

## SRP Member Survey Complied RESULTS

Sent to faculty who have served on SRP within the last three years and are still employed with UWEX (13);

6 were returned (n=6)

Return rate: 46%

*Reflecting on your recent portfolio reviews...*

1. **For each of the four areas of scholarship, describe how you observed probationary members struggle demonstrating any specific element(s)?**

a. Creative, intellectual work;

- The fact that all our educational work is based on a community identified need and to clarify what their part was in this creative and intellectual work that addresses needs.
- some faculty have not had appropriate and meaningful needs identification,
- often they don't describe the contribution or results of their development/adaption of work that is scholarly (especially in a team situation).
- not always making the connection between what research says about best practices and the framework developed for their work.
- Not always recognizing work that has already been done, and then noting what they have added or improved upon to make it what we call creative and innovative.
- OK here

b. Reviewed by the scholar's peers who affirm its value;

- they knew they needed to do this; opportunities for this are less because the program area does not meet every year and districts time is limited.
- Any work that is peer reviewed should be cited as such, otherwise show the result of true evaluation of the work
- Not willing to bring their work to peers to share; seem to feel like they are taking people's time when they offer to bring things to peers at the district level.
- District peers not really willing to schedule time to do program sharing or not attending meetings when this is on the agenda
- Some districts not eager or being able to afford a face to face meetings and then some lack of willingness to discuss these topics at length (wasting time of Acad. Staff when taking time to discuss Dept. issues and conversely not wanting to take time while Acad. Staff need to discuss issues – so no real discussions take place.
- Hard to know what is being discussed as a Dept. issue when Vice Chr seldom shares what is under discussion – don't know how they can share the District viewpoint.
- OK here

c. Added to our intellectual history through its communication;

- candidates do not use research and publications as much as the association awards – is there a way to encourage cross utilization.
- List professional sources (teaching at national meetings; publishing in professional journals, etc.)
- Things get shared minimally – maybe because people are not encouraged to do so but maybe mostly because of time and support staff constraints along with many tasks falling to YD staff.
- We have good sharing and teaching going on in a variety of venues but maybe not good planning on how to elicit feedback from these audiences.
- this is an area that could be stepped up. Making items available on websites, writing department papers or journal articles

d. Valued by those for who it was intended

- evaluation is at times an afterthought and long term is not often captured. I worry about the diminishing access to evaluation staff and how that will affect new colleagues.
- some faculty need more long term follow-up evaluation to show longer term impact
- true and valuable evaluation. Longer term - longitudinal evaluation would be helpful.
- Lack of understanding of how important it is to plan evaluation to prove you have made impact
- Lack of understanding on how to develop objectives that are measurable.
- Maybe the biggest problem – failure to develop a really strong situation statement justifying program development and then objectives.
- Struggles would be connecting evaluation methods, questions, to what the learning objective is. Lack of longer term evaluation.

2. **Were there any more common weaker or problem areas noticeable in the probationary members work?**

Please think about any elements of the portfolio. For example, short, medium, and long term evaluation (developing, using, communicating results, etc.), plans of work, 8-page reflection, professional resume elements, support material, grammar, professional appearance of document, etc. **Please list the element(s) and describe what you noticed.**

- I noticed resumes were good and professional appearance of document was good. If there was any problem it usually was seated in how the 8-page pulled it all together with direct connections to scholarly work.
- Evaluation--see above--need more documentation of how the work the candidate has done has been used and applied by others.
- Plans of Work--tend to be too repetitive; often do not include appropriate evaluation to get to the impacts needed for tenure; a good option is to consider the summary of program development that is part of II:C. A candidate needs a good program story to tie to the 8 pages and everything else.
- 8 page reflection--not always reflective; needs to include implications of the work the candidate has done; sometimes is a summary of 'activities' rather than a demonstration of programming--and this might tie back to the plans of work and whether they are plans for a 'program' or for activities.
- Support materials--What constitutes an exhibit? One piece or several parts? If several parts are included in one exhibit, how many parts can be included in each exhibit before it is more than 30? (i.e., if someone has 7 exhibits, but each exhibit includes 5 parts, is that 7 exhibits or 35 exhibits?) this is a real issue at FTAC where departments define things differently. Do support materials need a cover page? If a cover page is used, the candidate needs to include only essential information rather than create another page of reading.
- Grammar and editing are a real issue in some documents. People need to remember this document reflects the candidate, the department and UWEX.
- Grammar and spelling can be a blatant problem if the person has not had the document proofed (poor grammar is very hard to overlook). Support materials need to be significant in nature. FTAC has had heated discussions regarding support materials that are cited as one item when the exhibit really contains multiple facets (i.e. includes program outline, teaching materials and evaluation as one item...this would technically count as 3).
- Quite a few do not have the writing skill sets for portfolio documentation
- We still have people mixing the Department/ Association and Program contributions. It tells me that we are not clear in explaining the differences or people are not all are willing to pay attention to the differences.
- WE could use some training on preparing documents as a professional – everything from how to design a brochure to how to documentation for a lesson or bibliography. WE see extremes of really good or very so, so.
- Reflection writing needs to pack a punch! Often see a reiteration of what appears elsewhere.

- Writing to get to the point, and then really making a strong point!
- Support materials – not always well chosen meaning that they didn't support anything previously mentioned in the 8-pages; repetitive meaning too many of the same types of exhibits, i.e. teaching outlines; not enough variety; portions of handbooks or teachings that weren't original are being included and then also not cited/credit given to original author.
- Grammar/appearance – we've seen this needing improvement in some documents. It's critical that the documents come with appropriate grammar, sentence structure, typos.

**3. Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding how the Department may assist in the success of its probationary faculty members.**

- I am wondering if there needs to a more intentional approach annually for each probationary faculty that continues the three year review process. As resources continue to dwindle we need to be conscious of all the different expectations of the program area, department, and association.
- The department might consider assigning or forming mentor teams rather than just one mentor. Some candidates might have a mentor who is too busy to help or is not strong in planning or other issues. A team might help balance that out.
- We need to take a stronger stand in helping people realize that mentoring is everyone's responsibility and providing the opportunity to do group mentoring should be a priority!
- WE need to assess the ratio of mentors to probationary staff – I think we have a shortage or people self-identify mentors (not a bad idea) and then more of the burden is on those who are maybe very good at mentoring. I don't know if a monetary reward could be noted for people who mentor more than one person. I am starting to worry about staff who have little or no support staff and how they will fare in the tenure process.
- WE may need to think through reporting requirements with the program to see if they are still the best way in light of time constraints and all the political tasks we are doing now to survive.
- I wish Department service were as popular as Association service! How do we get people interested in and really involved in Faculty Governance??
- Need to emphasize that responsibility is still that of the probationary faculty to move their work forward and assert themselves to seek help early on, regardless of whatever processes are in place.
- Prob. Faculty need guidance on developing quality needs assessments early in their programming. By year 5, it is too late.
- Mentoring makes a difference, as does the faculty member's willingness to listen.
- Prob. Faculty need guidance on writing good, measurable objectives for their programs, and then evaluating those objective