

## Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee

### Final Report:

### Revised Guidelines for Faculty Development Leave Program

November 9, 2020

#### **Committee Members:**

1. Bill Carroll, College of Engineering, Co-chair
2. Peggy Semingson, College of Education, Co-chair
3. Patricia Allard, CONHI
4. Matthew Fujita, College of Science
5. Anne Nordberg, SSW
6. Stefan Romanoschi, College of Engineering
7. Tom Rusher, CAPP
8. Salil Sarkar, College of Business
9. Barbara Tobolowsky, College of Education
10. Naoko Witzel, College of Liberal Arts

#### **Background and Process:**

The Faculty Development Leave (FDL) program at UT Arlington traditionally has operated out of the provost's office at the university level and has historically provided a semester (100% leave) or a year (50% leave) for tenured full-time faculty to pursue research and scholarly project(s) that went beyond the scope of regular job duties. In the 2019-2020 academic year (fall 2019, a broader university-wide task force chaired by Dr. Teik Lim and Dr. David Coursey met to examine all programs that supported faculty development, including the FDL program and submitted a final report from their three-fold charge: (1) conduct a comprehensive review of all the existing programs related to faculty development; (2) decide if specific programs should be maintained or revised; and (3) develop a plan that better fits the needs of our faculty today given the current mission of the institution. The task force report (Lim & Coursey, 2019) concluded by making suggestions for revisions to faculty programs, including the FDL program. Some of the key recommendations from the original 2019 task force report are excerpted below:

*Merge former FDL and pre-tenure reapportionment programs into one larger program for faculty starting in year 3 of their tenured or tenure-track appointments at UTA. For the sake of discussion, we will call this merged program as faculty development efforts (FDE)*

*2.1 The purpose of the proposed FDE is to be flexible so that faculty may take this leave to focus on research, creative works or teaching.*

*2.2 The rationale behind the proposed FDE is to ensure that there are more FDEs awarded and that these are more inclusive of the faculty body.*

*2.3 The combined proposed FDE program will be managed within the college with guidelines provided by the division of faculty affairs. Approval levels include department chair or program director, dean and then President. Positive and negative outcomes for*

*proposals will move up the approval chain. Provost serves as an advisory to the President similar to the tenure and promotion process.*

Additionally, the original report led by Lim and Coursey had an appendix (Appendix B), which we have included here at the end of this report for reference. The notes at the end are more detailed.

The FDL Ad hoc committee was convened from Senate membership to build on the previous task force suggestions to examine the FDL program and to provide guidelines towards the revision and potential expansion of the FDL program, based on the report and input from the dean’s council.

This committee looked at the following aspects:

- Apportionment of funds at the college level (taking into consideration the 6% cap on full-time faculty who can receive an FDL)
- Eligibility and frequency
- Expectations of the FDL
- Application Process
- Selection Guidelines

The Ad hoc FDL committee was comprised of one representative senator from each college at UTA and led by two co-chairs. The committee convened regularly to discuss options in the summer and fall of 2020, aligning their work and discussion with the guidance of the original primary task force report (report led by Lim & Coursey, 2019). Input was gathered from committee members’ respective academic units regarding suggested FDL revisions. The committee also gathered FDL guidelines and criteria for peer and aspirational peer institutions to analyze how the process works at these institutions.

**Key Recommendations of the Committee**

The revised program will be effective for the 2021-2022 academic year and beyond.

Each college/school will:

- Establish a Faculty Development Leave Committee consisting of faculty senators from each department in the college or school plus one NTT senator. In the case of the School of Social Work, all their senators would serve on the committee. The FDL Committee will review leave applications and send rank-ordered recommendations to the college/school dean who will make the final selection of leave recipients. The committee will also have oversight of the college/school’s compliance with FDL policies and procedures. The minimum should be three people on the committee. (This committee is separate from the research committee.)
- Grant the following number of FDLs each year.

College/School	CAPPA	COB	COE	CoEd	COLA	CONHI	COS	SSW	Total
Leaves/Year	2	6	12	2	12	6	8	2	50

- Allow FDL applications from any full-time faculty member who has been employed full time for five or more consecutive years as detailed below.
- Grant FDLs for a wide range of scholarly, artistic, pedagogical, or clinical activities that advance the applicant’s career.
- Establish policies and procedures to realize a Faculty Development Leave program consistent with these guidelines.
- Not allocate a heavier load to the faculty FDL awardee in exchange for the FDL nor can the courses to be covered be offloaded to other faculty.

Each recipient of a faculty development leave will:

- Strive to complete the activities included in their leave application.
- Submit a report of their leave activities and result to their department chair, dean, and FDL committee within one month following return from their leave.
- Return to UT Arlington for one year following their leave.

Faculty Affairs and Faculty Senate will:

- Monitor compliance with university FDL policies and procedures and report findings to the Provost.
- Develop a communication plan informing faculty members of the revised FDL program and encouraging them to apply.
- Develop a policy for inclusion in HOP that formalizes the FDL program.

**1. Funds to Colleges/Schools:**

Previously, then president Dr. Vistasp Karbhari committed \$240,000 per year to support a new faculty leave program. This was an increase of \$60,000 over the amount budgeted for the old Faculty Development Leave (FDL) program. This committee was tasked with recommending how the \$240,000 would be apportioned across the eight colleges and schools. A distribution plan was drafted that took into account the maximum number of leaves allowed per college based on 6%<sup>1</sup> of faculty headcount. The plan also accounted for the cost of adjuncts which varies considerably across colleges. Another factor in the allocation plan was how to accommodate full-time, non-tenure-track faculty (NTT) members in the model. The committee decided to articulate plans for tenured/tenure-track (T/TT) only, T/TT plus NTT, and an average of the two. These allocations are summarized in the table below. The Annual Leaves columns are calculated as 6% of the number of faculty members in the corresponding categories rounded up to the nearest integer. The average column is the average of the 6% T/TT and 6% Total columns rounded up to the nearest integer.

College/ School	Faculty Lines (Fall 2019)			Annual Leaves		
	T/TT	NTT	Total	6% T/TT	6% Total	Average
CAPPA	31	8	39	2	3	3
COB	71	50	121	5	8	7

<sup>1</sup> The 6% amount was chosen based on the section of the Texas Education Code (Sec. 51.106: Number on Leave at One Time): “Not more than six percent of the faculty members of any institution of higher education may be on faculty development leave at any one time.” Source: <https://texas.public.law/statutes/tex. educ. code section 51.106>

COE	159	53	212	10	13	12
CoEd	26	13	39	2	3	3
COLA	155	85	240	10	15	13
CONHI	33	110	143	2	9	6
COS	111	38	149	7	9	8
SSW	29	17	46	2	3	3
Total	615	374	989	40	63	55

The following table summarizes the cost to hire adjuncts to support the above leave plan. The table also shows the percentage of cost totals on a per college basis.

College/ School	Adjunct Cost for Above Plan				Percent of Cost Totals		
	T/TT only	Total	Average	Average Stipend	T/TT only	Total	Average
CAPPA	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$5,000	5.14%	5.05%	5.74%
COB	\$50,000	\$80,000	\$70,000	\$5,000	12.85%	13.46%	13.40%
COE	\$150,000	\$195,000	\$180,000	\$7,500	38.56%	32.80%	34.45%
CoEd	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$2,500	2.57%	2.52%	2.87%
COLA	\$75,000	\$112,500	\$97,500	\$3,750	19.28%	18.92%	18.66%
CONHI	\$16,000	\$72,000	\$48,000	\$4,000	4.11%	12.11%	9.19%
COS	\$56,000	\$72,000	\$64,000	\$4,000	14.40%	12.11%	12.25%
SSW	\$12,000	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$3,000	3.08%	3.03%	3.44%
Total	\$389,000	\$594,500	\$522,500				
Assumptions -- one semester leave, two course load per semester							

One clear fact that emerges from this model is that \$240,000 is not sufficient to fund 6% of faculty members on leave. In fact, it would take \$389,000 for 6% of T/TT and \$594,500 for 6% of T/TT plus NTT. So, colleges/schools would have to supplement the funds allocated from central administration to fully fund 6% of the faculty or reduce the number of leaves to 3.7% per year for T/TT only or 2.4% for T/TT plus NTT.

The following table shows distribution of \$240,000 across colleges/schools based on the percentages from above. The table also shows the number of leaves that could be funded.

College/ School	Distribution of Funds by %			Leaves fundable from \$240K		
	T/TT only	Total	Average	T/TT only	Total	Average
CAPPA	\$12,339	\$12,111	\$13,780	1	1	1
COB	\$30,848	\$32,296	\$32,153	3	3	3
COE	\$92,545	\$78,722	\$82,679	6	5	6
COEd	\$6,170	\$6,056	\$6,890	1	1	1
COLA	\$46,272	\$45,416	\$44,785	6	6	6
CONHI	\$9,871	\$29,066	\$22,048	1	4	3
COS	\$34,550	\$29,066	\$29,397	4	4	4
SSW	\$7,404	\$7,267	\$8,268	1	1	1
Total	\$240,000	\$240,000	\$240,000	23	24	23

Fast forwarding to now (November 2020), Interim President Teik Lim has announced that UTA is transitioning to an incentive-based budget model where funds will be allocated to

colleges/schools by formula at the beginning of each fiscal year. We have been informed that under this new model, colleges/schools will be expected to fund faculty leaves from those allocations and that no additional funding will be provided from central administration. Hence, the above apportionment model is no longer applicable but is offered as guidance to college/school leadership when planning and budgeting for faculty leave programs.

Alternatively, this committee recommends a policy requiring each college/school to budget for or otherwise support faculty leave programs appropriate for their mission and strategic goals. Moreover, we recommend the following number of leaves per year for each college/school.

College/School	CAPPA	COB	COE	COEd	COLA	CONHI	COS	SSW	Total
Leaves/Year	2	6	12	2	12	6	8	2	50

**2. Recommendations for Eligibility and Frequency:**

- A. General requirements: Faculty Development Leave proposals may be submitted by any member of the UT Arlington faculty who has (1) served as an Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor for at least five consecutive academic years at the time the proposal is submitted, or (2) made a successful third year review as an assistant professor or five years of employment as a Full-Time NTT faculty. The FDL program is open to both tenure and non-tenure track faculty. The FDL program is not open to part-time faculty at any rank. Colleges will decide the distribution of FDLs among their faculty.
- B. Frequency: Faculty are eligible to apply after five consecutive academic years from their previously awarded FDL.
- C. Scope: Faculty may propose a broad range of activities, including those that leverage professional opportunities and contributions that may not be explicitly tied to pursuing future external funding.
- D. Candidates for faculty development leave remain eligible for the Research Enhancement Program (REP) grants, fellowships, or other financial or in-kind support to assist in funding their research and travel during their leave. Application for and granting of any such support, however, is wholly independent of the FDL program.
- E. Faculty members shall not be precluded from participation in the FDL program solely based on the programmatic and scheduling needs of their academic unit. All eligible faculty members must have the same opportunity to compete for FDLs. Academic units must be prepared to make reasonable accommodation for their absence.

**3. Expectations for Awardees:**

FDL recipients should produce a clearly defined deliverable appropriate to their academic rank, discipline, and scope of work originally proposed.

- A. A faculty development leave request must include the specific dates for which the leave is requested.
- B. A faculty member who takes a faculty development leave must agree to return to full-time service at the university for at least one academic year following the leave.

- C. Following the faculty leave, a summary of the project/purpose for the leave must be submitted to the Director of the Program and the Dean of the College and should describe:
- the specific project or work which was proposed to be accomplished during the leave
  - the value of this project to the faculty members' career trajectory and the mission of the university
  - If applicable, the location (geographical, institutional, agency, organization, repository, online, etc.) where the project was conducted and relevant travel/study plans
  - tangible products, outcomes, or results generated from professional activities

#### **4. Application and Routing Process:**

- A. A university-wide deadline should be established by the provost's office, which allows for at least three months for the internal review process
- B. Colleges or Schools should use one Standard Application Document developed by the Provost's Office with the oversight of the faculty senate to collect basic information on the faculty member's status at UTA. Items such as Academic Rank, years of service at UTA, a summary of the proposed project (600 words or less), how the project fits into their career development, and the length of time they are requesting for the leave. The applicant should include their current CV.
- C. Faculty should apply for an FDL for either one semester at full pay or two semesters for half pay for the following academic year.
- D. Applicants must initiate the development leave process with the Chair or Director of the Department or School who will then forward the request to a Faculty Development Leave Committee of the College. The committee will evaluate and rank each proposal submitted.
- E. The final list of ranked applications will be forwarded to the Dean of the Academic Unit for endorsement.
- F. The final decision for who receives the FDLs rests with the Dean.

#### **5. Selection Guidelines and Assessment Criteria:**

In this section, we describe the process and criteria to be used for selection. A clear process should be created by the college for a final report and/or presentation to faculty of the outcome of the leave.

##### **Selection Guidelines**

We suggest the following guidelines for selection of the FDLs in each college:

- A. The Dean of each College/School will make it clear how many FDL's would be available for the particular academic year.
- B. Each College/School should form FDL Committees that would evaluate applications based on the merit of the proposal. This FDL Committee should be more comprehensive in scope and should be consistent with the overarching principles of the FDL.

- C. This FDL Committee should include one member from each department, some of whom should be full-time NTT Faculty with a minimum of 5 years of employment.
- D. The College/School FDL Committee will evaluate and rank the applications.
- E. The College/School FDL Committee will make the final decisions based on the number of FDL's selected and the agreed upon merit of the proposals.
- F. The Dean will review FDL Committee's recommendations for endorsement and final approval.

### **Assessment Criteria**

The proposed FDL activities should meet the following criteria:

- (1) The proposal was complete and written clearly.
  - The overall purpose of the FDL was clear.
  - The leave would help the applicant meet this purpose
- (2) The proposed activities would contribute to the applicant's career trajectory
  - scholarly, artistic, pedagogical, or clinical
- (3) The proposal clearly explains how the proposed activities are beneficial for the applicant's academic discipline.
- (4) The college-level FDL committee should develop a rubric for assessing the proposals and are required to share this rubric with the Senate and faculty members once such a rubric has been developed.

These proposed FDL activities should not be evaluated solely on:

- A. potential external grant funding.
- B. potential scholarly publications.
- C. a bias towards research over other types of activities.
- D. the programmatic needs of their academic unit.

Academic Units must be prepared to make reasonable accommodations for the absence of the faculty member on leave.

## **Appendix: Original Notes from Faculty Development Task Force Final Report and Recommendations (Lim & Coursey, 2019)**

### Appendix B – Team 1 (faculty career) report

Team Members: Debra Wood (Lead), Yi Zhang, Alex Weiss, Toni Sol, Jean Hood, Liliana Perez Nordtvedt

Notes on this proposal to President Karbhari and Provost Lim:

1. Both Pre-tenure reapportionment and faculty development leave are fused together, referred to as Faculty Development Leave (FDL). We request that the faculty pre-tenure reappointment portion be grandfathered and honored for Assistant Professors who were hired on and before Fall 2019. This is because this benefit was used and has been used to recruit candidates. It would be unfair to remove this from these prior and current hires.
2. In general, the proposal suggests decentralization of FDL to the Colleges/Schools.
3. The statement “faculty are not required to leave Arlington” is added so that opportunity is given to a wider range of faculty members who have families or who cannot afford to leave town, but who will use the time to do research or creative activities.
4. The statement “FDLs are available... at 2/3 pay for two semesters” is to encourage faculty members to take the full year of leave. Half pay is not realistic for a faculty member to take the full year. Faculty members can accomplish a lot more during 1 year. At ½ pay, faculty members may not be able to financially afford the full year. Full year proposals can be more impactful for the career of the faculty member and to the benefit of UTA.
5. The statement “submit a FDL proposal to the faculty’s main academic unit (department or college) is there for 3 reasons: 1. Academic units know the individual faculty members better than a university-wide committee, and 2. Academic units also understand what activities are worthy of a leave for their particular faculty better than other units across the university, and 3. This give opportunity to a wider range of faculty members who may be in fields that are obscure to a centralized committee from diverse areas.
6. The statement “No more than 5% of the faculty in the college can be on FDL at any one point in time” is added so that teaching needs are always met by the unit. The 5% is an arbitrary number, but it may need to be adjusted by the size of the college. Regardless, the statement is to let faculty members understand that they might need to wait an extra year to be awarded the FDL or that they need to be staggered with other faculty members in the “wait” list.
7. We recommend that Deans should be responsible for building potential faculty development leaves into their unit budget, with help from central administration. This is to increase the number of FDLs available at UTA currently.
8. We created 3 FDL types to guarantee that a wide range of activities are covered under the FDL umbrella. Again, this is in the spirit to be more inclusive and recognizing that what is worthy of FDL in a particular field may not in another. Thus, academic units evaluate the merits in a decentralized way.



9. The proposal includes faculty members who may need to renew their research activity to have access to FDL.
10. We suggest that data be gathered about the effectiveness of the FDL program. Specifically, faculty members should complete a survey right after FDL asking about the usefulness of FDL. Awardees should also complete a survey one year after the end of FDL to assess whether or not FDL is produced specific outcomes (i.e., the publication of a journal article, or the publication of a book).
11. We also suggest that central administration keep track of who is getting FDL in each college and academic unit. This oversight is necessary to make sure Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors from all departments are being awarded FDLs and that FDL is not only being awarded to a particular group (e.g., Assistant Professors, or Males) or department (e.g., Marketing Department) exclusively. Colleges can gather this data but need to send it to central administration.
12. In addition, we also recommend that central administration tracks what departments and groups are submitting applications. Colleges can gather this data but need to send it to central administration.
13. We suggest that each department provide example ideas for faculty development leave that are appropriate for their unit.
14. We suggest that the reasons and parameters of this proposal be communicated to all Deans and Department chairs for effective implementation.
15. The specific proposal starts in the next page.

#### Description

1. FDL Includes all tenure stream faculty. Both non-tenured and tenured tenure track faculty qualify.
2. A FDL is not deferred compensation to which a faculty member is entitled but it is granted or denied on the merits of the individual proposal.
3. Faculty are granted one or two semesters to pursue a wide range of activities to enhance the faculty member's value to UTA. While faculty are not required to be in attendance at the University during a FDL, faculty are not required to leave Arlington.
4. FDLs are available at full pay for one semester or at 2/3 pay for two semesters.
5. The faculty member is required to submit a FDL proposal to the faculty's main academic unit (department or college).
6. The needs of the unit, number of applicants, etc. should be used by the unit to determine how many FDLs can be granted. No more than 5% of the faculty in the college can be on FDL at any one point in time. FDL may be delayed based on teaching needs by the academic unit.
7. Once endorsed by the academic unit head, in consultation with the academic unit's tenured faculty, the leave will require the Deans approval.

#### FDL types

There are three types of FDLs:

1. Research FDL: This type of FDL is awarded to faculty who use the leave time to engage in research (e.g., data collection, writing an academic book, writing journal articles, writing grant proposals and the like).
2. Creative works FDL: This type of FDL is awarded to faculty who use the leave time to engage in creative activities (e.g., producing a new composition, performing concerts, doing art exhibitions).
3. Teaching FDL: This type of FDL is awarded to faculty who use the leave time to engage in teaching activities (e.g., Fulbright scholars, developing new teaching approaches, developing study abroad programs, etc.).

#### Eligibility to participate

Tenured stream faculty can apply for a FDL every 3 years of service at UTA, starting with the time served as tenure stream full time employment at UTA. Consideration will be given to tenure stream faculty members:

1. With the greatest seniority in terms of University service and in terms of service between leaves.
2. Who have never received a FDL.
3. Who need professional renewal or to launch a new area of research.
4. With a special project.
5. Who need assistance toward promotion.
6. Who are research active.

If two or more proposals are judged to be of equal quality, first priority is given to applicants who have not been awarded FDLs for which they have been eligible in previous years. Recipients are required to provide a 1 to 2 page report of their accomplishments within the 3 months following the end of the leave. Only faculty members who have submitted a report on what they accomplish during their FDL can re-apply.

#### Application requirements

1. Prospective applicants for FDL should discuss their interest in FDL with their academic unit heads before submitting an application.
2. To apply for FDL, a proposal of no more than 2 pages, a CV, and any supporting materials need to be submitted to the faculty member's unit head (e.g., department chair) one year prior to the desired leave explaining the activities to be undertaken. Applicants need to include a report on the accomplishments of previous FDLs, if applicable.
3. The Faculty member's academic unit (i.e., the other faculty members in the unit) conducts a peer review at the unit and college level to evaluate the proposal and endorse the FDL. Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the potential enhancement of the applicant's effectiveness and career, and the potential value of the faculty member's contributions to UTA.

4. Such endorsement should consider both the merits of the proposal as well as the ability of the academic unit to meet staffing needs while the faculty is on FDL. The Dean has final approval authority for FDLs.

5. The employee is required to return to UTA for the 2 years immediately following the FDL, otherwise the faculty must reimburse UTA the salary paid during leave.