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I. Overview

The New Professoriate Study Group of the Chancellor’s Rutgers University-Newark Strategic Plan (the Plan) studied various aspects of current and future instructional roles in the context of an urban anchor institution committed to both equity and excellence. Ours is a broad agenda, arising directly from the strategic planning process—from charrettes to strategic priorities. As the Plan observed, “Our strategic vision calls upon us to embrace a wider range of excellence in faculty scholarship, recognizing the multifaceted value gained from the diversity of research that emerges from breaking silos and engaging with other constituents outside the academic sphere.” The Plan also recognizes that the New Professoriate will be different from its predecessor.

What is the New Professoriate? Our campus is undergoing a scholarly evolution where our mission transcends traditional scholarship. The professoriate component of the university in turn has a mission to contribute to the public in a way that is scholastically meaningful. Thus, the professoriate consists of all academic components at the University, whose members must receive appropriate mentoring, guidance and support in order to meet our mission.

Who is the New Professoriate? The New Professoriate is more ethnically and racially diverse than its predecessor. Its wide range of backgrounds and interests is made richer from increasing opportunities for people who historically had not sought or been hired for faculty positions to participate in careers of the mind. The New Professoriate is also more likely to come from communities beyond the mainstream of society, to engage in research with members of those communities and to teach students from those places. The New Professoriate is comprised of many more non-tenure track faculty (NTTs), part-time lecturers (PTLs) and professors of practice—a diverse faculty of dedicated instructors who often connect the institutional learning experience to the lived work experience outside academia. The New Professoriate are scholars more likely to engage in public scholarship by and with identifiable communities and interests. And they are more likely to collaborate across disciplines to tackle questions of significant impact. The men and women of the New Professoriate, therefore, are a bridge to more experiences, fuller meanings and new possibilities.

With these observations in mind, our Study Group examined five specific areas\(^1\) in a professor’s life:

---

\(^1\) We recognize that other than a broad discussion of resources, we have omitted the very important subject of budgetary priorities and constraints, a subject beyond the group’s expertise at this point.
1) Supporting and Evaluating Publicly Engaged Scholarship
2) Innovations in Promotion and Tenure Criteria
3) Building Institutional Resources for the New Professoriate
4) Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Part-time Lecturers
5) Graduate and Post-graduate Training

We tried to read widely and discuss actively. The debates have been productive, and we expect to produce two sets of deliverables, this report offering near-term recommendations, and a later report offering more comprehensive recommendations. At the same time, we will distribute to deans and the faculties of each RU-N unit questions for further discussion. Issues such as tenure clock management and use of NTTs are treated very differently from school to school, and the group members decided to learn from the considered responses of our colleagues before issuing recommendations on those and other matters. Next year we will issue a second set of recommendations reflecting that feedback. Following a brief discussion of each of the five discussion subjects, the preliminary recommendations appear below. The report concludes with a bibliography and a list of the Study Group membership.

II. Discussion

1. Supporting and Evaluating Publicly Engaged Scholarship (PES)

By whatever definition of PES one uses, it is clear that many Rutgers faculty engage in a lot of PES. Less clear is whether they are recognized and rewarded for it. The Study Group spent ample time debating a suitable definition, followed by discussions to determine the standards by which it should be evaluated. We were most interested in the question of impact or contribution, an issue not necessarily of intent or scholarly engagement but of significance, relevance and dissemination. We also recognized the concerns of some scholars that, at least at Rutgers, PES may receive disproportionate support, sometimes at the expense of more traditional scholarship. We are mindful to avoid such a consequence.

a. Definition

Many theorists and practitioners have defined PES under different names and perspectives, ever since Boyer (1990) published his book, Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, who called for a new type of scholarship that goes across and beyond the traditional disciplinary and university walls, and researches the pressing social and civic problems of the time. This new type of scholarship has also been called engaged scholarship, community engaged scholarship, action research, and so on. The National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement, which provides external peer review of faculty’s scholarship of engagement submitted by their institutions, “considers the Scholarship of Engagement as a term that captures scholarship in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service. It engages faculty in academically relevant work that simultaneously meets campus mission and goals as well as community needs. In essence, it is a scholarly agenda that integrates community issues. In this definition community is
broadly defined to include audiences external to the campus that are part of a collaborative process to contribute to the public good.”
(http://www.scholarshipofengagement.org/)

After reviewing many definitions in the literature, we arrived at the following working definition of PES:

**Publicly engaged scholarship/public scholarship/engaged scholarship is**

*A substantial research effort in which the researcher takes up an issue of significant public interest to an identifiable community, acts upon or with particular segments of that community in constructing the design of the project and the measure of its impact, with the aim of producing contribution through knowledge creation disseminated to at least an identifiable public.*

This is the principle of public contribution and mutual benefit. PES projects often join the academic in partnership with non-academic authors. The mode of research findings may be traditional (e.g., publications) or not (e.g., displays, digital exhibits, sustainable programs), but must demonstrate an attempt to create measurable impact for a target community. The methods of research must satisfy the standards of other members of the field, with a preference for peer review or its equivalent.

Many PES theorists argued that this new type of scholarship has the potential to revive higher education in today’s social and economic environment. On one hand, public universities are challenged more and more by the public to demonstrate relevance in terms of using public funds for research presumed to be beneficial to society; on the other hand, competing for public funding is increasingly intense and funding agencies are requiring eligible research to demonstrate real and broader impacts. Facing both challenges, PES provides a strategy that connects universities to real world problems and the new knowledge produced could generate positive and alternative forms of impact outside of the higher education institutions. We note that by providing an exceptionally diverse student body, itself part of the public, with access to excellent and internationally recognized faculty, engaged in important research, RU-N is already providing very valuable service to the public. Advancing our PES allows us to do much more.

*b. Evaluation and Support*

Advocating PES does not mean abandoning traditional scholarship; rather, many of the same standards should apply to evaluating the products of PES. For example, the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement adopted the framework proposed by Glassick et al (1997) as six qualitative evaluation criteria: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique. Similarly, the Community-Campus Partnerships for Health from the University of Washington developed a toolkit for practitioners to recognize, promote, and reward PES, especially through the faculty promotion and evaluation system. It suggested that in order to qualify as scholarship, the research has to be conducted with disciplinary
expertise, in a scholarly manner with clear goals and appropriate methodology, be effectively documented and disseminated to audiences with reflective critique about significance, processes, and lessons learned, have significance beyond the individual context, be judged to be significant and meritorious by panel of peers, and demonstrate consistently ethical practice, adhering to codes of conduct in research, teaching, and the discipline (Jordan, 2007).

Campus Compact is a national coalition of college and university presidents who are committed to fulfilling the civic purpose of higher education. According to its 2005 conference report (Gibson, 2006), some research universities were already quite advanced in promoting PES on their campuses at that time. Two examples are the Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service at Tufts University and the Neighborhood Participation Project (NPP) at the University of Southern California’s School of Policy, Planning, and Development. In addition, the University of Utah, Vanderbilt University, and the University of Michigan all have started to provide generous financial support for individual faculty engaged in PES. Dedicated community engagement offices or centers have been established on some campuses to help identify and facilitate partnerships for faculty and students’ active engagement research, teaching, and learning opportunities.

Deeper institutional changes, such as altering promotion criteria to recognize and include PES works in the promotion process, are either being considered or have been adopted in research universities like Portland State University, the University of Wisconsin and the University of Guelph (Gelman, Jordan, & Seifer, 2013). Such deeper level structural changes have never been an easy task though. It usually takes years of careful efforts in forms of individual faculty surveys, departmental or campus level data gathering, and university level conversation and seminars, as exemplified in the recent cases of the University of Massachusetts (Saltmarsh, Wooding, & Mclellan, 2014), Tulane University (Tulane University, 2013) and Syracuse University (Phelps, 2010).

Community engagement is not new to Rutgers University – Newark, and in fact, there are already rigorous publicly engaged activities in many research centers and departments (Rutgers-Newark Office of University-Community Partnership, 2013), and there are even annual institutional awards, recognition, and celebration of community engagement for both staff and faculty members. In addition, the Carnegie Foundation classifies Rutgers University – Newark as a community engaged university campus.

Nevertheless, the Study Group recognized a series of challenges that need to be addressed and discussed by university faculty at large. For instance, there may be significant disciplinary differences in terms of conducting or not conducting PES. Based on an analysis of multiple years of the self-reported community engagement scholarship activities by the faculty of Michigan State University, Doberneck et al (2012) pointed out that pure, hard, and non-life sciences were not engaged with the community with the same level, intensity or approaches as applied, soft, and life sciences. Our study group also noted that every scholar, especially junior scholars, will need to make careful decisions about their career goals with appropriate mentorship and advice from their
senior peers. For those interested in incorporating PES into their research agenda, they will need to do so strategically, considering their limited time and energy.

We found that the standards for evaluating PES, especially for promotion or tenure, cannot be defined by a single university study group. These are considerations that ultimately go to the heart of how different disciplines value scholarship and distinction in their fields as well as how different faculties exercise governance. Therefore, the Study Group decided that our detailed recommendations about PES should await further discussion among different schools and faculty.

c. Examples

Among our Study Group, faculty from Rutgers Business School observed some types of public engaged scholarship that would be acceptable in addition to traditional scholarship:

- Grant funded research projects
- Grant funded research reports
- Reports completed for nationally recognized foundations
- Op-Ed, Essays, and other publications that reach the public
- Creation of publically available datasets
- Books and edited books (which are usually not rewarded)

Another member of the Study Group from the Department of English offered the following examples of PES that innovate and broaden the field:

Professor Khaled Mattawa of the University of Michigan interviewed members of a community in Tripoli, Libya to discuss the trauma of war and political unrest and its effects on them. As a method of dealing with this aftermath, he got a gallery to sponsor foreign (North American and European) film showings from other countries and readings both of poets from the U.S. and Arab poets he would later translate into English. He would bring the Arab poets to America not only through his translations but also through an International Conference of Arab and Arab American Poets. His translations of Syrian poet Adonis amplified his international audience and may have helped in Adonis being shortlisted for the Nobel Prize. (Experts in Arabic literature think it was Adonis’ circulation in French that actually got him shortlisted.) As a result of the work he does in Libya, he later founded The Arete Foundation for Arts & Culture. In 2014, he was awarded a MacArthur Foundation (Genius) Award.

http://digitalhumanitiesnow.org. This online journal exhibits the best in online, peer reviewed scholarship that might extend beyond the bounds of academia

---

2 The member also offered the following alternative definition of PES: This work should actively exchange knowledge with the public sector, creating new, original, innovative work. This work should exhibit rigorous scholarship and the potential to change the field through active public engagement. The engagement with the public may happen either digitally, in the digital humanities, or physically, in propia persona.
without excluding more traditional academic scholarship in the field. An example of the kind of scholarship that broadens the public and academic community might be found in Jonathan Reeves “Proposal for a Corpus Protocol: http://jonreeve.com/2015/03/proposal-for-a-corpus-protocol/

2. Innovations in Promotion and Tenure Criteria

While the Study Group universally acknowledged problems with the current tenure clock (it is too short or too rigid in many cases), there was little consensus on precise problems and fixes. Clearly, a more flexible clock is welcome. Several expressed a desire to see the University embrace the goal that all tenure-track candidates receive tenure at some point. Some group members expressed a sentiment to end as much as practicable the up-or-out nature of the tenure decision. This sentiment specifically referred to cases where candidates are excellent teachers and mentors and/or provide critical service to the University and yet turned down for tenure – these candidates should be considered for available non-tenured positions within the University. This would not subvert the critical nature of the tenure-process, but to offer alternate pathways where possible. (It is important to note that the non-tenured positions would not replace tenure-track/tenured lines.) We thought that depending on field and discipline, tenure and promotion criteria were generally less flexible than they could be—including references to PES work—and the Rutgers Extension rules received favorable mention. Indeed, most of us would do away with the question asked to outside reviewers: Would this candidate receive tenure at your school? Some of us would revise Form 1-A.

The current tenure clock may need adjustment to reflect the realities of different research expectations exist across disciplines. For example, successful tenure in the science disciplines not only requires successful creation/discovery of knowledge, successful publication in peer-reviewed journals, successful management of a research laboratory, and successful transfer of knowledge in the classroom, but also successful competition for hundreds of thousands and in some instances millions of dollars. The time to receipt of first grant award is getting longer and the rate of grant success is dropping, which necessitates a rethinking of the tenure clock, at least, in the sciences.

Two notable observations involved development and changes in professional focus over time. With the exception of the RBS, the group expressed a lack of developmental feedback for junior faculty. This coincided with a general criticism about the lack of consistent mentoring (before and after tenure), followed by a need to mentor the mentors. Some of the lack of mentoring reflects the lack of training in how to be a mentor. Few, if any, schools at RU-N have vehicles in place to instruct faculty on how to develop each other.

Finally, we realized that an individual faculty member often wants to pursue different things at different points in his or her career. The trajectory varies. We observed that faculty may spend years doing traditional scholarship only to suspend for a time in order to pursue different classroom opportunities or a PES or service project. This “lifecycle” reality to a professor’s productive life should be recognized and encouraged.
3. **Building Institutional Resources for the New Professoriate**

In cumulative fashion, each succeeding subject helped to illuminate more about the last. This one immediately suggested the need for resources around PES (which can be expensive and unpredictably time-consuming enough to affect the tenure clock); the need for resources devoted to learning about and adopting more effective development and mentoring; the possibility that even the life cycle represents changes in resources, so that a professor may wish to devote him or herself to PES at certain stages of his or her career because that is when they have the resources to do so. Other resource needs were very straightforward. Resources are needed to recruit and retain, for instance, more female and minority NTT and TT faculty (at all levels), and especially in STEM fields. Also additional resources such as professional development and conference travel are necessary for most NTT faculty. Resources are needed for international scholars to travel to conferences and also to conduct overseas research. Over all, this subject may intersect with what Saltmarsh referred to as the need for a “substantial infrastructure” (Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013).

A distinction arose between resources and systems, especially in the context of PES. One member offered that Rutgers needs to develop “systems and cultures by which scholars here conduct research, teaching and PES.” Another thought that legitimacy is a resource needed, for instance, in any University office promoting PES. Other resource needs for PES included money for short-term feedback and methods research, reduced teaching responsibilities for those doing approved PES projects. Our recommendations will reflect even more specific resource needs, such as a Center for Teaching Excellence.

4. **Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Part-time Lecturers**

The Study Group had strong beliefs about the role of NTTs and PTLs in the New Professoriate. We recognized the increasingly important role they play in the professoriate over all, a development that came about without much planning or an expectation that the trend would grow. Many of us expressed support for recent policies on pay and hours that correct for past mistakes and move toward a goal of balance. We noted again how different can be the roles of these faculty by school. A general distinction seemed to hold that NTTs represent more integral members of the professoriate, with needs closer to those of tenure-track faculty, while many PTLs are professionals who may enjoy a more flexible (though often long-lasting) relationship to Rutgers. This is important to considerations of roles; NTTs increasingly serve the functions of more traditional faculty, but without the same service demands or professional development. Although there were some concerns expressed about the implications of this imbalance, most of our discussion focused on how to expand participation of NTT faculty in the range of professoriate benefits and duties.

We concluded only that developing the role of NTTs and PTLs in the new professoriate at RU-N is a significant work in progress that should proceed toward the goal of fuller participation beyond teaching—in governance, scholarship and service. Informed by the
feedback from our colleagues across RU-N, we intend to return to these issues in our follow-up report and recommendations next year.

5. Graduate and Post-Graduate Training

Graduate students already comprise a significant part of the New Professoriate, given their extensive teaching duties. Many, of course, will go on to become full-time members of the professoriate when their studies conclude. The major distinction we discussed regarding their current status is between doctoral students who seem to receive a lot of support in general and masters-level students who do not. Several members of the group expressed concern about the secondary status of masters students who often are part time, travel long distances to get to class, do not feel supported or mentored by the faculty and get scant career services help. Members recounted the many incentives to teach to PhDs and invest in them, particularly at a research university. These problems seem to occur in most, but not all, fields. The issue is whether providing more for masters-level students ought to be a New Professoriate priority even if they are not training to teach. The question arose again and again: How can we give masters students more resources and what would they be?

As for PhD students, we discussed the fact that many grad students are not really taught how to teach, though they have significant teaching responsibilities. Another observation was that many grad students at RU-N are first generation and do not really know how to be a grad student. (A graduate representative told the Study Group that some grad students do not necessarily want to do research on or in Newark.) Clearly, providing resources that better address these characteristics of RU-N grad students advances the University’s more general goals about sending out the most accomplished new professors into the academy. We concluded that, once again, this was an issue area ripe for broader departmental input and further analysis before we can issue final recommendations.

III. Preliminary Recommendations

Given the preceding analysis of the main issues with which we were charged, the Study Group offers the following ten preliminary recommendations in order of priority. Some require further action before execution; others are quite specific but require resources. The goal of these first recommendations was to find a medium between the bold and the expeditious.

1. **RU-N should vigorously adopt definitions, evaluation standards and reward structures that encourage widespread appreciation in PES among the faculty.**

Although the Study Group has offered more than one definition of publicly engaged scholarship in this report, including its own, we believe that broader, more intensive adoption of this important work will entail ownership by individual schools and departments at RU-N. Each will need to define it, develop the details of evaluating work in their own fields and reward it accordingly. We strongly encourage this work on behalf
of all of their faculty—NTT, tenure-track and PTLs, as well as their graduate students. The recommendations below further reflect our discussions about the necessary institutional resources that accompany a commitment to PES, which can often take longer to conduct at significantly greater cost than traditional scholarship but without many of the same external funding sources. (Additional institutional resources for the new professoriate are suggested in several recommendations below.)

a. RU-N Faculty Development Office (see recommendation #4) should
   i. Develop a portal/website/webpage such that each department/unit on our campus is listed and, for each of those, about three or four examples are provided regarding CES being done elsewhere
   ii. Provide training on conducting PES
   iii. Provide training on evaluating PES
   iv. Invite external PES scholars to present their works

b. Office of University-Community Partnerships should help
   i. Highlight public scholarship (see Recommendation #3)
   ii. Connect scholars with potential community partners by
      1. Information sharing
      2. Organizing forums
   iii. Develop extensive internship programs for students at all levels.

Time frame: Implementation within a calendar year.

2. RU-N should issue multiple annual PES awards from a central office.

Awarding PES through a central RU-N office will demonstrate RU-N’s commitment to encourage and support PES, and the actual awards at the institutional level will also help scholars who conduct PES to present stronger evidence of excellence for their tenure and promotion reviews.

a. Setting up a PES award committee composed of faculty representatives from multiple schools and departments to annually set up criteria, call for applications, and select winners of the PES awards. There should also be a celebration event in RU-N recognizing the winners and their accomplishments.

Time frame: Implementation within a calendar year.

3. RU-N should publicize the work of its faculty.

One important way to increase the impact of faculty scholarship both within academia and in the broader society is to increase dissemination. Too much high-quality scholarship remains locked in hard-to-find journals, books and other publications known mainly by members of a particular field. RU-N can increase the exposure of its scholars’ work by taking a more active role in publicizing and disseminating their work more broadly. Electronic dissemination offers new means of publication and re-publication as
well. RU-N as an institution could help set up a publishing outlet and provide trusted web gateways for worldwide access to our faculty’s scholarship.

a. Assign a chief editor (e.g., rotating faculty, an institute or center) and call for an editorial board to establish a new publication featuring RU-N faculty’s scholarship in all areas, including PES, with adequate quality controls.

b. Along with the Rutgers’s Open Access Policy implementation starting from September of 2015, establish RU-N digital scholarship portals through Rutgers University Libraries’ “Scholarly Open Access at Rutgers”, an institutional repository system (http://soar.libraries.rutgers.edu/) to help increase and demonstrate faculty’s research impacts. Work with the library to set up portals for schools and departments, and also portals for PES and diversity scholarship.

Time frame: Implementation within a calendar year.

4. RU-N should commit to mechanisms for ensuring both internal and external faculty training and resources for development and mentoring. In the areas of PES and diversity, RU-N should leverage its membership in and leadership of several national PES and diversity initiatives.

The faculty is the primary asset for RU-N that deserves continuous investment in development. Most of our peer institutions have dedicated faculty development services that coordinate a variety of resources and trainings for faculty to rely on for learning strategies and obtaining support to be professionally successful (Diaz et al., 2009; McKee, Johnson, Ritchie, & Tew, 2013).

a. Each school should establish a formal mentoring structure for faculty:
   i. Assign senior mentors for junior faculty;
   ii. Organize regular mentor and mentee meetings to provide instruction about how to be mentor and how to be mentored;
   iii. Evaluate the program regularly for continuous improvement;

b. The Provost should lead the establishment of a RU-N Faculty Development Office (FDO) to
   i. Regularly survey faculty development needs;
   ii. Manage campus-level faculty development funding and awards;
   iii. Identify and support off-campus professional/leadership development opportunities for faculty;
   iv. Develop campus-wide and disciplinary-specific faculty development programs, such as
      1. More comprehensive new faculty orientation;
      2. Seminars and workshops on research productivity, effective committee service, administrative leadership development, work-family balance.
v. Identify national PES and diversity initiatives in which RU-N should pursue membership and leadership on behalf of its faculty and see Recommendation 10 for additional FDO responsibilities.

Time frame: Implementation within a calendar year.

5. RU-N should ensure that professors of color experience the fullest possible participation in university governance and departmental leadership.

RU-N should continue to be a national leader in training, recruiting, supporting and promoting faculty of color in all fields and at all levels. However, the ranks of faculty of color sometimes thin out at higher levels of university governance and departmental leadership. The Study Group recommends that the New Professoriate at RU-N take bolder, more conscious steps toward increasing the participation of faculty who have historically been underrepresented in leadership.

Time frame: Immediately.

6. RU-N should offer renewable research funds for faculty across the University, including funds for conference travel, preliminary funding for exploratory research and extra stipends for international scholars.

Today’s faculty needs generous funding, not only to gather valuable data and explore innovative research ideas, but also to participate in national and international scholarly networking events and conferences. Faculty who are at the early stage of their career, and those in the arts, humanities and social sciences, need stable financial support to be able to carry on bold research aspirations.

a. The Vice Chancellor for Research and Collaborations should plan a renewable budget to financially support individual faculty research and professional development. There should also be a dedicated funding pool for NTT faculty’s professional development and conference traveling.

b. Faculty in need of research funding and conference travel should be able to apply directly to this fund, which would not be competitive but available on a first come, first serve basis.

Time frame: Immediately.

7. RU-N should re-establish a Center for Teaching Excellence. Among its strengths should be approaches to teaching a diverse student body in the 21st century.

Faculty, including tenure track and non-tenure track and graduate students who are practicing teaching, all need continuous training and support in pedagogy and education technology in order to provide effective learning experiences for each new generation of
students with their uniquely diverse backgrounds and aspirations (Cargiaga-Lo, Dawkins, Enger, Phyllis, & Spence, 2010; Jacob, Xiong, & Ye, 2015).

(There is an existing proposal from the Library, Computing Services, and FASN on establishing a Center for Innovation and Teaching).

Time frame: Implementation within a calendar year.

8. **RU-N should create a Graduate Office of Career Training.**

The national graduate education trend is to prepare future graduates for more diverse career trajectories. Faculty can provide excellent academic training for graduate students, but not be able to prepare them for non-academic careers. The current RU-N Career Center mainly serves mainly undergraduate students. Graduate students deserve their own dedicated career support.

a. Create a Graduate Office of Career Training, which should
   i. Develop an information and resources inventory for different career trajectories;
   ii. Support graduate students’ career advancement through
      1. Trainings on successful job hunting, interview and negotiation skills, and application document preparation;
      2. Providing individual consultation;
      3. Helping develop and implement personal career plan.

Time frame: Implementation within a calendar year.

9. **In order to better support research and teaching projects to provide faculty with appropriate, timely, and state of the art resources, RU-N should encourage greater collaboration among the following service departments: library, computing services and the research office.**

In the New Professoriate, successful research projects increasingly need solid support from multiple facilitating departments, coordinating their unique expertise towards common goals.

a. There should be a regular research facilitators meeting among representatives from library, computing services and research office, and representatives from faculty (for example, the Research Advisory Council), to learn about researchers’ needs and discuss ways to update faculty about relevant new technology and information resources.

b. Computing services and library services should be equipped with enough infrastructure and staff to be able to provide
   i. Consultation on research project development;
ii. Customized support for research (IT, information management, publication outlet, website development, data management, and so on).

c. Research Office services should provide
   i. More proactive grant development support;
   ii. Customized grant information inventory and notification;
   iii. Funders’ informational sessions;
   iv. Help to interested faculty in identifying public scholarship funding resources and grant development.

Time frame: Immediately.

10. RU-N should encourage all of its schools to promote, plan and provide for a “life cycle” of faculty life and productivity, rather than a one-size-fits-all set of expectations and rewards.

Faculty at all schools have standard expectations for scholarship, teaching and service. However, they engage in these activities with different emphases that often correspond to different times in their professional lives. This we called the “life cycle” of a professor’s career. Since it is an often unacknowledged aspect of the professoriate, we encourage schools to openly recognize it, plan for it and reward it appropriately.

Time frame: Immediate encouragement, substantive proposals by departments within a calendar year.
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