), detractors (0-6), and passives (7 and 8). A net promoter score is calculated by subtracting the percent of detractors from that of promoters. In general a positive NPS is good and one in excess is 50 is good. For UWF and the first question (N=143) for teaching the NPS was 24.3-29.4=-5.4 and for the second question (N=143) for research the NPS was 6-70=-64. On both measures and especially for research and
scholarship the NPS was negative indicating that detractors outweighed promoters. The fact that only 6% of the faculty were UWF promoters with respect to research and scholarship was troubling.

Several open ended questions were asked with text boxes so that faculty could share ideas, attitudes and opinions about several aspects of research and creative scholarship. One open ended question asked: Do you have any specific ideas for how to better foster an environment of intellectual contributions and/or creative activities among faculty at UWF while maintaining our stated mission? The verbatim (spellchecked) results from the question are displayed in Appendix IV and summarized here. There were 66 responses so that 30% of the research participants provided ideas. There was considerable response diversity but several major themes were apparent. Flexible course scheduling and reduced teaching load were the most frequently mentioned methods for scholarship support. Other frequently mentioned ideas included differential teaching research tracks for faculty, increased salary and merit pay, summer research funding, and general research support (travel, writing/editorial, publications). Other ideas included recognition, research infrastructure investment (equipment, software, data), new research faculty lines, reduced bias towards external funding, increased sabbatical funding, and support for graduate students. Several other items received mentions including a mandatory three year tenure progress review with a fourth year research leave. One person suggested that current contracts include research expectations and they should be enforced with load increases if the contractual research obligation is unmet although this is similar in perspective to the alternative teaching-research tenure tracks. There was also the mention of adding a doctoral program that could be more research focused. Finally the survey itself was criticized and perhaps a more focused survey research effort should be undertaken. The comments were interesting and worth reading for the breadth of issues that they span.

An open ended question was also asked regarding student engagement in collaborative research. The question was “Based on your experiences, what are the most important steps that UWF could take to involve qualified students in collaborative research?” The verbatim results from this question are in Appendix V. Many good suggestions were offered and the preponderance of them involved increased funding support for both graduate students (compensation, research support, tuition and fee reductions, etc.) and their faculty mentors (mentoring compensation and
reduced loads). It was also suggested that more effort be allocated to recruiting quality students but many note that this was tied to our compensation packages.

Four open ended questions were asked of those that responded yes when asked if they had ever submitted a proposal through the OR&SP. Responses to each of these three questions are displayed verbatim in Appendix VI. The first question was “If you could change one structural/organizational aspect of Research and Sponsored Programs, what would you change?” There were a total of 41 responses to the question. By far, the most frequently mentioned change recommended by faculty using the office was increase staff for proposal development and submission this was followed by time oriented issues which were also symptomatic of an office that is understaffed or that the staff is not allocated optimally. Other changes were facilities and administrative (indirect) cost allocation and distribution along with a funding switch from soft money to university lines which would then free up indirect cost recovery funds to support additional research. The second question was “What service or resource (if any) for faculty should be added by Research and Sponsored Programs?” There were 32 responses to this question and again increased office staffing in the area of proposal development and submission also with an eye to increased editorial support and external reviews of proposals. Faculty also indicated an interest into better opportunity matching with faculty research interests and tutorial about the proposal development process. Increased resource flows, especially summer support money, to faculty for proposal development was also mentioned. The third question was “What service or resource for faculty that Research and Sponsored Programs currently offers is the most in need of improvement?” There were 36 responses to this question and the pre award process from opportunity matching through proposal development and submission were mentioned with the key feature again being an overworked staff so that the office is in need of additional pre award staff. The Scholarly and Creative Activity Committee (SCAC) and seed money resources for faculty were also mentioned. The fourth question asked “What service or resource for faculty that Research and Sponsored Programs currently offers has been the most helpful to you?” There were 38 responses to this question. The pre award process including proposal development, budgeting, editing, and submission was by far the most frequently mentioned helpful service; it is noteworthy that this area is the one that faculty also feels is in need of additional support and staffing. The SCAC was the next most frequently mentioned helpful activity and IRB, post award management also received several mentions.
Summary and Major Recommendations

The faculty survey illustrated a wide range of possible changes to facilitate research and creative scholarship at UWF. It appears to be a most formidable task to implement organizational change and resource allocations to support the elements identified by the task force to support research. Several recommendations do appear to be easy to implement and are low cost or even revenue neutral solutions. Work load flexibility, course banking, and alternative research and teaching tracks all seem to be promising policy changes that will facilitate research and scholarship. Major faculty and task force suggestions for an improved research infrastructure at UWF seemed to center around the two main factors of time and money. Rather than a resource flow to colleges to reduce teaching loads and increase compensation a potential solution would be to create a new organizational structure to support research and scholarship. A good possibility for such a structure would be a Center for Transdisciplinary Research and Education. This center would not have a faculty of its own, rather, it would be composed of faculty selected competitively from existing disciplines across the current college structure. New faculty could also be assigned to the Center (perhaps after a third year progress review) and a formal mentoring process with existing Center faculty might be established. Faculty appointments to the Center might also include visiting research scholars on nine month and summer appointments from other institutions and executives in residence from industry and government. The Center might well mirror the founding idea for UWF in the Alpha, Gamma and Omega interdisciplinary structure and provide a marketing opportunity for the official 50th anniversary. The National Science Foundation (NSF, 2008) workshop on transformative interdisciplinary research and graduate education contains much discussion and several examples of implementations across the academy. Appointments to the Center would include reduced load and a salary supplement for faculty. Faculty sabbatical appointments and a fourth year leave prior to tenure could also be included into the Center. The Center might have its own physical location and offices with expectations that faculty will be allocating time between their discipline office and their Center office. Students can also be assigned to the Center in a competitive manner and provided with support (funding, tuition waivers, health care, etc.). Existing Center structures at UWF could be combined with this unit as well. A Center organized in this fashion could also have as a mission component the encouragement of engaged scholarship in the professional disciplines and from outside interests.
Another big idea feature for UWF would be an interdisciplinary Ph.D. program that could also be housed with the Center. There is not currently a single department at UWF that is academically strong enough to support a discipline-based doctorate. There are, however, a number of departments that could combine to offer doctorate level education. Interdisciplinary doctorates are not new and there are many examples across academia. An interdisciplinary doctorate degree program would certainly facilitate the activities of a transdisciplinary center concept. Both the idea for a new organizational unit at UWF and a new doctorate degree are worthy of more discussion and could well energize the faculty in a new culture that recognizes and rewards research and creative scholarship while providing practical application.
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APPENDIX I. Examples of Scholarly Activities

Publications

- peer reviewed research or creative accomplishments
  + authorship or co-authorship of peer-reviewed published materials such as journal articles, abstracts, monographs, books, book chapters, cases, artistic works, software, or other professional and technical documents;
  + peer reviewed works of art, such as painting, sculpture, design, planning, architecture, musical composition, poetry, fiction, drama, dance, photography, and film
  + peer reviewed public performance, music recitals, concerts, conducting, theater performance and production, dance performance and production, radio or television production
  + peer reviewed exhibitions, commissions, and acceptance of work for permanent collections
- authorship or co-authorship of published materials that have not been peer reviewed such as
  + editorially reviewed books, articles, abstracts, proceedings translations, software, cases, artistic works or other professional and technical documents;
  + other writings such as textbooks, book reviews, handbooks, and bibliographies
  + educational or pedagogical materials such as teaching cases and/or instructional materials
  + non-print instructional materials
  + software developed for pedagogic or applied purposes
- other types of publications
  + publication of a composition
  + publication of program notes
  + production of a CD as producer and/or sound engineer
  + production of a professionally released CD as performer
  + commission/creation of new compositions
  + production and presentation of radio and television works, films and videos related to the scholarly or creative discipline
  + bulletins
  + white papers
- patents and patent applications

Scholarly Presentations

- invited presentations and papers or posters delivered at local, regional, national and international meetings
Professional Involvement

• refereeing or editing journal articles, grant proposals, and book manuscripts
• chairing of paper sessions
• participation in conferences, conventions, seminars, symposia, and professional meetings
  + reading papers, holding office, serving on committees or on editorial board for a discipline-based professional organization
• presentations to professional or stakeholder meetings

Exhibits

• non-competitive exhibits, performances, or built works
• a creative work on display

Performances (regional, national or international)

• invited
  + solo recitals
  + collaborative recitals
  + solo performances with a symphony orchestra
  + performances as an orchestral musician in a symphony, chamber orchestra, or other groups
  + performances as a conductor of a choir, band, orchestra, or other ensemble
  + performances in an operatic role
  + premiering new compositions
  + live or taped performances in radio and/or television
  + lecture recitals
  + lecture demonstrations
  + producing an opera, musical, or other staged genre

• other
  + production or performance of art, music, literature, or drama
  + presentation of a master class
  + serving as an adjudicator for a competition
  + serving as a clinician for music festivals and/or schools
  + service as jury panelist for composition entries (conferences, festivals, etc.)
  + a revenue generating performance
Grants and Development

- proposals for competitive grants, internal or external, related to scholarly and creative productivity
  - receiving or otherwise being awarded
  - writing and submitting;
    - outcome pending
    - not awarded
- invitations to serve on review panels or to review papers or proposals
- generation of major gifts to endow a program
- non-competitive funding such as contracts or repeatedly renewed grants where proposed research funding is highly probable

Awards and Recognitions

- artistic achievement recognition by major corporations (e.g., Steinway, Yamaha)
- premiers of new works
- awards for competitive work by students
- leadership in field/discipline and duration of such leadership
- awards, honors, and recognition from professional associations and organizations
- performance competition awards, competition wins and other honors

Community Engagement

- significant improvement in economic, social or environmental conditions of a community, region, agency, industry or other sector
- enhanced status for UWF or its academic units
- association with organizations and groups that will result in professional improvement to the participant and bring recognition to the university
- awards, honors, and professional recognition

Other Professional/Scholarly Activities

- managing or serving as a professional consultant
- mentoring and facilitating the research, scholarly and/or creative activities of other faculty, staff, and/or students
- curriculum development and innovation in ways that are important to the discipline, industry, and/or practice
- research for new course preparation
- demonstrated innovation such as a newly developed way to interact with or instruct students
- participation of undergraduate/graduate students in research
- attendance at professional association or organization meetings
- professional development activity (e.g., licensure, technology training, etc.)
- teaching, performing at national/international music festivals
APPENDIX II. Examples for Reviewing the Quality of Scholarly and Creative Activities

(i) Publications
   - significance and quality. Variables:
     + published by recognized presses and journals (including peer-reviewed e-journals)
     + quantitative analysis of journals is a way traditional peer review may be augmented to gain a more complete picture of a scholar's impact in his chosen field. Three measures can be used:
       - number of publications
       - number of times an author's publications have been cited
       - the importance of the journal where the article is published, or the Journal Ranking.
     + statistics on the selectivity of a journal or publisher
       - for example, quality may be defined as works in a peer reviewed journal with an acceptance rate not to exceed 50%
     + journal is not identified on a current list of predatory journals
     + impact factors of an academic journal
       - impact factor is a measure reflecting the average number of citations to recent articles published in a particular journal publication. It is frequently used as a proxy for the relative importance of a journal within its field, with journals with higher impact factors deemed to be more important than those with lower ones.
     + Journal Citations Report (JCR)
       - the most often recognized source for journal rankings
       - journals may belong to more than one subject category
       - is based on citations compiled from the Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE) and the Social Science Citation Index
       - evaluates and compares journals using citation data drawn from approximately 12,000 scholarly and technical journals and conference proceedings from more than 3,300 publishers in over 80 countries
       - 5-Year Journal Impact Factor is the average number of times articles from a journal published in the past five years have been cited.
     + Eigenfactor score (measure the importance of a journal to the scientific community)
       - journals are restricted to only one subject category (journals in JCR can be measured in more than one category)
       - Eigenfactor score scales with the total impact of a journal. All else equal, journals generating higher impact to the field have larger Eigenfactor scores
       - Eigenfactor also displays the journal's Article Influence score which is a measure of the average influence of each of its articles over the first five years after publication
       - based on the ISI Web of Science database
     + h-index (and is sometimes called the Hirsch index or Hirsch number)
       - is an index that attempts to measure both the productivity and citation impact of the published body of work of a scientist or scholar
     + i10-index
is a measure developed by Google Scholar in 2011. It is the number of academic publications an author has written that has at least ten citations from others.

SCImago Journal Rank (SJR indicator)
- is a measure of scientific influence of scholarly journals that accounts for both the number of citations received by a journal and the importance or prestige of the journals where such citations come from.
- inspired by the PageRank algorithm (used by Google to rank web pages), the SJR indicator has been developed to be used in extremely large and heterogeneous journal citation networks. It is a size-independent indicator and its values order journals by their "average prestige per article" and can be used for journal comparisons in science evaluation processes.
- The SJR indicator is a free journal metric, based on the Scopus database, provides an alternative to the impact factor (IF), which is based on data from the Science Citation Index.

Altmetrics
- altmetrics are non-traditional metrics proposed as an alternative to more traditional citation impact metrics, such as impact factor and h-index.
- altmetrics can be applied to people, journals, books, data sets, presentations, videos, source code repositories, web pages, etc. Altmetrics cover not just citation counts, but also other aspects of the impact of a work, such as how many data and knowledge bases refer to it, article views, downloads, or mentions in social media and news media.
- as used by the Public Library of Science:
  + viewed - HTML views and PDF downloads
  + discussed - journal comments, science blogs, Wikipedia, Twitter, Facebook and other social media
  + saved - Mendeley, CiteULike and other social bookmarks
  + cited - citations in the scholarly literature, tracked by Web of Science, Scopus, CrossRef and others
  + recommended - for example used by F1000Prime [Faculty of 1000 Prime from which members (mostly biology and medicine) recommends articles].
- terminal works receive more credit than works in progress. For example, a faculty member should detail research works in progress and submission status; but more credit is given to published works than those in progress. Works in progress can show future potential or can indicate “current” work, but reception should count for more than potential.

Status levels in order
+ terminal = evidence of publication
+ accepted = evidence that work will be published (e.g., confirmation); publisher’s schedule may not elevate this work into terminal status for some time
+ submitted = evidence work has been submitted; has yet to be accepted
Recognition
- citations of work by others; adoption or use of work by others
  - times author’s article cited
- the relative number of citations an individual article receives is better viewed as citation impact
- wide peer recognition (national and/or international) of the work as substantial, seminal, and scholarly

Community Engagement
- 50 or more people in attendance

Other Measures
- demonstrate the significance of the activity by including, for example:
  + statistics on the dissemination of the published work
  + description of the importance of a journal, periodical, edited collection, or other outlet for scholarship or creative work
  + description of the importance of the organization, institution, festival, or other outlet for creative activity
  + published reviews
  + the number of libraries that purchase or hold a work
  + references in the scholarship and creativity of others
  + written testimony of outside scholars or other experts.
  + awards
APPENDIX III. Summary of Benefits for MS Students in Biology Departments at Peer and Aspirant Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Cost of living relative to Pensacola, FL</th>
<th>Teaching load (Fa/Sp/Su)</th>
<th>Summer teaching required?</th>
<th>Salary** per year</th>
<th>Salary per class</th>
<th>Tuition waiver</th>
<th>Fees per year</th>
<th>Health care provided?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. West Florida</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3/3/1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$1,428</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$2,715</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Central Florida</td>
<td>+16.5</td>
<td>3/3/0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>yes w/ fee for GAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. North Florida</td>
<td>+9.2%</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>~65%</td>
<td>$760</td>
<td>yes w/ fee for GAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International</td>
<td>+29.8</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,592</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. South Florida</td>
<td>+4.6</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$18,600</td>
<td>$4,650</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>yes w/ fee for GAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>−5.5</td>
<td>2/2/2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$3,333</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>yes for $900/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Florida</td>
<td>+5.9</td>
<td>3 – 4/3 – 4*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$2,250 – $3,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,340</td>
<td>yes w/ fee for GAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC Charlotte</td>
<td>+9.2</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>$500–$1000</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>yes w/ fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State U.</td>
<td>+25.3</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Annual Profits</td>
<td>Monthly Profits</td>
<td>Base %</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Additional Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC Wilmington</td>
<td>+9.2</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>yes w/ fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison U.</td>
<td>+12. 2</td>
<td>1/1/0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami U. (Ohio)</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
<td>2/2/0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$18,344</td>
<td>$4,586</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>no but required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Depends on the size/subject of class being taught

** If summer teaching is required the salary covers 12 months, if not then salary is for 9 months
APPENDIX IV. Responses to open Ended Survey Question: Do you have any specific ideas for how to better foster an environment of intellectual contributions and/or creative activities among faculty at UWF while maintaining our stated mission?

Reduced teaching loads and more startup support.

The answer to some of these questions depends on whether or not we establish a teaching track and a research track. If I were offered a 4/4 with no or a trivial research expectation, I would answer differently. The same is true if I were offered a 2/2 with a higher research expectation. Especially true on this last page.

I believe a research/teaching emphasis would be appropriate, though I foresee problems with accountability and with those selecting a teaching emphasis getting "locked into" teaching with no opportunity to change emphasis. A heavy teaching load would make it nearly impossible to get a research agenda up and running if one were to seek to change emphasis. I worry that some would exploit the system and choose a research emphasis and not produce, simply to get a course reduction. An additional consideration would be different research cultures across the disciplines. For example, a productive scientist may publish 10 articles in a year, though this would be unreasonable for professors in the Humanities (who largely work alone rather than as part of research teams) where 1-2 per year is productive (subject to the time it takes for a journal to referee an article which can be up to a year).

Access to a fourth-year research leave (as is de rigeur at many other institutions) would be extremely helpful for junior faculty trying to start up a research program pre-tenure. This leave could be competitive and/or predicated on a proposal, a successful third-year review (which my department doesn't have), or some other limiting factor. Summer funding for research would also be useful. As it is, I do research unpaid all summer. Course releases for research and publication would help (again, I've been told I can't get those, even though I'm writing a book pre-tenure). There are so few opportunities available for junior faculty to get a break from teaching to do more research, even compared to other similar institutions.

Respect faculty by fixing compression of salaries.

Provide annual travel support to present research papers at academic conferences. Provide graduate research assistants.

Convert year-end awards to base salary awards rather than one-time payments. Full-year sabbaticals at 3/4 pay. / Institutionalize Distinguished University Professor rank more strongly with an increase to base salary and clear application schedule

I am an Associate Professor with more than 40 journal papers in TOP SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS. Most of my papers were published during the past 8 years, while a UWF employee. As of December 2014, my articles have received more than 600 citations. Numerous people in RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES envy my scholarship record. How much support and recognition did I get from UWF? THE ANSWER IS ZERO! As a matter of fact, my salary, which I use to support my research activities, is $6000 below the salary of the
new Assistant Professors in my department! I thank the Administration for this generous and fair treatment!

Many of us have come to this University for the balance between teaching and research. If there is the notion of having faculty choose between more rigorous teaching or research, this would ultimately compromise the balance many of us value and lead to high quality faculty leaving.

Begin to redress compression issues--our publishing faculty leave because their salaries are quickly compressed, and they easily obtain work elsewhere--by instituting a process for individualized salary mediation. Don't lower teaching loads because of publication--it's important to keep things equitable between faculty members when assigning teaching--but allow those faculty who obtain distinguished scholarly publication records while still teaching a full load to apply for remediation of their compressed salaries. Absent some such reform, our talent will continue to fly away, and the University will pay more and more to hire new and unproven tenure-track faculty.

Quit expecting R-1 research/publication production when we're saddled with Regional Comprehensive teaching and service loads.

Provide more financial supports for publications.

There should be a balanced attitude towards artistic creative activity and STEM projects. Currently, STEM research is receiving more funding than any other area.

Foster a climate in which one discipline members do not express critical judgments about other disciplines in which they are not trained. Incorporate SOTL as legitimate and equivalent research to traditional disciplinary research.

provide better start up packages for new faculty. give decreased teaching load to new faculty members.

Balance the load by providing more faculty lines. Right now our faculty do not have sufficient time to pursue their research and creative activities agendas AND meet our professional accrediting body's expectations of faculty ratio.

To support faculty that do bring in grant money. I had to buy out one class but still had significant service responsibilities along with graduate student advising.

Reduce some of the restrictions on funding. For example, the requirement that a proposed research project must have "significant probability of receiving external funding" is silly. It favors some disciplines, in which external funding is more available, over others. Of course, faculty in those disciplines are more productive with respect to research, which make them more favored for future funding. Stop favoring "the scholarship of teaching and learning." We won't have much left to teach if we are out of the business of producing new knowledge. Look at quality, not quantity, of research produced.

How do you define and/or measure "intellectual contribution"? This is the reason i had
above answer "don't know".

Create stipends for graduate students to be the Research Assistants. Respect for needed office space. Respect for faculty-student research.

creativity takes time and freedom (flexible time)......work with faculty to create schedules that give more non-teaching days, and reduce teaching loads to those with a track record of grantsmanship and scholarship (and include metrics of quality for the latter)....

I favor summer teaching release programs that provide some support for faculty who do not teach in the summer, but who dedicate summers for scholarship. For example, .25 pay for scholarship instead of .75 to teach two classes. These could be competitive applications for a limited number of awards.

1. offer course release, travel, and compensation incentives for meeting or exceeding individualized faculty scholarship performance plans / 2. offer increased travel funding to national and int'l research conferences if faculty member presents their work / 3. develop more doctoral programs and add quality young faculty from research-intensive training programs who are acculturated in an ethic of strong research/scholarship / 4. hire (more than one per college) faculty members whose primary job is to obtain research funding and conduct research / 5. hire notable visiting scholars to mentor younger investigators

fostering an environment of research takes large investments of time and money.
Unfortunately, in my case, the required infrastructure is not available for me to be at my best and most efficient and unless I bring in my own large external grant (currently trying) I do not foresee this changing. Similarly, I believe the culture here is supportive of research and many faculty would like to become more involved with research. However, this cannot be accomplished with a free Friday afternoon to talk. Consistent and reliable research productivity takes a long-term investment of time in order to establish momentum in one's research project. For me, I am not under contract over the summer but I use the summer to build that momentum. Typically I can establish a productive project over the summer but once my teaching load (3+3) kicks back in that productivity is significantly hampered.
Unfortunately, once momentum is lost it can take a month or more to build it back up again. It is not an optimal cycle or environment to build productivity.

Provide compensation (either monetary or scheduling/work assignment) for unscheduled teaching, ESPECIALLY at the graduate level. Mentoring graduate students through a quality research is very time intensive, takes away from faculty research, but still provides scholarly output for the department/university. STOP pushing for unreasonable increases in enrollments in graduate programs that are research focused.

open up the opportunities and encouragement for administrative faculty

Better data access, specifically WRDS

put a primary focus on level of undergraduate engagement over traditional researcher output (papers and grants)
I think it begins with recognizing one important this: Intellectual contributions by faculty members is technically a required portion of every faculty member's contract. However, the culture at UWF has created an understanding among faculty that research and/or creative activities is something done to perform "above and beyond", making this an optional activity for many. The change in culture begins by establishing the existing expected standard for research productivity and backing it up by moving faculty to the "unproductive" teaching load of 4/4 if they are not performing. Then, we can move to a discussion of better fostering an environment for intellectual contributions. This begins by rewarding faculty that are productive via merit raises. This survey mentioned many other great opportunities for reward. But any motivation must use a carrot and a stick (i.e., reward for doing good, penalty for doing bad). I think this committee should focus just as much on finding a way for administration and/or departments to more strongly enforce required performance of faculty in their intellectual contributions. This "costs" the university nothing, and only increased the value of the education we are giving our students. Worst case scenario (or possibly best case?) is that some unproductive faculty become upset and choose to either perform or leave. If they are willing to leave because they are being asked to fulfill their contract, then the university is probably better off without them anyway. Again, finding a way to get from faculty what they are already being paid for should be the first element of action for promoting increased intellectual contributions - we are already paying for it! Simultaneously, incentives should be provided to top performing faculty, not all faculty who are meeting the bottom threshold of expectation for their contract. If we set the bar high, people will reach it. If we set it low we will be cultivating a culture of mediocrity. Thanks for considering my comments.

I think we need to define our mission more clearly. We function as a regional comprehensive (and thus a teaching-centered university), but many departments have very high tenure standards. In some areas, tenure standards are lax. We need to let deans and department chairs work with faculty to develop teaching/research assignments that reflect individual interests, strengths, and weaknesses. Flexibility is key.

Ensure faculty are given adequate resources for professional development with regards to visiting successful research scientists to create collaborations. Ensure faculty are given adequate time for research by receiving an accurate contribution which reflects number of students in research lab (i.e. time spent in lab)

Make two separate tenure tracks, one teaching-focused (4-4) and one research-focused (2-2).

A lot of the extra incentives offered to encourage scholarly or creative activities could be replaced by tying pay raises in some measure to productivity in scholarly and creative activities. It seems UWF devotes a lot of time to work arounds where just making a direct connection could be helpful.

Anonymous assessments of chairs and deans by the faculty will provide much needed transparency to the provost. / Course releases are NOT compensation.

In order to encourage research, faculty who teach graduate courses and large classes should
have course releases. Also, faculty who are doing significant research (publishing, etc) and have an active research agenda, should have a reduced teaching load to facilitate research. Good research (including grant activity) cannot be expected when faculty teach three courses a semester and many times those courses are graduate courses (and sometimes large graduate courses).

Research is appreciated in pockets within the university. I can see efforts are already being made to fix this and I appreciate that. Eliminating a one-size-fits-all approach to faculty assignments will make a huge impact. As we do so, however, it will be ESSENTIAL to help non-research-oriented senior faculty continue to feel valued. At times, I've felt that some of the senior faculty have viewed research accomplishments as a threat or a symbol of lack of commitment to what they believe the true mission of the university is or was. Meanwhile, they make important administrative contributions and might help with the change if they felt valued more. On the other hand, high research accomplishments are valued externally at competing institutions with high compensation and resources and we do need to maintain external competitiveness. Otherwise, faculty will use resources here and UWF will be a stepping stone. Getting a substantial cut of the grant you bring in might be a good solution. UWF has a smaller infrastructure and presumably can spare some IDC.

More help in identifying sources of funding, writing grants, and maybe partnering with community organizations or other Universities, plus more flexible workload assignments.

When I have submitted research requests, they go to a committee and are voted upon. I've seen popular faculty and popular research get funded while 'unknown' faculty or those whose projects are meritorious but not understood by the committee go unfunded. Research funding therefore becomes a popularity contest. I would rather see funds assigned to every Dean to go to their faculty research (the four college Deans as well as Dean of Libraries, etc.).

Less teaching and service.

It would benefit the environment if all of the questions on this survey actually had relevance to scholarship and creative activities. For example, I'm completely unclear as to how the impact chart can be answered. What are the relationships among Minimal, Some, Significant, and Very Strong? Any data that you might get from it will not be usable -- so, what's the point? Many of the questions on this survey are odd and seem not to be relevant to reality. Parking? Office Space? Aren't there better questions to ask? If research was truly taken seriously, this survey would be much better. I hope you're not going to be talking about its validity, reliability, and meaningfulness.

Junior faculty should focus on their own research in initial years and establish themselves first rather than doing consulting work in or outside the university. Give courses off to conduct independent research and with students.

Have two tracks: teaching & research faculty tracks. Provide even better (lower) teaching load for newly hired assistant professors (those that elect to go into the research track), at
least for the first three years. Provide summer research support

The current emphasis is extremely grant focused, even to the new/junior faculty. We cannot get grants before products; and products are more useful for tenure and promotion because they are expected on the CV. Quit pushing external grants as the only valued currency at this university.

Hire graduates from research universities rather than graduates from UWF (and other similar institutions).

Reduce the amount of extra load teaching faculty are asked to do.

SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER SERVICE LOADS OR MORE EQUALLY DISTRIBUTE SERVICE DUTIES ACROSS THE FACULTY. THIS SURVEY ASKS NOTHING ABOUT THE UNUSUALLY HEAVY AND UNEVENLY DISTRIBUTED SERVICE LOADS AT UWF. MOST FACULTY WHO CARRY OUT RESEARCH AGENDAS HAVE AVOIDED (OR BEEN SHIELDED FROM) SERVICE. A MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF SERVICE WOULD ALLOW MORE FACULTY TO CARRY OUT THEIR RESEARCH AGENDAS.

First, more up-front investment in research. To get to the point at which I am competitive for internal grants, most of the legwork is done. Also, expect that some investments will not pay off. Second, there is an implicit assumption that external funding in certain sciences, particularly those receiving funds from the NSF, is the norm or standard for all other fields. That is very misleading. The state already discriminates against these fields. If the university wants to do that, as well, at least admit defeat and turn all those lines into teaching only with no PhD requirement. Third, I mostly need time to do my work, not travel funds or grant money for materials. Time is expensive, but the university won't pay for it. Specifically, for financial reasons, I need to work over the summer. Receiving grant money to research instead of teach would greatly improve my productivity.

More sabbatical awards. More travel funding. More course release. I also think that appreciation for work-in-progress is crucial. Most often, a significant publication like a book or a major empirical study takes years. Annual evaluations hav

I suggest implementing a committee to advise and oversee the production of intellectual contributions and/or creative activities for all faculty & departments at the University.

Not everyone on the faculty at UWF does (or is capable of doing) first-rate research and/or scholarship. Those who produce legitimate, field-advancing work should be rewarded with the time, financing, and recognition such work deserves. On the other hand, there are plenty of dedicated teachers at UWF who find their satisfaction in that endeavor. Sometimes these are the same people who do quality scholarship/research, but usually not. UWF should reward both types—but first and foremost, let the researchers/scholars be free to do it.

Create an environment where the teaching load is appropriate. Successful research institutions have a teaching load of 2/2, and the class sizes are realistic. Large classes should
count for extra since the workload is massively increased. My department should be properly staffed so that we can offer our required courses without putting someone on overload. We should not be forced to choose between our personal time and making sure students are able to graduate on time.

Need departmental/college support for novel community in all academic outreach programs. To my knowledge there is no financial support for faculty research while there is an overemphasis on empowering undergraduate research; there should be some kind of balance / ratio. There should be no monetary award for Teacher of the Year Award, recognition is good enough as it already counts toward tenure & promotion which, in themselves, have financial rewards. The award money should go to graduate assistantships or faculty research seed grants.

reduce teaching loads from 9 to 6 contact hours; REWARD accomplishments in research (e.g., some universities award a $5000 raise to base salary for receiving awards such as Fulbright Research Awards); reduce emphasis on assessment of teaching; replace CUTLA with a research-focused office; replace most personnel in the Office of Research with individuals who KNOW how to make the life of a researcher LESS complex

Improve research infrastructure at UWF (instruments, facilities, hardware, computers, hoods, specialized chambers ...) Set aside funds to maintain/replace aging infrastructure on a regular basis
APPENDIX V. Student Faculty Research Collaboration Open Ended Question

Based on your experiences, what are the most important steps that UWF could take to involve qualified students in collaborative research?

Recruit quality students

Tie research to course credit and to potential compensation; especially, tie it to future employment.

Enhances compensations for directed studies and fee reduction for students who take directed studies tied to faculty research.

More funding for graduate student thesis projects. The $1-2k they can get is not enough for them to do good work in my field (as UWF doesn't have access to the equipment necessary, so we have to go to other institutions, which is expensive). I have materials for them to work on, but I don't have funding for them.

Allow funding when they are volunteering as well was when they are registered for directed study or honors thesis. Many projects are long-term and involve more time than elective credits allow.

Raise admissions standards and improve reputation of university to improve graduate student recruitment.

recruit quality students / work on communication and writing / disseminate opportunities widely

I'm not sure how effective our grant-writing officers are in RSP. They seem to give their attention to a few high-profile projects at a time. They also _seem_ to spend a great deal of their time doing nothing in particular (though I suppose the same could be said about faculty). It might be time to bring in some fresh blood. At any rate, they've been of no help to me in securing funding, despite repeated attempts to connect with them.

Pay them for their investment of time and energy. Compensating the faculty mentor is also critically important.

Publications between professor and students

Better support to allow them to actually work on their thesis while enrolled

Better screening of student abilities and qualifications before admission. Provide better funding for qualified students. Offer incentives to graduate students that excel at research. Pursue PhD programs in the sciences.

Do research interesting to students
in humanities there is little collaboration

This section is very badly designed - you assume that I have grad students
Give the faculty more time (less teaching) to accomplish this

Honestly, just making things easier. I had a student who presented at a national conference last year. Those can be very expensive. She managed to get money from a number of sources (including OUR, SGA and the Alumni Association.). It took a significant amount of on her part just trying to find out what to do. Fortunately for her, I was aware of these opportunities and could point her in the right direction. A simple web page would help. For example, "Are you presenting at a conference? Here are resources for funding (and links).

Provide faculty with release time from traditional teaching load since when you are working with students on research projects teaching still is an integral part of the research experience for students.

Compensation and salary

Faculty availability

I have never used students in my research. I am near the end of my research career, so I will not be likely to every use any students.

hire more faculty in departments that have active/productive masters/doctoral programs; create more doctoral programs to attract higher caliber students who will stay longer and contribute to research team productivity

You have to stay competitive with the rest of the country in terms of graduate stipends. I cannot attract talented students if FSU down the road pays double, offers full tuition waivers, and health care. The students who do stay at UWF for graduate school are those who UWF was not their first-choice, and it is clear that this is negatively affected productivity.

More travel funding for students (on a rolling basis). Allowing faculty to get more teaching credit for supervising student-based research projects (at grad and undergrad level)

identify them early and prioritize the student mentoring process as a primary focus of the faculty load

I believe in student research, but this issue MUST be considered separate from faculty research at many colleges and departments. While some are heavily dependent on this (many of the hard sciences), most colleges are not. In fact, it seems some faculty have sought to fulfill their research requirements for tenure/promotion, etc. by getting undergraduate or master's students to publish papers with their name on it in very low quality (or pay for pub) journals. We should absolutely be moving more funds toward helping those graduate students that work on high level and high impact research with faculty, but this should be specific to colleges and
departments, not something that should be mandated at the university level. In many instances, this funding could be used much better in other places.

funding, funding, funding!

Pay the graduate students better, in a way that would allow us to compete with peer institutions

Early identification of talented students. Get talented students on federal work-study working in the department of their major

We accept almost 90% of applicants. This sends a clear message that it is easy to get into UWF. I would imagine that our reputation isn't very good to outside entities. Mathematically, we must be admitting students who aren't ready. Empirically, based on grades, retention, et cetera this is true. Therefore, we are a) diminished in our perceived rigor by admitting too many under qualified students and thus strong students are turned off and never apply and b) we spend extra time with low performing students and do not focus on research or developing more rigor c) there is so much teaching to do it takes extra time to grade and prepare, d) we do a lot of staff-level work.

We have to increase the stipends that graduate students get to attract more graduate students (to be competitive). We also have to increase the number of graduate student stipends, to get more graduate students.

The grad program in my department is essential to my research productivity. The students have been what made grants possible in the three I've had. I'd encourage administration to value such student contribution as a currency when thinking about grad enrollment numbers and making resource allocations. I'm not sure the formulas used account for this.

Financial aid to recruit top notch graduate students interested in conducting research.

Create a pool of graduate scholars in each college and library that could be made available to assist faculty on research projects. Such scholars would receive additional stipends or reduced tuition or course release to work alongside faculty in a mentoring capacity.

Actually respect both basic and applied research.

Give faculty more incentive to work with students. Students do not need the incentive, as undergrads already know that it will help them in grad school applications and graduate students need to meet Capstone requirements. Make it easier for faculty to say "yes" to more students without it being done as unscheduled teaching.

Train faculty in how to develop research-level abilities in students

Increase the quality of students
Provide students with compensation and travel funding

Seed funding availability to acquire equipment/supplies that allow students to perform self-driven original research.

Encourage students to pursue Master's or Ph.D. degree.

Funding so that they don't have to worry about bills for one or two years. In other words, short-term funds are almost useless because they are thinking about rent, transportation and so forth over the long term. Quitting a job is not an option, but adding more work to their jobs and school is usually not feasible.

Restrict research activities to graduate students and maintain high criteria for students to become involved.

The investment of time (from the student and mentor/adviser) and money (in both the student and mentor/adviser) is needed to increase the involvement in collaborative research. Without a workable balance of investment in time and money, there will be little advancement in quality or quantity of research.

Provide adequate and reasonable funding and incentives for both students.

Enhanced support for graduate students. As it is, there is little reason to encourage a talented student to attend a graduate program in my department. Any worthwhile graduate program supports some of its students with tuition waivers and insurance.

Make graduate education here competitive so that we attract and keep top students. Paying me to take on incapable grad students is throwing money down a hole. People I have to educate and carry on my back are an impediment to my work, rather than a help. Unless they're good enough, I'm better off without them.

The increase in the amount of lab spaces available to faculty who actively do research with undergrads.

Allow students to be paid for research during the school year so they don't have to work outside jobs.

Dedicate 70% funding for third and fourth year students, 30% for first two year students.

Financial remuneration for the student AND, to a lesser degree, the faculty mentor.

Enhance research infrastructure at UWF so our best students don't go away to other campuses to do summer research (internships, REU, etc.)

Improve funding for graduate research assistants in departments that currently do not have funding
Ability of students and faculty to make interdisciplinary connections...especially graduate students to connect with faculty in programs that only have an UG component.

UWF should recruit through scholarship opportunities for excellent students. The establishment of more and broader graduate programs would also help.

I engaged and undergrad in research via EMERGE and had a doctoral student act as a liaison/mentor during the process. When I sought to repeat the next year with new students...well, I was not funded. So increase the number of funded opportunities for faculty willing to engage in such a labor-intensive but meaningful activity.

Increased seed funding for pilot projects or short-term studies (for students and faculty), reduced teaching load for 3/3 faculty, research stipends for students (e.g. SURP).

Offer higher pay or tuition break

Provide some compensation. Our students in Teacher Education cannot afford to not work and to engage in research for the indirect and future value only.

Get better graduate students.

Stronger emphasis on thesis in programs.

Improve graduate student treatment

Providing compensation or a course release for unscheduled teaching. I have dramatically decreased the amount of students I accept for supervised research because it takes so much time and it is not compensated with either time or money. There are only so many hours in the week, and I did not want the quality of my scheduled courses to diminish because I was spending so much time on unscheduled teaching for a few students. Supervising a few (2 or 3) high-quality student research projects--especially at the graduate level--can sometimes take more time than teaching one of my scheduled courses in a week. I did not want to compromise my standards for student research quality or scheduled research quality, and I became tired of feeling like I was stretched too thin. Consequently, I let much of the supervised research go.

Give more time to faculty to actually do research. Research at UWF will not succeed without this crucial step no matter how much money is thrown at it.

Provide compensation in terms of tuition and stipends so students can be involved in research. Many students work off-campus to make enough money to support themselves. Some of them could work on campus and be involved in teaching and research.

Pay them so they can take time from their other jobs.
Integrating research projects in the curriculum and courses

discipline-specific mentoring / increased compensation

Ideally (and this may not be possible), helping to identify the right student. Some of my directed studies led to published research, the most recent did not (student was unable to commit enough time to get the research very far along). That experience reduces my interest in finding another student.

Increased flexibility in the way OUR funds can be spent would be helpful in addition to a potential increase in the funds available per project.

Since no qualified students are on campus to help me, recruiting them would be necessary. Still, our programs do not lend themselves to advancing the careers of graduate students in my field.

make discretionary funding available

Provide greater travel funds for graduate students to attend conferences.
APPENDIX VI. Office of Research and Sponsored Program Open Ended Questions

If you could change one structural/organizational aspect of Research and Sponsored Programs, what would you change? Please be Brief and specific.

F&A allocation and indirect negotiation

Having all grants go through one person for submission makes it extremely difficult to get proposals submitted in a timely manner. Hire more people, please, who know what they’re doing.

Add more staff.

Some lobbying of funding agencies, like the lobbying that research universities do all the time, will certainly help UWF obtain more grants.

Personnel

It will be better if the Research and Sponsored Program follows up publications of UWF professors.
Clean house, hire all new people.

None

Increased compensation for graduate students so that they do not need to seek employment outside the university.

different funding structure-- it should not be so dependent on indirect costs

The process of preparing and submitting grants through RSP can be problematic. Whenever I see a call for proposals form an external funding source, the biggest reason I am hesitant to apply is because of time to write the grant and the RSP process. I know it will be a headache after months of work invested in writing the proposal.

enhance/increase staff directly supporting RFP identification and proposal preparation

Increase number and amount of research awards for faculty and grad students.

the inefficiency and lack of organization of the office, several folks want to be involved in all aspects rather than just their job

Less fringe taken off grants

The office no longer needs to be on "soft money"
They do what other RSPs do and are structured similarly. I am unclear what all the commotion seems about with the angst directed at RSP. I understand they missed a deadline submission. That's a problem but it has happened at other places due to changes in e submissions and error detections by grants.gov. My previous institution made us submit grants two weeks prior to deadline. It is not RSPs fault if it is turned in right up against the deadline. The systems are way better than they were just a few years ago so last minute submissions are again more possible now. It used to be you could fedex the grant in the day before so the transition to electronic made for some frustrating years in there. Unless there is systemic problem that recurs, I haven't had a problem that wasn't easily resolved.

It seems that our RSP office is bogged down with meetings and faculty professional development. They're often shorthanded and stretched too thin. As a result, they make mistakes on high-stakes things such as budgeting. Or, they're not available when we need them to do a proposal because they're in meetings all the time. I suggest having separate roles such as a separate pre-award person and post-award person. They've been short-staffed. Christi is a wonderful addition, in particular, but she needs to be valued so that she stays.

F&A rates

I would increase staffing by having a staff person for each college. There are frequent staff turnovers in the office and I end up talking with a different person each time I call or e-mail, has been frustrating.

I would provide them with additional resources.

Hire a science person as Vice-provost

I get sent too many emails about grants that have zero to do with my research interest. If you have a grant to hock, put it on your website under "featured grants."

Help submitting grants on time and correctly.

RSP does not do much to help in the overall grant writing process. They assist in proofreading, but they do not directly contribute to the written document. Other Universities have grant writers ready to help in the writing process, so that the proposer is only responsible for the specific research components of the grant.

Increase the department's personnel.

Need a formal Graduate School with a Dean. As it is now, RSP is saddled with the same responsibilities but no power to enforce anything.

Hire a young, motivated, and well-connected director (and also qualified staff members).

RSP doesn't do things in a timely manner. Everything is always last-minute, just before grant
deadlines. Things (checks, papers, emails, etc.) get lost and overlooked.

Expand the resources of the Research and Sponsored Programs. The people are great, but the office is inadequately staffed.

Separate research from sponsored programs and put more seed money opportunities when it comes to faculty and doc students doing research.

Improved assistance identifying appropriate funding opportunities.

Staff of RSP are overburdened and it is difficult to schedule time to meet with them, particularly with competitive grant announcements that have rapid turnaround times and do not allow for long-term, advance planning.

F&A cost sharing and distribution.

They need more staff members. Their workload is too heavy.

Allow faculty to directly submit grants.

More integration with colleges and departments

More structured support and incentives for applying for external grants

I don't know what they do.

Speed.

Have more staff available to help faculty with grant identification and development.

**What service or resource (if any) for faculty should be added by Research and Sponsored Programs? Please be Brief and Specific.**

More effort directed toward facilitating collaborative projects

All the appropriate resources are there, but it's difficult for faculty to take advantage of them because RSP is so woefully understaffed.

Improve Undergraduate Research Program with more staff.

It seems that Ms. Carol Rafalski is doing EVERYTHING herself. While she is certainly a wonderful person and a hard worker, this is simply not logic and not helpful. I wish I can submit more grant applications every year, but I am unable to do so because Ms. Rafalski is clearly overloaded.
Personnel with expertise in securing funding for each of the colleges.

Publication presentations
Service would be an attitude of service, resource would be a Sponsored Research advisory committee

Grant evaluation contractors

At previous institutions, they had statistical support through RSP.

grant writing editors

more staff that can handle grant agreement submission and management (we only have 1)

More personnel who have first hand experience in the development and submission of extramural grants from the major federal agencies.

summer pay for proposal preparation rather than fall/spring release time

We need more Carol Rafalskis. External grant application reviews
they should keep some money In a pool for large equipment purchases

tutorials for budget planning.

Their grants tend to be toward those that 'develop new sources of grants' which is not the same as scholarship and research. That makes many faculty unable to request funding.

Summer research support. Sponsoring research conference in campus.

Community partnerships. There should be a place for community groups/organizations/businesses to visit and click a "Help Me With..." button that could initiate partnerships between those groups and researchers here at UWF.

Provide grant writing support.

Grant writing assistance and EndNote software

More introductory seminars available to faculty.

Need seed grants for faculty research and objective research board members to disburse those funds fairly.

Someone who can manage grant submissions more effectively.
Editorial support

more helpers for developing in-house seed grant proposals

Proposal editing...matching the proposal to the RFP.

More staff members to help manage grants and contracts.

More communication about grant opportunities

Compensation and/or course release for demonstrated research productivity

To repeat an earlier answer, their attempts to match funding to me have been crude. They've been sort of based on topic, but with no information on how likely my effort will result in funding.

Co-application process between faculty SCAC and grad student SCAC, or between faculty SCAC and OUR. What I mean is often the research of my students also requires my participation. It would be nice if both the faculty member and the student could jointly apply for coordinated funding for their respective parts in the same research project.

**What service or resource for faculty that Research and Sponsored Programs currently offers is the most in need of improvement? Please be brief and specific.**

Post award follow up

All of it. I had most difficulty with proposal submission because of various unwritten rules for how to submit that I wasn't aware of until the very end, and had to scramble to complete stuff that I should have been told about at the beginning of the process.

Improve Undergraduate Research Program with more staff.

It seems that Ms. Carol Rafalski is doing EVERYTHING herself. While she is certainly a wonderful person and a hard worker, this is simply not logic and not helpful. I wish I can submit more grant applications every year, but I am unable to do so because Ms. Rafalski is clearly overloaded.

Proposal preparation

SCAC Distinguished Research Award

Leadership - grant submission process is often antagonistic
more industry and commercial sector connections

Current staff are overloaded - they do an amazing job but really need more support.

a director that offers help rather than depends on faculty to pull in $$ to support the office

Identifying new funding opportunities for the diverse research programs. Organizing and time-management of preparation and submission of grants.

1) the lack of ability for administration to accurately determine reasonable expectations of faculty regarding time frames in which to prepare proposals  2) staff do not accurately understand the requirements necessary prior to submitting high profile proposals which causes young professors to waste time writing proposals not feasible (i.e. pushing young faculty with not enough research to submit a CAREER award)

Help us find funding opportunities. Just an hour of searching would help me tremendously. The automatic Pivot/COS funding alerts are too broad and usually geared to R1 universities.

should offer money to hire consultants to help write and prepare grants, there are companies out there that provide this service. It is worth it. Could also use money to pay for external review prior to submission, another effective tool to get grants in better shape to compete.

more budget experts to move the grants and contracts through faster.

The cap on faculty compensation needs to be increased dramatically from 25% to 40% or higher.

Faculty have little incentive to apply for external grants.

More funds to support faculty projects, greater ability to fund projects but not in a competitive environment where faculty of one college decide whether to fund research of another college or unknown discipline.

They do a great job.

Graduate admission process and requirements.

I don't need money to do my research. I need time. If we could find a way to award course releases over FSCAC money, that would be great.

Provide larger funding opportunities. All you can get for $2K is a grad student. Some research involves a larger sum for equipment and is necessary to collect pilot data for further grant funding opportunities.

submitting proposals
IRB. Their attitude is based on protecting the University prior to protecting human subjects. According to NIH guidelines, University protection is to be a separate issue from the IRB in order to protect the Academic Freedom of the researcher.

The website.

Need a dedicated graduate student or two to help with filling out research grant applications.

Grant submission.

Assistance with grant writing and familiarity with the research interests of different disciplines.

too few grant workers to help faculty assemble a grant
Identifying appropriate funding opportunities.

Post award spending management and support.

submission process

They are in need of more staff members and more "hard lines" that are not totally dependent on external funding.

provide better support for grad. students to attend conference when they present papers,
provide funding for grad. students to do thesis work

internal funding for models

The symposium is all over the place and not well thought out. Rather than by Department, awards should be sorted by types of research and a quality threshold should be applied (the latter is used for Masters thesis). Also, for our best work, the student now has his MBA and moved from the area.

Speed.

Better communication with the campus community.

What service or resource for faculty that Research and Sponsored Programs currently offers has been the most helpful to you?

proposal preparation

SCAC awards
Human subjects research has been supported and response times are excellent. Submission of proposals.

SCAC

grant preparation/submittal

SCAC grant

SCAC tech transfer

Grant specialist

Budgeting

getting grant agreements / contracts approved and set up

staff help

Susan Feathers was a fantastic help before she retired.

budget preparation!

course releases for proposal development

When Carol takes the time to explain the grant application process with all the loopholes and exceptions.

Small faculty grants.

Proposal submission

NA

The ease of the SCAC is great. I wish all graduate student awards were just as easy. Students should not be awarded money based on judgment of project. Instead, the money alloted to graduate students should be evenly split between all those that apply.

none

SCAC
Information from the present staff.

The IRB...is very helpful and timely with their comments and suggestions. Never have had to wait longer than a week.

advance planning

RSP support of research related travel, etc.

Grant writing support

Grant/contract submission and management

grant support

Contract management

The IRB has operated very efficiently and promptly over the last few years.

Proposal submission.

Budget preparation

small grants, proposal preparation

Financial and legal wrangling on contracts

Their "can do attitude" - they do what is necessary to get the proposal submitted and then help with project management.
APPENDIX VII. Research Survey Questions

Dear Colleague:

At the Fall Convocation the Provost announced the formation of a task force to study and report on research and scholarship at UWF. A task force was formed with input and support from the college deans. This survey was developed by that group to measure faculty preferences, attitudes, and opinions about research and scholarship and their role at UWF.

Please take the time (about 20 minutes) to complete the survey and note that it is meant to be taken on computer or large screen device and might be difficult/impossible to complete on a smart phone or similar device.

Results will be used to develop a report for the provost containing recommendations for resource allocations in support of research and scholarship at UWF.

The information that you enter will be aggregated and your individual data will be held confidential.

Given the importance of this information to future decisions at UWF it is important that we receive responses from as many faculty members as possible so that we have a representative sample of the faculty.

Prizes will be randomly awarded to faculty members from each college; prizes include a free annual reserved parking spot and eight (8) will be awarded. You will be able to enter your email address at the end of the survey if you wish to be included in the drawing.

Thanks for your time.

Research and Scholarship Task Force

For the next two questions we are inquiring about faculty self selecting between a research intensive teaching load and a teaching intensive teaching load. The first question asks about your current status and the second your preferred situation. Both scenarios would be valuable contributions to the university and evaluated accordingly.

Please indicate the distribution of your actual work effort at UWF between the following activities over the course of a typical year. Note that the sum of the percents must be 100%.

Teaching