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The Biology Department at North Dakota State University supports a positive workplace environment.

Threatening language and/or actions directed at students, staff, or colleagues will not be tolerated and will be handled swiftly and appropriately.

Our goal is to foster individual respect and dignity within a safe and healthy environment.
Today’s Topics

• Collegiality Operationally Defined
• Civility Operationally Defined
• Faculty Roles and Responsibilities
• Proactive Strategies to Employ
• Developing a Community of Scholars
Today’s Objectives

• Practical, hands-on useable information
• Sharing with our peers and colleagues
• Sharing information in an informal and fun environment
• Taking information and ideas back to your department
• Developing ready-to-use strategies to implement
Collegiality

• Facts about collegiality – what collegiality is and what it is not [productive dissent]
• Identify strategies to use to develop collegiality within departments
• Collegiality as a 4th criterion for promotion, tenure, and reappointment
• Roles and responsibilities of academic leaders in promoting collegiality.
Institutions of higher education go about the business of education with the efficiency of the Department of Motor Vehicles . . . and the compassion of the Internal revenue Service.

Recognize that the most valuable assets in a department/university are their people, the intellectual capital they possess and the culture they create.
Most Important Advice

Use Your Resources!
In this workshop, your resources are:
• The presenter
• The PowerPoint slides
• The handout materials
• Your own experience and imagination
• The ‘active’ case studies

Each Other: Your wonderful colleagues!
What . . . And . . . How??

What are the proactive, proven strategies that academics can use to bring processes that generate and retain candidates that support and maintain a collegial environment within the department and university?
A Good Leader Needs:

Courage

A Heart

A Brain

An Ability to Q. T. I. P.

Quit Taking It Personal
Your Brain...
FINISHED FILES ARE THE RESULTS OF YEARS OF SCIENTIFIC STUDY COMBINED WITH EXPERIENCE OF MANY YEARS
Your Brain on F’s...
Do you think collegiality should be a criterion for personnel decisions – e.g., tenure, promotion in rank, and reappointment?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO  [ ] NOT SURE
A House Divided Against Itself Cannot Stand
(Honest Abe Lincoln)
Agree to Disagree Without Being Disagreeable
(Honest Bob Cipriano)
The beatings will continue until morale improves!
Words to Remember

• Uncivil and nasty behavior often elicits like behavior and like responses toward the person who precipitated the encounter.

• **YOU CAN CHOOSE** to meet others’ poor behavior with effective responses that do not take the same approach.

[Mark’s story: The stuff of urban legends]

• Emotional Contagion

• Moral Disengagement – spreads like a germ
Collegiality Operationally Defined

• As a NOUN, **collegiality** means cooperative interaction among colleagues.

• As an ADJECTIVE, **collegial** indicates the way a group of colleagues take collective responsibility for their work together with minimal supervision from above.

• To many DETRACTORS, **collegiality** is merely a code word for a person who is overweight, smokes, dresses badly, has a “different way” of seeing things, is outspoken, et al.
Collegiality represents a reciprocal relationship among colleagues with a commitment to sustaining a positive and productive environment as critical for the progress and success of the university community.
Collegiality is a multi-dimensional construct that permeates the successful execution of all parts of the tripartite: scholarship, learning, and service.
“Collegiality refers to opportunities for faculty members to feel that they belong to a mutually respected community of scholars who value each faculty member’s contributions to the institution and feel concern for their colleagues’ well-being.”

(Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007, p. 305).
Collegiality consists of collaboration and a shared decision-making process that incorporates mutual respect for similarities and for differences in background, expertise, judgments, and points of view, in addition to mutual trust.
Does Collegiality Count?

While academics, legislatures, and Board of Trustee Members debate the relative importance of collegiality in faculty personnel decisions, the courts have clearly and consistently spoken:

THEY WILL NOT PROTECT TRUCULENT PROFESSORS!!
Collegiality & Campus Culture

“A campus culture that values collegiality and civility is among the most important contributions a university can make.”

(Cipriano, 2011, p. 12)

Collegiality is an important predictor of faculty retention.

(Norman, Ambrose, & Huston, 2006).
An Operational Definition of Civility

Civility indicates politeness and courtesy. In higher education, civil behavior is demonstrated by the following:

2. Speaking in a professional and respectful manner toward others.
3. “Stepping up” when needed and agreeing to serve on committees, helping colleagues in personal crises, et al.
An Operational Definition of Civility

[Continued]

4. Following through on professional tasks and deadlines.

5. Respecting the decision-making processes of the unit. [NOT bringing up the past!]

6. Consistently communicating respectfully.

7. Relationships are constructive, supportive, and professional. [NOT personal]
Incivility, Bullying, & Harassment

• Incivility often manifests itself as bullying behaviors. (Koonin & Green, 2004).

• Uncivil and bullying behaviors in the workplace include covert hostility, verbal hostility, manipulation, and physical hostility. (Rospenda & Richman, 2004).
Rise of Incivility -- WHY?

Some of the reasons for the rise of incivility are:

• Economic uncertainty
• Mandate to do more with less
• Less prepared students
• Less motivated students

Why so much incivility?

What do you think are some additional reasons for the rise in incivility in higher education?
Reasons for Incivility . . .

• Shift to online teaching
• Corporate culture influence
• Diverse students & faculty
• Ratcheting up of the workload
• More rigorous standards for tenure & promotion
• E-mail as primary mode of communication
• Faculty workload scrutinized by peers
Hire Somebody (ANYBODY)!!

We could lose the position due to budget constraints! (OH NO!)

No guarantee the position will be open next academic year! (NOOOOO!)

Even if the choice is the ‘best of the worst’, he will CHANGE when he is in our collegial department!

“The greatest derangement of the mind is to believe in something because one wishes it to be so.” (Louis Pasteur)
Your dean has indicated your department can hire a new full-time position at the Assistant or Associate Professor level. You are chair of the Search Committee. You are fearful that if you do not hire 1 of the 2 finalists you will lose this much-needed position.

Following are the candidate’s qualifications as shown by CVs and reaching out to people they have worked with . . . and for. Each person has worked at 2 other universities for a combined total of 9 years.
Whom do you hire? . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Average teacher</td>
<td>1. Good teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Great researcher</td>
<td>2. Does not publish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Widely respected in field for cutting edge research</td>
<td>3. Known in field and liked by peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tolerates students</td>
<td>4. Liked by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Great grants person</td>
<td>5. Never wrote grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Terrible colleague</td>
<td>6. Great colleague</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whom do you hire? . . .

**Candidate A**
1. Very good teacher
2. Great researcher
3. Widely respected in field for cutting edge research
4. Tolerates students
5. Great grants person
6. Terrible colleague

**Candidate B**
1. Good teacher
2. Does not publish
3. Known in field and liked by peers
4. Liked by students
5. Never wrote grant
6. Great colleague
**Whom do you hire? . . .**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very good teacher</td>
<td>1. Good teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Great researcher</td>
<td>2. Does not publish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Widely respected in field for cutting edge research</td>
<td>3. Known in field and liked by peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tolerates students</td>
<td>4. Liked by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Great grants person</td>
<td>5. Never wrote grant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collegiality in Hiring

Arguably, the two most important decisions a university can make are:

Whom to HIRE
Whom to TENURE/REAPPOINT
Overheard at a luncheon meeting to discuss candidates by a member of the search committee:

“I don’t give a damn if he is a Nobel winner: he is a total jerk and I don’t want to spend the rest of my career having coffee with him!”
But he had a great C.V.
Awarding tenure to an uncivil, nasty person just feels like a sucking chest wound – taking the life out of a potentially great and viable department.
Working with a mean spirited, uncivil, selfish, self-serving non collegial person is like being pecked to death by a duck!
Tenure or Not – Mitigating Variables That May Effect Your Decision

Mini Discussion – Any variables . . . ?

1. Person is a member of underrepresented group (e.g., disability, minority status, et al.)
2. Person bring in grants and contracts.
3. Person is married to a tenured person who brings in major grants and contracts.
4. Person is a terrible colleague.
5. Person has several sexual harassment charges against them.
Mitigating Variables [Cont.]

6. Person has a major health issue – going blind
7. Person is a wonderful colleague
8. Person is overweight
9. Person dresses inappropriately
10. Person has ‘weird’ political beliefs
11. Person is undergoing major lifestyle changes – has to take care of their elderly parents
Mitigating Variables [Cont.]

12. Person has stated they want to ‘work from home,’ only teaching online courses
13. University is fearful of a lawsuit brought by this person
14. College is fearful of bad publicity in local and national papers, radio, and television
15. Department is fearful they will lose this tenure track position.
Your INCREDIBLE Right Foot

1. While sitting, lift your right foot off the floor and make CLOCKWISE circles.

2. While doing this, draw the number ‘6’ in the air with your right hand.

3. Oh wow: Did your foot change direction?
Nothing you can do about it.

Your brain, apparently, couldn’t handle it!
Can We ‘Change’ People? 
From Nasty to Great? 
(Yes? No? Not Sure?)
What Skills Can Be Taught?

Hire and Tenure Well.
Collegial or not, YOU make the call

1. Dr. Thunder yells at faculty and students.
2. Dr. Doitt is a pleasant person and a good teacher.
3. Dr. Carp chronically complains . . . about everybody and everything.
4. Dr. Chitchat spends hours gossiping.
5. Dr. Unbendable has developed a reputation for being inflexible.
You Make the Call

6. Dr. Gracious responds promptly to e-mail and voice messages from students and colleagues.

7. Dr. Forbearance is tolerant toward opposing opinions and colleagues.

1 sentence is not enough. Uniformity—throughout university as a whole—of what constitutes non collegial behavior is a needed step in fostering a civil, collegial university.
What Constitutes Collegiality?

If we can’t agree on what collegiality is (consistent and well-defined) we resort to Justice Potter Stewart’s definition of pornography:

“I KNOW IT WHEN I SEE IT.”
The Facts About Civility . . .

1. Can “lack of collegiality” be used as a basis to terminate a full-time faculty member?
   YES ☑️     NO _____     NOT SURE _____

2. Are climate, culture & collegiality more important to the satisfaction of early-career faculty than compensation, tenure clarity, workload & policy effectiveness?
   YES ☑️     NO _____     NOT SURE _____
Facts About Collegiality [Cont.]

3. Do most institutions of higher education specify collegiality as a distinct criterion for tenure and promotion?

YES _____ NO ✔ NOT SURE _____

4. When considering collegiality in faculty employment decisions, courts of law have consistently upheld its importance.

TRUE ✔ FALSE _____ NOT SURE _____
Facts About Collegiality [Cont.]

5. Collegial behavior implies mindless conformity or total absence of dissent.
   TRUE  ______  FALSE  ______  NOT SURE  ______

6. The courts do not perceive collegiality as important to the university to fulfill its mission.
   TRUE  ______  FALSE  ______  NOT SURE  ______
Facts About Collegiality [Cont.]

7. Destructive conflict can immobilize departments.

TRUE ✔️ FALSE ______ NOT SURE ______
Does Collegiality Count?

While academics, legislators, and board of trustee members debate the relative importance of collegiality in faculty personnel decisions, the courts have clearly and consistently spoken: They will not protect truculent professors.
If there was an objective, validated tool that assessed collegial behavior, would you be in favor of having collegiality as a criterion for tenure and promotion?

___ YES    ___ NO    ___ NOT SURE
Collegiality as 4th Criterion

- 2010 – 104 chairs responded to a survey
- 1 question on the survey asked: “Should collegiality be the fourth criterion, in addition to teaching, scholarship, and service, for tenure decisions?”
  - Seventy-six chairs (73.1%) said YES
  - Twelve chairs (11.5%) said NO
  - Sixteen chairs (15.4%) said NOT SURE
Yes/No Responses

- Removing the “Not Sures”... 6.5 to 1 ratio

86.4% YES
13.6% NO

6.5 to 1 ratio
Collegiality (2011)

The following question was asked of 451 chairs:

If there was an objective, validated tool that assessed collegial behavior, would you be in favor of having collegiality as a criterion for tenure and promotion?
Collegiality - RESULTS

- YES, 354, 79%
- NO, 46, 10%
- NOT SURE, 49, 11%
Collegiality - RESULTS

- Removing the “Not Sure” responses...
  
  7.7 to 1 ratio

![Pie chart showing 354 yes responses (88%) and 46 no responses (12%)](image-url)

- YES, 354, 88%
- NO, 46, 12%
Collegiality [Continued]

• Why did more people (N = 49) select “NOT SURE” in greater numbers (N = 46) than responded “NO”?
  – Ambiguous Term
  – Imprecise
  – Can be used to “Get someone”
  – SUBJECTIVE
Ideas for Dealing with a Non-Collegial Faculty Member (2012)

• 21 Question Survey

• Survey Themes
  – Do nothing
  – Positive
  – Punitive
  – Proactive
Data from 2012 Study

• Survey Themes
  – Do nothing: 11.7%
  – Positive
    • Totally support: 13.1%
    • Serving as a mentor: 3.6%
    • Legacy building: 51.9%
    • Ask what you can do to help: 66.7%
Data from 2012 Study

• Survey Themes: Punitive
  – Place in smaller office: 0.2%
  – Five-day a week teaching schedule: 4.7%
  – More students to advise: 0.4%
  – No summer employment: 15.7%
  – Serve on more committees: 4.5%
Data from 2012 Study

• Survey Themes: Punitive
  – Unpopular courses to teach: 1.1%
  – Late evening classes: 1.9%
  – Early morning classes: 2.3%
  – Do not invite to any department social functions: 2.7%
  – Observe teaching in classroom: 17.8%
  – Scrutinize use of sick/personal days: 9.1%
Data from 2012 Study

• Survey Themes: Proactive
  – Contact Dean: 80.3%
  – Contact Provost: 21.2%
  – Contact Human Resources: 57.0%
  – Write letter explaining problems: 60.2%
  – Have an open and frank discussion: 92.8%
  • 79.8% would have this meeting on-campus

79.8% would have this meeting on-campus
Data from 2012 Study

• Survey of 528 department chairs
• In response to the question:
  – Have you ever had an uncivil or non collegial faculty member in your department?

  440 YES (83.3%)
  88 NO (16.7%)
The CAM & S-AM

Collegiality Assessment Matrix (CAM) used to i.d. observable behaviors most commonly associated with collegiality in the academy.

Self-Assessment Matrix (S-AM) – faculty completes the S-AM [similar to CAM]

Possible to compare a person’s rating of his own collegiality with how others (chairs, deans, peers) perceive the same behavior
The CAM and S-AM [Continued]

- Both instruments were pilot-tested by chairs and faculty.
- Results: both matrices were highly useful, easy to complete, associated with observable behaviors rather than interpretations of someone’s personality or attitudes, and valuable for promoting productive discussions of collegiality within departments and throughout campus.
Applying the CAM & S-AM

Both instruments have multiple uses.

• In a department or college, the chair or dean completes a CAM for each faculty member, while each faculty member completes his or her own S-AM [MOST COMMON]

• In a 1-on-1 conversation, supervisor & faculty member can discuss where their perceptions of the faculty member’s level of collegiality agree, where they differ, and what might be done to improve matters for the future.
Applying CAM & S-AM [Cont.]

• At other times, especially as part of a tenure review where a faculty member’s collegiality (or lack thereof) is a matter of ongoing interest, faculty member can complete the S-AM while the chair and all other members of the department assess the candidate’s level of collegiality with the CAM.
By calculating medians of the faculty ratings, the review committee will have 3 useful data sets to compare:

1. Supervisor’s assessment
2. Individual’s self-assessment
3. Aggregated scores of candidate’s peers
Applying CAM & S-AM [Cont.]

• **NOTE:** Since items left blank or scored as N/A do not enter into the averages, faculty members can feel comfortable rating only those items about which they have direct knowledge and observation.

• Both the CAM & S-AM contain 10 statements. If a person rates all 10 statements and adds the numerical total for all 10 statements, that score is divisible by 10. If he only completes 8 statements, the total is divisible by 8.
What’s Next for CAM & S-AM

• ATLAS is developing a national data base on the aggregate scores for both assessment instruments. Specific variables will be analyzed (e.g., gender, geography, tenure v. non tenure status, rank, et al.) and the results will be shared with colleagues and universities that participate.

• Online version of both CAM and S-AM.
4 Causes of Non Collegial Behavior

1. Self-image is different from perception by others.
2. Poor communication skills.
3. Lack of ownership or investment.
4. Perception that non collegial behavior is permitted.

What can departments do to improve collegiality?
The department has a “transparent” meeting:

1. What is collegial behavior?
2. The importance of collegiality.
4. Expectations – what is collegial behavior, & what is not collegial behavior.
5. Use of CAM & SAM can be helpful.
6. Determine department policies regarding ways to facilitate a more collegial department.
University-Wide Responsibilities for Fostering Collegiality

There should be expectation that collegiality, respect, and civility will, permeate the climate of the university.

A clear, unambiguous message regarding the importance of collegiality must be sent.

Actions may include terminating a person whose behavior continues to constitute incivility and a clear disrespect for his colleagues.
Most effective approach is one that addresses concerns of incivility in a systematic manner. University-wide policies established that promote collegiality campus wide. Universally applied reward and reprimand systems should be established and consistently followed.

Non collegial behavior cannot be “smiled away.”
Important that all safeguards concerning academic freedom and shared governance be in place PRIOR to initiating any policy. All segments of university community must have open dialogues before applying the following recommendations and strategies for fostering collegiality.
University-Wide Strategies for Fostering Collegiality

- Encourage faculty members to take personal responsibility for the quality of their academic community and the professional behavior of their colleagues.
- Include the expectation of civility, respect, and collegiality in the mission statement.
- Conduct campus-wide dialogues on civility and collegiality.
• Clearly state expectations for civil behavior for faculty, staff, students, and the administration in the faculty handbook.

• Gather documented support from the faculty senate, president, provost, deans, chairs, and faculty that non collegial behavior will not be tolerated.

• Make collegiality the fourth criteria for tenure, promotion in rank, and reappointment.
• Develop a university-wide code of ethics that is endorsed by faculty members, staff, students, and administrators.

• Indicate in the collective bargaining agreement, if applicable, that a proper academic climate can be maintained only when faculty members display civility and collegiality.
• Publicize values of collegial relationships through HR and equity & diversity offices.
• Provide professional development workshops to all faculty on topic of collegiality.
• Encourage search committees to specify collegiality in interview questions.
• Adopt a workplace harassment policy that encompasses more than sexual harassment.
• Educate chairs and deans in conflict management, resolving conflict, and pre- and post-conflict communication techniques.
• Prominently feature the importance of respect and civility in position announcements for new faculty.

• OTHERS . . . ?
A Special Assessment . . .

• Strictly adhere to specific protocols and safeguards.
• Academic freedom and shared governance!
• I.D. problem(s) with faculty member and, if needed, develop a plan of improvement.
• Have dean and chair design appropriate evaluations and assessments of faculty member [CAM & S-AM can be helpful].
• Draw from list of faculty approved evaluators.
• Assign trained evaluator(s) to work with faculty member.
• Have evaluator(s) develop specific intervention strategies to help faculty member.
• Have evaluator(s) submit written report to the dean, chair, and affected faculty member with recommended actions.
• Implement and evaluate specific plan with a detailed schedule of compliance.
- Faculty input essential when formulating principles and policies.
- Full, thoughtful, and transparent deliberations will serve, at the least, to bring importance of collegiality to the forefront of a variety of constituencies throughout the university community.
WHO IS YOUR SUPER HERO. . . ?

Do the simple math:

1. Pick your favorite number between 1-9
2. Multiply by 3
3. Add 3
4. Multiply again by 3
5. You will get a 2 or 3 digit number
6. Add the digits together
7. Your number is _____

With this number, see who your super here is . . .
Your super hero is . . .

1. Dr. Dudas
2. Mother Teresa
3. Tiger Woods
4. Oprah Winfrey
5. Drew Brees
6. Albert Einstein
7. Mickey Mouse
8. Abe Lincoln
9. BOB CIPRIANO
10. Bill Gates
Resources

NUTS!
Southwest Airlines' Crazy Recipe for Business and Personal Success

The No Asshole Rule
Building a Civilized Workplace and Surviving One That Isn't

Facilitating a Collegial Department in Higher Education
Strategies for Success
Dilemmas Have Two Options

1. One PRACTICAL
2. One MIRACULOUS

Practical Option: Our duly-elected Democratic and Republican members of Congress will work together collaboratively in a non-partisan manner to help solve our country’s problems.

Miraculous Option: A non collegial, uncivil and toxic faculty member will transform himself and turn into a civil, supportive, and collegial faculty member!
This financial crisis is forcing universities to make tough decisions:

There is a risk that we might need to lay off André...
Creating a More Collegial and Harmonious Department
Questions?

THANK YOU!!

ciprianor1@southernct.edu