

Performance Review

What are the Performance Review procedures?

We encourage you to talk with your mentor, department chair, department evaluation committee chair, and colleagues about the faculty evaluation procedure. The specific university requirements and faculty responsibilities for evaluations, tenure, and promotion are found in the [Collective Bargaining Agreement](#), Articles 12, 14, 15, and 16, and in our local guidelines. Note that some departments require additional documents when conducting a performance review. You may want to maintain a portfolio that organizes your accomplishments into the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service, so that you can reference it during the evaluation process and applying for tenure and promotion.

What are BU's requirements for tenure?

The guidelines for applying for tenure are found on the S:Drive under BU Documents then Tenure Guidelines.

For your rights and responsibilities see the APSCUF [Collective Bargaining Agreement](#) Articles 12 and 15.

What are BU's requirements for promotion?

The guidelines for applying for promotion are found on the S:Drive under BU Documents then Promotion Guidelines.

For your rights and responsibilities see the APSCUF [Collective Bargaining Agreement](#) Articles 12 and 16.

How can I get organized for yearly evaluations, tenure and promotion?

In order to keep track of your accomplishments at Bloomsburg University, consider creating and maintaining a portfolio that includes the items listed in the guidelines for tenure and promotion.

Consider watching this slidecast, entitled [Get Organized for Evaluations, Tenure, and Promotion](#). It offers many useful ideas on what records you should keep and how you might create a portfolio to keep track of your teaching, scholarship, and service.



You may also want to contemplate the following essays that provide useful tips on how to thrive in academia:

Billie Hara, [Open Letter](#);

Gary Olson, [How We Value Faculty Work](#);

Rob Jenkins, [The Five Characteristics of Successful New Faculty Members](#);

and

Michelle Toews and Ani Yazedjian, [The Three-ring Circus of Academia](#)

May 20, 2010, 02:00 PM ET

Open Letter to 2010-11's First-Time Tenure-Track Professors

By [Billie Hara](#)



Today at ProfHacker we begin a new series on the transitions we experience and move through in higher education. One of the biggest (shocking, startling, unsettling, stress producing) transitions is from graduate student to full-time tenure-track assistant professor. And that's our post today: "An Open Letter to Next Year's Full-Time Tenure Track Assistant Professors."

Working in higher education can be difficult, and as graduate students, we think we understand those difficulties. We think we've been trained to handle whatever comes our way. Then we get the tenure track position, and, well, the transition from grad student to faculty member isn't always pretty. Today the voices of experience--those of us current assistant professors, those who are ending their first year right now--have perspectives incoming faculty members might need hear. What we want to provide today are words that we wish we'd received before we started our first year as assistant professors.

A few weeks ago, in preparation for this post, I asked my on-line blogging and twitter friends--folks who went on the job market and into first jobs at the same time I did--what one piece of advice they wish they'd received before they started their first tenure track position. Here are their anonymous replies to the question: **If you could offer one piece of advice to an incoming faculty member, what would it be?**

- Go to lunch with other faculty members, especially if there's a campus space/faculty/staff lunch room/club -- It's how you can get to know people from other departments who may well be your lifeline, information source, shoulder to cry on, inspiration, team-teaching/research partner.... Also you can make friends.

- Don't be afraid to say no to service, even when you think you should take on the task. Pick your service load limit (using male colleagues as your standard, since they do less service and get more credit), and stick to that limit.
- Make everything into research.
- Get in the habit of writing regularly.
- Don't be surprised if your writing production falls significantly the first semester. You are transitioning on many levels, and you might not have the mental energy to create.
- Schedule writing time and protect it like you would the time you teach, or a doctor's appointment, or something else you value highly.
- Check out *Advice for New Faculty Members* by Robert Boice and *From Dissertation to Book* by William Germano.
- Remember to feed your soul with something you really love or enjoy. Without recharging, it's hard to keep writing, teaching, serving on committees, and doing all the other things we're supposed to do as faculty members.
- Make sure you engage in a hobby or two, something that's very different from your daily working activities.
- Try to limit your administrative work until post-tenure.
- Don't believe all the horror stories you hear about personalities within departments. Not everyone (anyone!?!) will want to fire you. In fact, they hired you: they want you to succeed.
- Get a mentor who can help you navigate the local culture; if your department doesn't already do this, ask for one.
- Trust yourself. You know more than you think you do.
- Find your own mentor (or mentors) even if the department assigns you one.
- Don't put everything you do in the context of tenure; do the job well, and you make your tenure case.
- Get to know your new colleagues on your own terms, as much as possible. That is, try not to let people's reputations--good or bad--predetermine your relationship with them.
- Don't read all the horror stories (forums, chatrooms, etc.). In fact, steer clear of the negativity that can pervade academia.
- No matter how mind-blowing the thing you just heard (or were asked to do), wait three days before deciding its magnitude.
- Get everything in writing. Keep a copy of your job ad for future reference. If changes are made to your job description, get it in writing.
- Breathe. Also, smile and nod, especially when you are worn out.
- Be a good, generous listener. Equally important: be perceived as a good, generous listener.
- You don't have to do it all at once.

- For the first year, put your personal wellness first: choose fitness, healthy socializing, whole foods, and sleep.
- Exercise, exercise, exercise.

And finally,

- Study documents such as departmental by-laws, union contracts, and the faculty handbook as though your tenure depended on it--because it might! On a reasonably well-functioning campus, written policy will trump gossip/speculation about what 'really' goes on. You can also learn a fair amount about the history of your institution through these documents--policies often bear witness to the departmental/institutional battles of yesteryear. (I've always found that comforting: Policy X is this way, not because people are idiots, but because it was the only way to solve impasse Y. As long as there's a reason..) Finally, remember that your department probably wants you to succeed. The path to promotion and tenure isn't like crossing a DMZ.

How about you? What do you wish someone had told you your first year as a tenure-track professor? What one piece of advice would you offer next year's incoming group? Please leave suggestions in comments below.

[Creative Commons image by Jule Berlin.]

The Caveat: *my department, college, and university did a fabulous job with the tenure-track new hires last fall (of which I was one). My colleagues were prepared, sensitive, and knowledgeable, and they knew to anticipate many of the obstacles I found myself stumbling over. However, this post isn't about them. It's about next year's first-year tenure track assistant professors and what we can do to help them have a good year.*

October 17, 2010

How We Value Faculty Work



By Gary A. Olson

I attended a recent gathering for department chairs, and listened as the subject turned to how some faculty members misreport their accomplishments on their vitas and annual evaluation forms. "I have one professor who lists short pieces he writes for our departmental newsletter under his 'Publications,'" said one chair, "and another who counts coaching Little League as 'Service.'"

Do the faculty members mean to be misleading? Maybe, or maybe not. But the end result, the department heads agreed, was that some faculty members miscategorize their achievements or blur the lines between categories of work. That discussion led to a related subject: how universities value the various types of faculty work.

"Some of our colleagues," said one of the chairs, "are not clear on the usual hierarchy of academic values, especially when it comes to service and research."

Another chair added, "I'm sometimes amazed at the items that appear on a curriculum vitae and where they get listed." A third commented that some professors seem to believe that all activities have equal value. "We've got to do a much better job of mentoring our faculty," she concluded.

Most problematic, the group agreed, was how some academics conceptualize "service."

Of the three typical kinds of service—community service, institutional service, and service to the profession—the first one is the least valued in a university setting, and the last one is the most

valued. Often, however, *vitas* and tenure cases do not clearly distinguish between those very different types of work.

Institutional service—chairing or serving on departmental, college, or university committees and councils—is the most easily understood. After all, it is a standard work assignment, the sort of task expected of every academic.

The confusion over service usually arises from a conflation of community and professional service.

The highest value lies in service to the discipline. Whether you are an editor of a scholarly journal, officer of your national professional organization, coordinator of a scholarly conference, manuscript reviewer for a press or journal, external reviewer for tenure and promotion, or contributor to the discipline in some other capacity, those activities typically receive the most credit in deliberations over tenure, promotion, and performance review.

Volunteering as a Boy Scout leader, serving as a museum docent, or working in a soup kitchen are all admirable and important contributions to society, but not the kind of service that universities give much credit for.

Giving a public talk at the local library on your area of expertise is an excellent way to enhance town-gown relations, but it is not equivalent to giving a talk to your peers at a major professional convention, where your talk (or at least your proposal) is likely to have undergone rigorous peer review. The two talks may even be on identical subjects, but one carries much more weight.

Similarly, giving a talk at your own institution is not the same as being invited to give a presentation at another university—unless, of course, the invitation at your home institution arose from some formal vetting process, as in a distinguished lecture series.

It's not that community service is insignificant. Certainly, civic engagement has become an important theme in higher education lately, and a positive one. The question is not whether we should pursue such projects in our courses or individually, it's how we report them to our supervisors.

Engaging in community-service projects might well say something about your character and your willingness to contribute to society, but it says little about your contributions to your students or your discipline—the two principal responsibilities of our profession, and our *raison d'être*.

Civic engagement can become a more valued activity if your project is specifically linked to the theme and content of a course you are teaching or research you are conducting. A good example: when a

professor of social work organizes a class project around assisting residents of a local homeless center in order to demonstrate to the students how to apply concepts learned in class. Another example: when an adult-literacy specialist volunteers to tutor people in a local learning center while simultaneously gathering data for a research study on the efficacy for adult learners of certain pedagogical techniques.

Years ago I served as a volunteer in a private hospital for abused women, and while I employed techniques related to my work as a university English professor—teaching the patients how to keep journals, for example, that could later be used in group and individual therapy sessions—my work there had nothing to do with my teaching or scholarship. It played no role in deliberations over my tenure, promotion, annual evaluations, or merit pay rankings, nor should it have.

In fact, some institutions actively discourage faculty members from undertaking too much community service. A provost told me that when he was a dean at a fairly prestigious private college, the administration made it clear that community service would not count in faculty evaluations. "We wanted our faculty to focus on their research and, most importantly, on our students," he said. "We emphasized that their community work was their own business and that the college would not reward it."

Some professors also blur the lines in reporting on their research. A dean once told me that one of her faculty members actually listed editing his church's newsletter on his CV under the heading "Professional/Scholarly Activities."

"He contends that this work should count because he is an English professor and editing is something English professors do," she said, with amusement.

Another common blurring of lines occurs when professors lump all of their publications in one section of their CV without making any distinctions between those that were peer-reviewed and those that were not. I have seen faculty members list book reviews and opinion pieces published in the local newspaper under their "Publications" section, as if they were equivalent to peer-reviewed articles.

The chairs at the meeting I attended mentioned several similar bad practices:

- Listing items under "Books" that were not really books, such as pamphlets, study guides, and instructors' manuals;

- Not making clear whether a book or article you list on your CV is in print, in press, or under review; and

- Listing nonscholarly presentations (a talk before the Rotary club) along with scholarly presentations.

Other faculty members fail to make a distinction between contracted research and scholarly research.

A civil engineer who accepts a contract from the local city government to conduct research about improving traffic flow through a busy intersection might be employing her research skills, but such a project is a service to the community (and one for which she is compensated). It's not a contribution to the knowledge of civil engineering as a discipline.

While both activities have value, contributing to the knowledge base of one's field is substantially more important in the academic value system than helping the city solve a traffic problem.

Some professors may well pad their vitas intentionally. But most of the mistakes that professors make in reporting their work are probably the result of misunderstanding the hierarchy of academic values. You need only ask yourself one question: "To what extent does the activity or accomplishment contribute to the knowledge and progress of the discipline?"

Using that rubric, we can easily see that editing a scholarly journal trumps editing the neighborhood newsletter, organizing a scholarly conference beats organizing a school event, publishing a peer-reviewed scholarly monograph surpasses publishing an instructors' manual for a textbook, and publishing a peer-reviewed article reporting on scholarly research tops being paid to conduct research for a local company.

The key to reporting your accomplishments accurately is to remember academe's hierarchy of values.

Gary A. Olson is provost and vice president for academic affairs at Idaho State University and co-editor, with John W. Presley, of "The Future of Higher Education: Perspectives From America's Academic Leaders" (Paradigm). He can be contacted at golson@isu.edu.

September 14, 2009

The Five Characteristics of Successful New Faculty Members

By Rob Jenkins

No doubt all you brand-new faculty members at two-year colleges who read my August [column](#)—and probably most who didn't—have gotten off to a strong start in the classroom. After all, teaching is your strong suit. Now you're probably wondering, what about the rest of the job? How do I make the most of those 25 working hours a week (theoretically) that are not spent in front of a whiteboard?

The truth is, when it comes to getting your career off on the right foot, what you do outside the classroom is just as important as what you do inside it, if not more. Certainly you will be formally judged on your teaching, but you will also be judged, both formally and informally, on your performance as a department member and campus citizen. And those judgments will be more public and likelier to stick with you.

Based on my own experiences as a "newbie" (four times), as well as my observations as a department chairman and an academic dean, I've identified five characteristics of faculty members whose first few months set a positive tone for their entire careers:

Be humble. You might be surprised at how many new hires show up believing they're smarter than their colleagues, or thinking they already know more about how the institution ought to function than do people who have been there 20 years.

You should assume that, as a rookie, you know nothing about the culture of the institution or the way it runs, much less the way it ought to run. Spend the first few months watching and listening to the people around you, observing how they conduct themselves and how others respond to them. From that you will learn much about how to behave—and how not to.

Seek out an experienced faculty mentor, someone who's been at the college at least three or four years. Avoid members of the "old guard" who appear jaded, disillusioned, and burned out; you don't want their attitudes to rub off on you. Look for someone who knows the ropes but hasn't yet considered using them to hang himself/herself.

(Note: Your department chair may assign you a mentor, but if that relationship is unsatisfactory, feel free to seek out another one on your own. You may very well start with a mentor and end up with a friend.)

Be willing. I mean willing to do just about anything, within limits.

The list of tasks you will be asked to perform as a new hire is virtually endless, as your department head "volunteers" you for various unpleasant assignments (because asking you is less risky than asking someone with more seniority) and harried colleagues seek to shift some of their workload onto you. You will be expected to serve on departmental committees, represent the department on collegewide bodies, sponsor student organizations, judge contests; the list goes on.

Add to those chores the ones that everyone has, like grading exams and advising students, and the load can quickly become daunting.

That's why I say "within limits." It's important to be able to say no, especially when all of those other tasks begin to interfere with your primary responsibility of teaching, or leave you with no personal life. But it's equally important to say yes whenever possible, because, quite frankly, that's how you'll endear yourself to colleagues and administrators.

Occasionally I encounter new faculty members who refuse to do anything "extra," anything for which they aren't (in their minds) getting paid. They're determined not to be "exploited" by "the system."

The truth is, in a community-college setting, I don't even know what constitutes "extra." There's a lot to be done and sometimes no clear delineation between one's official duties and everything else. That's why we expect people to be willing to pitch in and do whatever it takes to serve, well, the system—meaning students, the department, and the institution. If you think that's exploitation, then I suggest you talk with doctors and lawyers about their first-year experiences on the job.

Be organized. That's the only way anyone can cope with the myriad tasks described above, plus teach five courses, while still maintaining some semblance of sanity.

Organization means, first of all, time management. I highly recommend using some sort of daily planner, whether print or electronic. Enter your classes and office hours first, then add other recurring commitments, such as regularly scheduled department or club meetings. Keep track of any new entries as well, including appointments with students, committee meetings, and campus events.

Then you can see the gaps in your schedule and plan to use that time for things like grading papers, working on committee assignments, and eating.

Being organized also means keeping track of your paperwork. There's no profession quite like teaching when it comes to generating paper, much of which is vital to the job: class rolls, drop/add slips, course syllabi, tests, handouts. And nothing can be more frustrating, time-consuming, and potentially embarrassing than spending 10 or 15 minutes looking for that one piece of paper you need. So take time to set up a filing system that works well for you. Then follow it. Don't just throw your papers haphazardly across your desk the minute you walk into the office (unless, of course, that happens to be your system).

Be collegial. Be friendly, open to sharing ideas and materials, and willing to help out a colleague in need. Your collegiality must extend not just to other faculty members but also to everyone else on the campus, including librarians, admissions counselors, and custodians.

It's especially important for new faculty members to cultivate a good working relationship—even a friendship, if possible—with the one person who has the most influence over their immediate happiness. No, I'm not talking about the department chair. I mean the department secretary. In fact, that's probably the single best piece of advice I'll give in this column, because having to deal every day with a department secretary who doesn't like you is the definition of misery for a new faculty member.

And why wouldn't the department secretary like you? Perhaps because you disregarded my next and final admonition.

Be low-maintenance. No one enjoys being around people who are always needy, who always expect others to go out of their way but rarely reciprocate, whose lives are always fraught with some sort of drama. Yet a surprising number of new faculty members fit that profile. (Some not-so-new ones, too.)

Remember, while your colleagues might not mind helping you out occasionally, they probably won't like doing it regularly. Department chairs expect to provide a certain amount of mentoring, but they have better things to do than hold your hand for the next 10 months (or 10 years). And, trust me on this, department secretaries divide faculty members into two categories: those who are high-maintenance and those they like.

So make your own copies rather than just leave your handout on the secretary's desk. Don't go to your department chair with a problem you can solve yourself or with a little help from a friend or mentor. Do more favors than you ask for.

The reputation you forge during your first year, fair or not, will stay with you at least as long as you're at the college. Maybe longer. It's worth a little extra time and effort (maybe a lot extra) to make sure that reputation is a good one.

Rob Jenkins is an associate professor of English and director of the Writers Institute at Georgia Perimeter College. He writes occasionally for our community-college column. If you would like to write for our regular column on faculty and administrative careers at two-year colleges, or have a topic to propose, we would like to hear from you. Send your ideas to careers@chronicle.com.

The Three-ring Circus of Academia: How to Become the Ringmaster

Michelle L. Toews · Ani Yazedjian

Published online: 4 May 2007

© Springer Science + Business Media, LLC 2007

Abstract The three-ring circus of academia is made up of research, teaching, and service. It is also characterized by continuous action that must be facilitated by the academic ringmaster. Academic life is more difficult than most anticipate because the responsibilities are time-consuming, diverse, and conflicting. Therefore, this article focuses on strategies faculty members can develop to meet these pressing demands. Specifically, we begin with a discussion of how to balance research, teaching, and service. We then highlight strategies faculty members can use in becoming an effective academic ringmaster. We conclude with a discussion of life outside the “big top.”

Key words college teaching · faculty development · junior faculty · research productivity · tenure

What is the three-ring circus of academia? The three-ring circus of academia is made up of research, teaching, and service. Research is similar to the high-wire acts and acrobats. It is a necessary “act.” It is what draws many people to the circus and amazes them. Similarly, research is what brings prestige to the university (Wolverton 1998).

Teaching, on the other hand, can be analogous to the work of the animal tamers. The skills that are required to train these animals to do tricks are appreciated. However, the

Michelle L. Toews received a Ph.D. in Human Development and Family Science from The Ohio State University and is currently an Assistant Professor of Family and Child Development at Texas State University-San Marcos. Her research interests include separation violence as well as conflict and coparenting after divorce.

Ani Yazedjian received a Ph.D. in Human and Community Development from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. She is an Assistant Professor of Family and Child Development at Texas State. Her research interests focus on adolescents and the role of families, peers, and schools in promoting ethnic identity development. In addition, both authors are currently working on a longitudinal study examining personal and internal variables as predictors of college adjustment and achievement.

M. L. Toews (✉) · A. Yazedjian

Dept. of Family and Consumer Sciences, Texas State University, 601 University Dr., San Marcos, TX 78666, USA

e-mail: mt15@txstate.edu

animal acts are often overshadowed by the acrobats unless the animals are out of control. Relating this more directly to teaching, although teaching is extremely valuable, it is not a sufficient condition for receiving tenure; and it often goes unnoticed unless one is a poor teacher (Milem et al. 2000; Wolverson 1998).

Continuing our circus analogy, service obligations are similar to the clowns. They are a distraction between the main acts (teaching and research), but would be sorely missed if they were not part of the show. In other words, service is expected and important to the functioning of the institution (Ballantine 1995); however, it is not highly regarded when making tenure decisions, and it certainly will not compensate for poor teaching or limited research productivity (Mullen and Forbes 2000).

Furthermore, the three-ring circus is characterized by continuous action that must be facilitated by the ringmaster. Similar to the ringmaster, faculty members are required to simultaneously focus their time on multiple “acts.” Being the academic ringmaster is more difficult than most anticipate because the responsibilities are time-consuming, diverse, and often conflicting (Gunter and Stambach 2003). Simultaneously focusing on these multiple “acts” has become even more difficult in recent decades because of the changing nature of academia (Ballantine 1995; Fox 1992; Mallard and Atkins 2004; Milem et al. 2000). Specifically, universities and colleges are receiving less state and federal funding leading to an increased reliance on external funding to support their institutions (Austin 2002). As a result, there is increased pressure on faculty members to secure external funds.

Although some would expect that the time involved in meeting these increasing research demands detracts from the time spent on teaching, Milem et al. (2000) found that faculty members today are spending more time on both research-related and teaching-related activities. In addition, Mallard and Atkins (2004) found that service demands have remained the same. Moreover, faculty members are required not only to engage in these activities; they are expected to perform well in all three areas (Ballantine 1995). Consequently, they need to develop strategies to meet the pressing demands required to be effective ringmasters.

Therefore, this article focuses on becoming the ringmaster of the three-ring circus of academia. Specifically, we begin with a discussion of how to balance research, teaching, and service. We then highlight strategies faculty members can use to become effective academic ringmasters. We conclude with a discussion of life outside the “big top.”

Becoming the Ringmaster: Balancing Research, Teaching, and Service

The majority of faculty members work more than 50 hours per week to meet the demands of academia (Jacobs and Winslow 2004). Most of this time is spent on the labor intensive activities of teaching and research. This leads to a question about the relationship between research and teaching. Some researchers believe that research and teaching are unrelated (Fox 1992; Hattie and Marsh 1996). Teaching and research are seen as conflicting activities, and thus spending more time on research means spending less time on teaching and vice versa. Others, however, see research and teaching as complementary activities (Kremer 1990). This means that one’s teaching can inform one’s research and research can inform one’s teaching (Smeby 1998). While most studies find that teaching and research are unrelated, their conclusions are based on examining how faculty members allocate their time to these activities (Milem et al. 2000).

We argue that, while the time demands are conflicting, engaging in both research and teaching makes one a stronger faculty member. For example, teaching may influence

faculty members' research. Specifically, class preparation can allow faculty members to explore the literature and generate new research questions (Marsh and Hattie 2002; Smeby 1998). Class discussions can also stimulate alternative ways of thinking about one's research.

In addition to teaching informing research, being engaged in research can enhance one's teaching. In fact, students respond more positively to faculty members who are actively involved in research because they are able to incorporate current literature, may be more excited about the subject matter, and appear more credible (Neumann 1994). Furthermore, teachers who are engaged in research have higher expectations for students than those who do not conduct research (Hattie and Marsh 1996). They are also more likely to promote critical thinking and help students develop a better understanding of the complexities associated with research instead of training them to accept, at face value, what they read in their texts (Marsh and Hattie 2002).

Although most studies focus on balancing research and teaching, faculty members must concurrently fulfill their service obligations. While service is an integral part of faculty life, it is also the least important for receiving tenure (Mullen and Forbes 2000). Therefore, it is important for faculty members to serve their institutions; but they must also protect the time they devote to research and teaching. However, too much time spent on service is a concern for tenure track faculty members, especially for female faculty and faculty of color who may be expected to serve on diversity-related committees in addition to their regular service obligations (Adams 2004).

Even though new faculty members are often aware of the multiple "acts" required in academia (research, teaching, and service), they may be unaware of how they, as the ringmaster, should focus their time on these "acts" in order to receive tenure and promotion (Koblinsky et al. 2006; Mullen and Forbes 2000). While these expectations will vary among institutions, and sometimes within them, it is important for new faculty members to have a clear understanding of the tenure process (Acker and Armenti 2004; Mullen and Forbes 2000; Sorcinelli 2000). For example, if the institution has written guidelines regarding the expectations for research, teaching, and service, those should be used to determine how one should allocate time.

We also recommend that new faculty members have conversations with tenured colleagues and administrators. Doing so will allow new faculty members to clarify issues that may not be explicitly stated, as well as begin to develop meaningful relationships with the tenured faculty members in their department and their department chair. Furthermore, it is necessary to revisit continually the criteria for tenure and promotion as the expectations may change over time (Acker and Armenti 2004; Austin 2002; Mullen and Forbes 2000). Understanding these expectations will enable new faculty members to become effective ringmasters.

One characteristic of all effective ringmasters is to be able to draw attention to the appropriate acts at the appropriate times. This ability requires an acute understanding on the part of the ringmaster regarding both the overall flow of the circus and the specific line-up of acts. Similarly, the effective academic has a keen awareness regarding the goals he or she would like to accomplish and an understanding of the steps it will take to accomplish those goals. Yet, beyond understanding, the effective academic must have the skills to implement the activities that will allow him or her to reach the aforementioned goals. In the following sections, we discuss strategies for effectively focusing one's attention on the "acts" of research, teaching, and service. These strategies represent best case scenarios; not all will be possible to implement given departmental and institutional constraints.

Research

Just as in a three-ring circus, one's research agenda should have several "acts" going at the same time and in different rings so one can easily redirect attention among "acts." More specifically, Zanna and Darley (1987) suggest having several research projects at different stages of development (e.g., data collection, data analysis, writing, etc.). In other words, to become an effective ringmaster, faculty members need to have several "acts" in the first years of academic life. Ideally, these should include publishing manuscripts based on the dissertation, implementing new research projects, preparing grant proposals, and submitting proposals to professional conferences.

Given that one component of tenure review is scholarly productivity, a suggested starting point for new faculty members as they settle into a new position is to prepare their dissertation for publication. However, the preferred format for disseminating one's work can vary between disciplines. While some disciplines prefer that faculty members transform their dissertation into a book, others believe it is more desirable to publish empirical articles. Thus, new faculty members should speak with tenured colleagues and administrators to determine if it is more beneficial to seek to publish the dissertation in its entirety or break it into parts and publish each part as a separate article.

In addition to publishing the dissertation, it is also necessary to develop and implement a new research agenda. New faculty members at teaching-oriented institutions may find this difficult given that the resources available differ from those they had as graduate students at their research-oriented institutions (Austin 2002). In their new institutions, they may have to adjust to higher teaching loads; limited, if any, graduate student assistance; limited or insufficient start-up packages; and inadequate research funding (Carroll 2003; Koblinsky et al. 2006). As a result, faculty members have to be creative in how they accomplish scholarly activities with limited resources.

One strategy for accomplishing scholarly activities would be implementing research projects that require minimal funding. For example, many institutions have internal funds that can be used to implement pilot projects. Pilot projects enable faculty members to collect data for publication, which then allow them to develop a track record that will aid in securing funding from external sources. Although many institutions have an office or staff person who can assist in this process, the task of finding an appropriate external funder can take more time than most faculty members anticipate.

In the interim, faculty members also have to be creative in how they pursue their initial research projects. One way to maximize one's efforts may be to integrate scholarship, teaching, and service. For example, the first author was able to integrate all three by using a service-learning assignment in a family diversity course, requiring the students to write a paper reflecting on their experiences, conducting a content analysis of the students' papers to determine the effectiveness of the assignment, and co-authoring a manuscript with a graduate student (Toews and Cerny 2006). By engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning, faculty members are able to improve their teaching strategies and practices while at the same time contributing to their scholarly productivity. However, it is important to note that institutions vary in the credence they give to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Thus, new faculty members should determine if this type of scholarship is valued at their institutions before pursuing such endeavors.

Although the above example involved working with a graduate student, another way faculty members can maximize their efforts is by involving competent undergraduate students in the research process (Lancy 2003; Page et al. 2004). This can be accomplished by bringing one's research interests into the classroom, which can pique students' interests

in the subject matter. Once their interest is aroused, students can enroll in an independent study course where they can gain a first-hand understanding of research methods and critical thinking skills (Ishiyama 2002; Ware et al. 1998). An additional benefit of student involvement is that it can increase faculty members' research productivity (Page et al. 2004; Ware et al. 1998). An important caveat is that faculty members' productivity can be compromised if appropriate care is not given to selecting students.

Another strategy for maximizing research productivity would be to prepare conference proposals. This allows one to begin developing the framework for future manuscripts (Carroll 2003). Furthermore, presenting one's work to peers in this way provides an opportunity to receive feedback from reviewers as well as conference attendees. While presenting at conferences allows faculty members to showcase their research, it also introduces them to others' research and may stimulate additional research questions (Mallard and Atkins 2004).

Perhaps a more difficult strategy, but one that can maximize scholarly productivity, is to develop collaborative relationships. While many talk about the importance of collaborating, it may be difficult to implement because it can sometimes mean having to develop expertise in a new area. We contend that, while this can take more time in the development and implementation stages, the payoffs can supersede the initial investment. For example, we developed a project that incorporated the first author's expertise in family relationships and the second author's expertise in ethnic identity to examine how personal and interpersonal variables predicted the transition to college. Although we spent considerable time familiarizing ourselves with the literature regarding college students' adjustment, the result is that we are now more productive in our scholarly output.

One critical component of being a productive scholar is allocating one's time appropriately. This is particularly relevant given that time spent on research is positively related to scholarly productivity (Marsh and Hattie 2002). In fact, Mallard and Atkins (2004) found that release time was the strongest predictor of scholarly productivity, as measured by the number of refereed journal articles, conference papers, and books. Therefore, if possible, new faculty members should seek to negotiate release time before accepting a position.

While the institution may not allocate release time, faculty members should purposely set aside time within their weekly schedules to devote to scholarly activities. Although the specific strategies vary among individuals, it is often easier to spend time on research once one has allocated time for research (Gunter and Stambach 2003). For example, blocking out certain times each day to focus on research-related activities is advisable (Boice 1992). In addition to blocking out time, it is important to create "to do" lists specifying what one hopes to accomplish during that time (Boice 1992). Specifying particular tasks allows one to experience a sense of accomplishment in a manner similar to what one might experience after completing a lecture (Carroll 2003).

With respect to creating "to do" lists, it is important to categorize tasks in manageable units (Boice 1990). Often faculty members think in terms of the end product rather than the specific tasks necessary to accomplish their goal. This can influence one's motivation as it is easier to focus on the tasks for which we feel a more immediate sense of accomplishment. Faculty members must train themselves to view the research process as similar to the teaching process in that it is composed of a series of tasks that lead to a final outcome. For example, instead of noting "work on manuscript" one might list "write literature review; write methods section; run analyses; write results" and so on. In this fashion, one is able to experience a sense of accomplishment at each stage in the process and recognize how one is moving closer to achieving the end product (Boice 1990).

While many faculty members can set aside time for research, not all follow through when faced with the daily demands of teaching. For example, time must be devoted to preparing classes, interacting with students, grading assignments, and writing exams. The consequences of not completing these tasks are more immediate and apparent (Boice 1992; Carroll 2003). Thus, it is often easier to succumb to the pressures associated with teaching as these often appear urgent. As a consequence, faculty members might compromise the time they have set aside for research in order to meet their teaching responsibilities.

One strategy for ensuring that time set aside for research is actually spent on research would be to cultivate a system of accountability, such as research circles or readings groups (Carroll 2003; Gillespie et al. 2005). Specifically, Carroll (2003) suggested that these groups “can provide the deadlines and immediate feedback that many faculty need for completing projects and exposing their work to a higher level of scrutiny” (p. 26). This accountability is beneficial as faculty members are more likely to postpone completing research related tasks because there are no immediate ramifications. However, given that research productivity is highly valued, the long-term consequences of neglecting this commitment can be detrimental to one’s academic career (e.g., merit, tenure; Wolverton 1998).

Teaching

Although most new faculty members feel fairly confident in their high-wire skills (i.e., research training), for some, animal taming (i.e., teaching) may seem like an “act” for which they have not been trained (Austin 2002). Yet, it is important to note that many have at least some exposure to teaching-related “acts” prior to assuming a faculty position. We argue that new faculty members should not discount the value of prior experiences relating to teaching. Specifically, even new faculty members who have very limited teaching experience can rely on the content they have learned in their classes and can model the example of successful teachers they have encountered.

Furthermore, before accepting a new position, faculty members should try to negotiate the courses they teach (Sorcinelli 2000). For example, if a new faculty member has previously taught a course while in graduate school, he or she could request to teach that same course at the new institution. Faculty members could also request to teach multiple sections of the same course or negotiate their teaching schedules so they teach on a certain number of days per week and devote other days completely to research. A final strategy, but one that can be difficult to maintain, especially if one is always in the building, is to meet with students only during specified office hours or by appointment.

Even for faculty members who have had previous teaching experience, many are not prepared for the challenges of teaching multiple classes. Specifically, many new faculty members feel overwhelmed with the diversity of courses they teach (Koblinsky et al. 2006). In most departments, academics are continually challenged by the demands of having to be both a generalist and a specialist, in that they are expected to have a specific area of research, but are required to teach on a broad range of topics, often outside their specific area of expertise (Ballantine 1995; Marsh and Hattie 2002). As a result, faculty members must devote the time necessary to develop that general understanding. This time must be balanced with the time necessary to stay current in one’s fields of inquiry. While a laudable goal would be to find ways to overlap one’s teaching expertise with scholarly expertise, this is not always possible. Thus, academics must find practical ways to negotiate this tension.

One way faculty members can ease the transition to teaching multiple classes would be to take advantage of opportunities for collaboration when developing courses. For example, although faculty members engage in discussions about scholarship, they are less likely to discuss pedagogy (Boice 1992). Therefore, we would suggest that new faculty members ask to examine colleagues' teaching materials for the courses they will teach (Sorcinelli 2000). This information can be helpful in terms of planning course activities and can also inform new faculty members about the instructional climate as they relate to student expectations. In addition, faculty members can search the Web for the syllabi of others who are teaching similar courses.

One potential danger for new faculty members when it comes to teaching is focusing an exorbitant amount of energy on class preparation. This is particularly relevant because research finds the amount of time spent on teaching related activities is not related to quality of instruction and in fact depresses publication productivity (Fox 1992; Marsh and Hattie 2002). While we are not encouraging faculty members to dismiss their teaching responsibilities, we are simply arguing that oftentimes new faculty can be inefficient in their use of time as it relates to instruction. For example, it is suggested that faculty members should spend no more than one and a half to three hours of preparation for each class hour (Boice 1992; Wankat 2004). While this may not be possible for new faculty members, it is an important goal toward which to strive.

Once faculty members have established a teaching routine, they can focus on integrating their scholarship and teaching. One way to accomplish this integration would be to find ways to overlap one's teaching expertise with one's scholarly expertise. However, this is not always possible. Another strategy is teaching a special topics course. Such courses can be a useful tool for exploring a research topic in greater depth. Preparing the course will allow the faculty member to become more familiar with the literature, and teaching the course can raise potential research questions and provide a forum for the discussion of related issues (Marsh and Hattie 2002; Smeby 1998).

Service

In between negotiating multiple "acts" and learning new skills, new faculty members are also faced with service responsibilities, which are analogous to the clowns. Although clowns are an integral part of every circus, they are often a distraction between the main acts (teaching and research). Similarly, too many service responsibilities can detract from scholarly productivity and quality instruction. However, some service responsibilities can provide opportunities to interact with students outside of class, form relationships with colleagues across campus, and learn about the institution (Adams 2004).

Learning about the institution is especially important given that research indicates new faculty members may not be familiar with the governance process (Koblinsky et al. 2006). Therefore, faculty members may want to be on committees where they will learn more about issues that will facilitate their transition or expose them to relevant university issues, such as search committees or committees drafting policies and procedures (Adams 2004). However, faculty members should seek to avoid committees that might address contentious issues (e.g., departmental restructuring, financial allocations) or those whose members might be at odds (Adams 2004). In addition, it is important to know the time involved in each committee assignment prior to volunteering to serve on that committee. For example, some committees meet once a year, but may require a considerable amount of work in the weeks prior to the meeting. On the other hand, some committees meet on a more frequent

basis, but preparation time is limited. Finally, to protect one's tenuous position, it is best to avoid chairing a committee until after tenure.

Another way to balance one's service responsibilities would be to integrate scholarship and teaching with service. One strategy would be to only accept community presentations related to one's research expertise or topics which one has already prepared for a class. This would involve less preparation time because faculty members are familiar with the topic. Faculty could also provide service to the profession by serving as reviewers for conference papers, manuscripts, and grant proposals. This type of service allows the faculty member to generate new ideas while also benefiting the professional community.

Life Outside the Big Top

Although becoming an effective ringmaster is crucial to one's success in academia, it is important to remember that life does exist outside the "big top." This is particularly relevant given that faculty members feel they do not have enough time to complete their numerous teaching and research responsibilities (Austin 2002; Colbeck 1998; Gunter and Stambach 2003). In fact, Colbeck (1998) reported that all faculty members in her study felt "they had more work to do than they could reasonably accomplish" (p. 663). As a result, the additional time needed to meet the increasing research and teaching demands often occurs at the expense of personal and family time (Gunter and Stambach 2003; Hattie and Marsh 1996). Faculty members, particularly women, tend to sacrifice time spent relaxing, exercising, sleeping, and socializing in order to meet these demands (Acker and Armenti 2004; Gunter and Stambach 2003).

Furthermore, some faculty members never feel as if they are doing "a good enough job" (Acker and Armenti 2004, p. 16). As a result, they often work harder and longer, which is detrimental to their physical and psychological health (Acker and Armenti 2004; Colbeck 1998; Gunter and Stambach 2003). Specifically, previous researchers have found that faculty members, particularly women and tenure-track faculty, report high levels of stress, illness, fatigue, health difficulties, and social isolation (Acker and Armenti 2004; Gunter and Stambach 2003; Moyer et al. 1999). Despite these physical and psychological health concerns, they are expected to "look relaxed and on top of things rather than frenzied, fatigued, [and] malcontent" (Acker and Armenti 2004, p. 13). By denying the struggles they face, faculty members miss opportunities to receive moral support from one another (Acker and Armenti 2004; Moyer et al. 1999). This can exacerbate one's feelings of isolation, thus making it more important to develop strategies to nurture one's life outside the "big top."

One such strategy is for faculty members to schedule personal time in the same way they schedule research and teaching activities. For example, faculty members should write personal time into their weekly calendars. They should also make appointments to spend time with family and friends or schedule a weekly lunch "date" with a friend or colleague. Another strategy is to schedule time to pursue recreational interests. It is also important for faculty members to recognize their needs and thus not feel guilty for taking this much-deserved personal time (Acker and Armenti 2004). Furthermore, similar to the circus, one perk of academia is taking time off between "shows." Faculty members should use this time effectively to rest, rejuvenate, and evaluate their work without the deadlines and pressures that are faced during the academic year.

Conclusion

The changing nature of academia has required faculty members to become more efficient in meeting the increasing demands of research, teaching, and service. Our primary goal was to focus upon and summarize strategies for becoming an effective academic ringmaster. We provided suggestions for developing one's research agenda while providing quality instruction, meeting one's service obligations, and maintaining a life outside academia. We believe, if one is able to become the ringmaster of his or her own three-ring circus, one's academic career can indeed become The Greatest Show on Earth®!

References

- Acker, S., & Armenti, C. (2004). Sleepless in academia. *Gender and Education, 16*, 3–24.
- Adams, K. A. (2004). *What colleges and universities want in new faculty*. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from Association of American Colleges and Universities Web site: http://aacu-edu.org/pff/PFFpublications/what_colleges_want/academic_life.cfm.
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Creating a bridge to the future: Preparing new faculty to face changing expectations in a shifting context. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*, 119–144.
- Ballantine, J. (1995). Teaching the elephant to dance: A parable about the scholarship of learning. *Sociological Focus, 28*, 207–221.
- Boice, R. (1990). *Professors as writers: A self-help guide to productive writing*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Carroll, V. S. (2003). The teacher, the scholar, the self: Fitting thinking and writing into a four–four load. *College Teaching, 51*, 22–26.
- Colbeck, C. L. (1998). Merging in seamless blend—How faculty integrate teaching and research. *The Journal of Higher Education, 69*, 647–671.
- Fox, M. F. (1992). Research, teaching, and publication productivity: Mutuality versus competition in academia. *Sociology of Education, 65*, 293–305.
- Gillespie, D., Dolšak, N., Kochis, B., Krabill, R., Lerum, K., Peterson, A., et al. (2005). Research circles: Supporting the scholarship of junior faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 30*, 149–162.
- Gunter, R., & Stambach, A. (2003). As balancing act and as game: How women and men science faculty experience the promotion process. *Gender Issues, 21*, 24–42.
- Hattie, J., & Marsh, H. W. (1996). The relationship between research and teaching: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 66*, 507–542.
- Ishiyama, J. (2002). Does early participation in undergraduate research benefit social science and humanities students? *College Student Journal, 36*, 380–386.
- Jacobs, J. A., & Winslow, S. E. (2004). Overworked faculty: Job stresses and family demands. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 596*, 104–129.
- Koblinsky, S. A., Kuvalanka, K. A., & McClintock-Comeaux, M. (2006). Preparing future faculty and family professionals. *Family Relations, 55*, 29–43.
- Kremer, J. (1990). Construct validity of multiple measures in teaching, research, and services and reliability of peer ratings. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*, 213–218.
- Lancy, D. F. (2003). What one faculty member does to promote undergraduate research. In J. Kinkead (Ed.), *Valuing and supporting undergraduate research* (pp. 87–92). *New directions for teaching and learning*, vol. 93. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Mallard, K. S., & Atkins, M. W. (2004). Changing academic cultures and expanding expectations: Motivational factors influencing scholarship at small Christian colleges and universities. *Christian Higher Education, 3*, 373–389.
- Marsh, H. W., & Hattie, J. (2002). The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*, 603–641.
- Milem, J. F., Berger, J. B., Dey, E. L. (2000). Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*, 454–475.
- Moyer, A., Salovey, P., & Casey-Cannon, S. (1999). Challenges facing female doctoral students and recent graduates. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23*, 607–630.

- Mullen, C. A., & Forbes, S. A. (2000). Untenured faculty: Issues of transition adjustment and mentorship. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 8, 31–46.
- Neumann, R. (1994). The teaching-research nexus: Applying a framework to university students' learning experiences. *European Journal of Education*, 29, 323–338.
- Page, M. C., Abramson, C. I., & Jacobs-Lawson, J. M. (2004). The national science foundation research experiences for undergraduates program: Experiences and recommendations. *Teaching of Psychology*, 31, 241–247.
- Smeby, J. C. (1998). Knowledge production and knowledge transmission. The interaction between research and teaching at universities. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 3, 5–20.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (2000). *Principles of good practice: Supporting early-career faculty. Guidance for deans, department chairs, and other academic leaders* (Report No. HE 033 809). Washington DC: American Association for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED450634).
- Toews, M. L., & Cerny, J. M. (2006). The impact of service-learning on student development: Students' reflections in a family diversity course. *Marriage & Family Review*, 38, 79–96.
- Wankat, P. C. (2004, March). *Effective, efficient teaching*. Paper presented at workshop at University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL.
- Ware, M. E., Davis, S. F., & Smith, R. A. (1998, August). *Developing students, developing faculty: Incompatible or compatible goals?* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED422555).
- Wolverton, M. (1998). Treading the tenure-track tightrope: Finding balance between research excellence and quality teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 23, 61–79.
- Zanna, M. P., & Darley, J. M. (1987). *The compleat academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Copyright of Innovative Higher Education is the property of Springer Science & Business Media B.V. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.