

FINAL REPORT

**ITHACA COLLEGE
FACULTY WORKLOAD PROJECT
1999-2002**

submitted by

**Garry L. Brodhead
Associate Provost
Project Coordinator**

August 2002

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ithaca College Faculty Workload Project was initiated as part of the Associated New American Colleges (ANAC) Faculty Workload Project, funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts from 1998-2000. The ANAC project originated in discussions about the unique problems of faculty work at comprehensive colleges, which, being neither liberal arts colleges nor research universities, try to provide the best of both of these institutional models. In comprehensive colleges and universities, teaching is central to the mission and faculty spend considerable time outside of class with students discussing course work and professional interests. At the same time increasing expectations that faculty will pursue research and creative work that will bring visibility and academic stature to their institution have become important in comprehensives as they have begun to find their place in the larger academic community. Service expectations have also grown with the complexities of shared governance that has become increasingly important in these institutions. Ithaca faculty, like those in other ANAC schools, have experienced difficulty in balancing these demands and sought alternatives to organizing their work more effectively while refocusing their efforts on institutional mission.

The ANAC Faculty Workload Project was an opportunity for faculty to address these problems collaboratively and over a period of several years. The Ithaca Faculty Workload Project sought solutions to the problems of increasing faculty work through exploration of the concept of differential work, in which faculty within an academic department collaboratively define the work of the department and then assign it based on individual professional interests, expertise, and short- and long-term goals and the needs of the department as a whole. The potential of the differential work model for solving accountability issues is receiving increasing attention in the higher education community and is being considered in liberal arts colleges and research universities as well.

Seven academic departments participated in the Ithaca Faculty Workload Project from 1999-2002: Art History, Organizational Communication, Learning, and Design, Physics, Physical Therapy, Psychology, Sport Studies, and Writing. Each department undertook a project that would address both the larger institutional project goals and departmental work issues. The projects centered on review of the department mission, curriculum, and faculty work patterns, using a variety of approaches. Curriculum review enabled the Psychology Department to reorganize its courses and teaching load for more effective delivery, while establishing a collaborative method for faculty to review each others' work plans annually. The result of this activity has been a reduction of the annual teaching load to 18 load hours from 24. Other departments pursued projects that focused on innovations in teaching that would increase student learning, such as increased use of technology in certain courses, alternative class meeting formats that would encourage independent learning, and student tutors for supplementary help in first-year courses. An important part of the project has been exploration of ways to reduce the 24-hour annual teaching load. With these models in place, implementation of the workload project in other departments on campus will begin in Fall 2002 through the Academic Program Assessment and Planning initiative, part of the second phase of institutional planning.

The success of the Ithaca Faculty Workload Project has been observed on several fronts. It has addressed issues associated with faculty work by providing direction, flexibility, and the means to solve these problems, while at the same time reinforcing collaboration as a positive force among colleagues and between the faculty and the administration at the college. It has achieved significant attention at national conferences through ANAC involvement and has been featured in two publications, *A New Academic Compact: Revisioning the Relationship between Faculty and Their Institutions* (Anker, 2002) and "The American Professoriate in Transition" (*AGB Priorities*, Spring, 2002).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We embarked upon the Faculty Workload Project with equal amounts of optimism, conviction, and uncertainty. Many people deserve thanks and appreciation for their steadfast support and commitment to the project.

Their efforts are foundational in our endeavors to change the faculty work culture at Ithaca College. Peggy Williams, president; Jim Malek, provost and vice president for academic affairs; Bill Scoones, interim provost and vice president for academic affairs; Members of the project Steering Committee: Chuck Ciccone, professor, physical therapy; Sandra Herndon, professor, OCLD; Marian MacCurdy, associate professor, writing; Steve Mosher, professor, sport studies; Jack Peck, professor, psychology; John Schwartz, associate professor, physics; Gary Wells, associate professor, art history.

Jerry Berberet, Executive Director of the Associated New American Colleges and Linda McMillin, associate professor of history at Susquehanna University, deserve special thanks for their outstanding leadership of the ANAC Faculty Workload Project, which was the impetus for the Ithaca project, and for their guidance in developing

*A New Academic Compact: Revisioning the Relationship between
Faculty and Their Institutions*

**Ithaca College
Faculty Workload Project
1999-2002**

Final Report

“In any given decade, one book in higher education stands out as having the potential to dramatically affect the professional lives of college and university faculty and their institutions. ... *A New Academic Compact: Revisioning the Relationship between Faculty and Their Institutions* details proven strategies for enhancing the effectiveness, institutional loyalty, and morale of faculty. ... If this book is as widely read and heeded as it deserves to be, it will become the heir to Boyer’s classic work [*Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*].” Howard B Altman, *Academic Leader*, May, 2002

Howard Altman’s review identifies *A New Academic Compact: Revisioning the Relationship between Faculty and Their Institutions* as a seminal work that addresses Gene Rice’s concern about the “disconnection between faculty priorities and institutional purpose” and a means for “aligning institutional mission, policies affecting faculty, faculty reward systems, and the actual work that faculty members do.” The Ithaca College Faculty Workload Project (FWP), 1999-2002, is the exemplar of the model for differential work that is proposed in the *Compact*.¹ The Ithaca FWP was undertaken as an experiment that would explore ways to change the faculty work culture at the College while developing new models of faculty work that would be more effective and productive.

The Ithaca FWP has enjoyed greater success and recognition than could have been hoped for at its inception. Seven academic departments participated in the project, from its planning phase through three years of actual project work. In addition to achieving the proposed goals, the Ithaca project has been shared at Associated New American Colleges summer institutes and presented at national conferences of the American Association for Higher Education and the Association of American Colleges and Universities.² These large-scale fora have attracted attention to the project from the higher education community and increased the college’s visibility. Reviews and responses to the project range from favorable to enthusiastic for its potential to change thinking about faculty work and to solve complex faculty-institution problems. This report presents the results of the Ithaca College Faculty Workload Project by focusing on how it has achieved the goals that were its underpinning; what has been learned by students, faculty, and the college through project participation; the implications and potential for reshaping the faculty work culture at the college; and future plans for implementing the project across the campus.

Overview and Methodology

With the variety of disciplines and teaching methodologies represented in the departments at Ithaca College, faculty work is defined by a wide range of teaching, scholarly and professional activity, and

service requirements and activities.³ Teaching occurs in traditional classrooms, clinics, studios, on stage, in production facilities, and labs. Scholarly and creative work takes on many different forms and is shared in traditional conference fora and publications, in performances on the musical stage and in the theater, and at exhibitions of art work, photography, and films. Service is given on a variety of campus committees and in disciplinary organizations and societies. This array of work in the context of a primarily undergraduate college for traditional age students where frequent interaction between faculty and students is the norm makes for a complex agenda of responsibilities that faculty must balance on both day-to-day and long-term bases.

Frustration over these demands were at the heart of discussions by faculty from member institutions during the ANAC workload project discussions, which began in Fall 1996. These perceptions are documented by data collected from the Carnegie Faculty Survey administered at ANAC member institutions in Spring 1997.⁴ For many experienced faculty, the “add-on” work culture that had evolved over more than a decade had become overwhelming. Faculty at Ithaca echoed the concerns of their colleagues at other ANAC institutions, citing in particular the demands of the 24-hour teaching load in combination with increasing scholarly and service expectations. Peggy Williams, the college’s new president in Fall 1997, took this problem seriously and expressed immediate support for participating in the ANAC Faculty Workload Project. A formal proposal was drafted (included here in Appendix A) and plans were made for presenting the project to the campus community in Fall 1998. A new provost and vice president for academic affairs, James Malek, added his support to the project, which was led by associate provost, Garry Brodhead. Nineteen ANAC colleges and universities participated in the project.⁵

Following a campus presentation announcing the Faculty Workload Project to Ithaca department chairs and faculty in September 1998, seven departments--Art History, Organizational Communication, Learning, and Design (OCLD), Physical Therapy, Physics, Psychology, Sport Studies, and Writing--elected to participate. Each department submitted a proposal that addressed the project goals as well as its own unique faculty work problems and department goals. A summary of the department projects is found in Appendix B. A steering committee comprised of one representative from each department worked with the associate provost in advancing the project. During the spring semester 1999, project principles and goals were discussed, the committee began a review of literature, individual department project plans were finalized, and timelines for various phases of the larger project established. Throughout the 1999-2000 year, the steering committee met monthly to discuss progress with the departmental projects and to develop plans for the two-year implementation phase, 2000-2002. The associate provost met with the other ANAC campus project coordinators several times each year to discuss the ANAC project goals and to share insights from the individual campus projects. This information was routinely shared with the Ithaca FWP steering committee to guide its thinking and advance the project. Especially helpful in the early stages of the project were Gene Rice’s monograph, *Making a Place for the New American Scholar*, and *The Collaborative Department: How Five Campuses are Inching Toward Cultures of Collective Responsibility* by Jon Wergin.⁶ Both authors visited campus and met with the project steering committee, giving helpful guidance and encouragement.

The problem to be solved by the FWP was the creation of alternatives to the standard work load model that was defined only in terms of the annual teaching load.⁷ This policy has been in effect for over 30 years at the College. Not only were there problems balancing the teaching load with scholarly and service expectations and the increasing demands by students for more interaction with faculty outside of class, but the teaching load had also become a detriment for departments in recruiting candidates of choice: the 24-

hour load had become a factor in some decisions not to accept an Ithaca College offer. An additional factor that will soon become problematic for the college are demographic projections that indicate that the market for faculty will become even more competitive within the next five to ten years when baby-boomers begin to retire.⁸ Solutions to the larger problem of faculty work lie in its deconstruction at the department level where new models that will both address the department's full responsibilities of teaching, scholarship and professional activity, and service, and realign the workload of faculty can be designed and tested. To address these issues and to guide the FWP, the following goals were adopted:

- C to explore new models of faculty work that are inclusive of all faculty responsibilities;
- C to introduce innovative modes of instruction that will enhance student-centered learning and allow faculty greater flexibility in their roles in that process (while moving away from a "seat time" approach);
- C to explore alternative course and curricular models;
- C to provide new models of faculty work and learning that can be applied by other departments at the College; and
- C to share the results of this work with other ANAC institutions.

Although assumed in these goals, another goal was subsequently added:

- C to encourage collaboration among faculty within a department as the basis for discussion and decision making in all aspects of faculty work.

An underlying premise for the project from the outset was that it be a partnership between faculty and the administration--faculty, dean, provost, and president. While the provost's office managed the project to ensure that institutional goals remained at its center, the members of the steering committee were encouraged to work closely with their colleagues, department chair, and dean. This was a new model of project management at the College that departed from the traditional hierarchic approach that prevailed previously. Although there was some uncertainty about this direction, it reinforced the underlying principles of departmental autonomy and collaboration among faculty and strengthened the institutional relationship with faculty that was at the heart of the ANAC project.

The department projects were diverse, representing disciplinary differences in teaching, scholarship and professional activity, and service. In the area of teaching the projects focused on ways to:

- C maximize teaching effectiveness and excellence, while exploring innovation in course presentation and delivery, e.g., greater use of technology, alternative course meeting formats, use of learning communities and student tutors to supplement scheduled classes;
- C inventory the different teaching/classroom/lab responsibilities and assignments, and assign weight or credit to this work;
- C incorporate non-classroom teaching and learning formally into the workload by identifying the range of activities that faculty undertake in these areas and assigning weight or credit to this work;
- C streamline curricular offerings to reduce redundancy and increase learning at upper course levels.

To address scholarly work and professional activity, several departments explored alternatives to block

scheduling every faculty member for a full teaching load each semester.

- C One department established a cyclic “teaching free semester” that would permit one faculty member each semester to pursue scholarship intensively.
- C Another incorporated a number of the above teaching/curricular strategies to maximize effectiveness with an 18-hour annual teaching load for all faculty in the department, resulting in increased opportunities to pursue scholarly and service projects.

Department projects that focused on service featured the following:

- C Teaching load time was reassigned to provide professional service activity within the department.
- C Service was considered an “assigned” part of a faculty member’s workload and approved by department colleagues.

Working collaboratively and in partnership with the dean’s and provost’s offices, departments were free to pursue their projects with minimal constraints. Three qualifications were established at the outset of the project, however: all faculty in the department must participate in and fully support the project; departments must continue to produce student credit hours at an average of the three years preceding the project; and all project activity must be conducted within existing resources. The Ithaca FWP timeline included a preliminary year of preparation for the project--campus presentation, selection of departments, developing the project agenda (1998-99), a planning year (1999-2000), and two years of implementation (2000-02).

Assessment, Outcomes, and Learning

The breadth of the FWP goals and differences in disciplinary methodologies, pedagogies, and professional activities among the participating departments offered challenges in developing an assessment program. Dr. Jon Wergin, a consultant for the ANAC workload project and professor of educational studies at Virginia Commonwealth University and senior scholar with the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), met with the FWP steering committee and provided direction for assessing the department projects. Because these projects varied considerably, it was decided that a common assessment instrument would not be effective. At Wergin’s suggestion, a general approach was adopted with each department designing an instrument that would address its project. The campus project organization suggested that assessment at the end of each of the two years of implementation would provide an opportunity both to make changes at the end of the first year, if they were needed, and to conduct a final assessment near the end of the second year of project implementation. Using the following questions as a guide, each department set up an assessment program that would address these points in appropriate detail.

1. In what ways has the FWP affected student learning?
2. How has participation in the FWP changed the faculty’s approach their work?
3. How has participation in the FWP affected collaboration in your department?

4. What benefits have accrued to the department as a result of participating in the FWP?

Using a qualitative approach, questionnaires, focus groups, and both informal and ongoing departmental discussions provided information from students, faculty, chairs, and steering committee members.

Student course evaluations (Student Statements), specially designed questionnaires, and information solicited informally focused on satisfaction with such things as: innovative teaching methodologies including technology; non-standard section or course scheduling and its impact on learning; and alternative learning opportunities as compared with the traditional course formats (e.g., increased opportunity for independent studies and internships). Information from faculty, chair, and steering committee members addressed: impact on teaching and learning; approaches to reshaping workload considering departmental priorities (including curriculum delivery) and the professional interests of individual faculty; impact on productivity and job satisfaction; perceptions of work flexibility, collaboration, and collegiality among colleagues; influence on long-term planning for both individual faculty and the department; and implications for changing the faculty work culture both in the department and at the College. Chair perspectives reflected their roles and responsibilities for coordinating the department's curriculum and workload effectively. Steering committee members were heavily invested as both project leaders and faculty colleagues. The information that was gathered from these participants provides a comprehensive and balanced view of the individual departmental projects as well as the larger campus FWP. Sample assessment questions are given in Appendix C.

Analysis: What have we have learned from the FWP?

Two project categories are represented in the FWP. Although all of the department projects addressed the details of faculty work, not all included direct student involvement. The OCLD, Psychology, Sport Studies, and Writing Department projects employed teaching and course management innovations that allowed for observable if not measurable student learning. These projects explored ways to increase student-faculty interaction, the introduction of technology in various forms, flexible course scheduling, and varying approaches to individual learning. The Art History, Physical Therapy, and Physics Department projects focused on recasting certain structural aspects of their work, such as reconfiguring course enrollments and inventorying both teaching and support functions of departmental work. These did not directly involve students. A summary of what has been learned in each of the department projects follows, organized according to the two categories identified above.

Organizational Communication, Learning, and Design

The OCLD project focused on redesign in instructional format for three courses, Organizational Communication and Technology (225-45000), How Organizations Communicate and Learn (225-10100), and Management of Organizational Communication, Learning, and Design (225-43400), and several unrelated smaller projects that addressed curricular change and increased effectiveness of faculty work assignment. As an example of redesign in instructional format, in Organizational Communication and Technology, a varied course schedule that included one lecture, one discussion section, and an on-line component each week replaced three regular class meetings. With course information posted on a website, this change allowed students to work and learn at their own pace. From the professor's perspective, the course was more collaborative, more time was spent in discussion (since students had access to the professor through e-mail), and the quality of student performance increased in papers,

exams, and projects. She reports that “the changes were ‘overwhelmingly positive.’” Students also indicate a high level of satisfaction with the revised approach, citing the use of technology to achieve their own learning and communication goals, having course material in an on-line version, while also having e-mail access to the professor. In another course, Management of Organizational Communication, Learning, and Design, a senior management course, students met in small groups with graduate students to follow-up on lectures that had been given to the combined group, giving each population--seniors and graduate students--the opportunity to discuss the topic based on their experience and individual expertise. This combined group discussion was received well by students who saw it as an added dimension to their learning.

An unrelated part of the OCLD project was reorganizing faculty work assignments within the department to allow for more effective and increased opportunities for teaching and learning. One example was the clustering of internships for load credit, which would enable one or more faculty members to replace a course(s) with supervision of a number of internships in a given semester, rather than either refusing the internship or taking it on as overload. Similarly, webteam development coordinated with co-curricular credit and service-learning opportunities has expanded the opportunities for students to apply their learning in projects outside of courses and often with clients external to the College. Although neither of these parts of the larger OCLD project include assessment by students, observable benefits from participation include greater opportunity for students to pursue independent studies and individual web projects with curricular support from faculty and greater ability on the part of faculty to create more flexible work loads that will support student learning.

Psychology

Faculty in the Psychology Department addressed the FWP head-on. Candid discussions considered longstanding sensitive issues about perceived fairness and balance of workload. Well-constructed exercises that allowed for differences in work assignments laid the foundation for developing a successful differential work model. A goal to reduce curricular redundancy in combination with more effective scheduling enabled the department to trim its teaching load to 18 annual load credit hours, on the condition that all faculty in the department produce an annual activity agreement that would be reviewed and approved by all department colleagues, the chair, and the dean. The agreements outline a faculty member’s goals for the coming academic year both in large and detailed terms, with specific plans for teaching, scholarship, and service. It should be noted that the department is forward-looking in its definition of scholarship, not only considering the “traditional” research model, but also more recent approaches that are inclusive of broader areas of investigation such as the scholarships of teaching, integration, and application that are proposed by Ernest Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered*. The psychology department project remains the model that most clearly demonstrates the principles of differential work that are presented in *A New Academic Compact*. As a result of its participation in the FWP, the psychology faculty were able to achieve their curricular and staffing goals, reducing the annual teaching load to 18 load credit hours within existing staffing lines, while strengthening collaborative research with their majors.

The substantial success of the psychology department project drew considerable interest from external audiences at conferences and other presentations. As a result, the chair, Nancy Rader, volunteered a more comprehensive assessment of the psychology department project. Among the benefits from

participation in the FWP, she cites: prompting review of the curriculum based on expectations for student learning and skill development; accepting differences among faculty in the areas of teaching, research, and service; moving the department away from a “teaching = workload” mentality; allowing flexibility among work assignments crediting previously uncredited work (e.g., internships); and improving job market position as a result of reduced teaching load. She summarizes a list of “old myths” and “new realities” that have resulted from the department’s participation in the FWP.

Old Myths

1. All are equal given a 4-4 teaching load.
2. Good teaching requires small classes.
3. All lines under the heading “Service” are created equal.
4. Workload Project = less work.
5. Workload Project = curricular depreciation.

New Realities

1. Acknowledgment of unequal work but equally important contribution (or) Equitable rewards for different work.
2. Use strengths for contributions to the departmental enterprise.
3. Greater productivity, satisfaction, and flexibility; better service to students.
4. Increased collaboration and information exchange; less fragmentation and more trust within department.
5. Departmental goals become highlighted *and* individual goals are supported.

Sport Studies

The Sport Studies project was similar in pedagogical design to that in the OCLD course, Organizational Communication and Technology. The History of Sport (663-20700), previously taught in sections of about 40 students, was offered in one large section with modifications in delivery and presentation (frequent use of PowerPoint during class, distribution lists for disseminating course information, and an on-line “chat” room). Use of PowerPoint presentations streamlined class presentations and resulted in more time for discussion. Participation in the on-line discussions were popular and the professor was able to answer student questions and direct their course work more effectively and in real-time. Overall this change in course format reduced teaching time (one presentation as opposed to repetitions of the same material), maintained the student credit hour rate, and introduced several innovative approaches to teaching and learning, to which students responded favorably.

The Sport Studies chair assesses the department’s workload project as establishing potential for further expansion of workload initiatives. Limited staffing and large student enrollments were constraints for exploring a comprehensive approach to revising workload. The department’s experiment with larger section sizes and increased use of technology in certain courses has shown a measure of success and will be worth examining by other departments. Additional staffing in Sport Studies within the next two years will allow greater flexibility in managing the curriculum and enrollments in this very popular program.

Writing

The Writing Department project was the most visibly aimed at improving student learning. In ten pilot

sections of first-year writing courses--four in Fall and six in Spring--an additional class meeting per week was given by a faculty member with a student tutor who was either a writing major or minor. The added class meeting was required but did not provide additional credit. All sections were for three credits. Classes were given in computer classrooms, thus integrating improvement in writing with developing compositional facility at the computer keyboard. In these classes students had the opportunity to research a project, work on draft material, refine previous work, and seek additional help from the faculty member or student peer. Student responses to this unique project varied, reflecting a number of views on the required extra class meeting--both positive and negative--and the opportunity for additional help, which improved their work. Students valued the additional hour at a 2:1 rate. Positive responses centered on increased guidance and the resultant higher quality of their work. Negative responses mostly had to do with the required extra time and its questionable benefit. Faculty were able to "manage" this situation for the most part, however, through positive "spin."

Writing Department participation in the FWP not only provided an opportunity for the faculty to review its work and experiment with its first-year courses but, as a new department, it was also able to coordinate certain of its necessary organizational activity with workload project discussions. For the FWP the faculty conducted an extensive curriculum review, laying out a course plan for three years. Part of this included experience and information gained from the workload project pilot program in first-year writing courses that was described above. Faculty perspective on this innovation is generally positive and the department will pursue changing the credit allocation to four credits to address student concerns about the inequity between meeting times and course credit. As a new department, participation in the FWP prompted the faculty to develop a governance document that would incorporate policies and procedures that would align with and support their plan for faculty work. Overall the faculty have been positive about the gains in student learning and pedagogy that have been made through participation in the FWP.

Art History

The Art History Department focused primarily on developing a "teaching-free" semester program that would enable each of its full-time faculty to work in a more concentrated schedule on scholarly projects in place of teaching, while continuing to maintain their other non-teaching responsibilities. At the conclusion of the two-year implementation phase of the project, four faculty had produced scholarly products that have substantial benefit to both themselves and the department. One faculty member was able to complete two scholarly projects, an article and a monograph, during the semester. Both have been published by premiere publishers. Additionally, this faculty member devoted time to several smaller projects that will enhance her courses and teaching. Of the experience, she says: "The opportunity to sustain my focus, daily and over a period of months, on a specific set of ideas and questions, made the final result possible and the process more gratifying and rewarding than usual. ... The words of modern architect Le Corbusier come to mind: 'Creation is a patient search.'"

The department approached the teaching-free semester through a credit-hour banking approach. Each faculty member teaches approximately five additional students in each section, enabling them to amortize the teaching-free semester through a period of six semesters. From a project perspective, this concept has promise as one means for faculty to re-think and redistribute enrollments for greater flexibility in course scheduling through multiple semesters. Although the project has achieved its goals, the department will abandon the teaching-free semester program in order to reduce its annual teaching load to 21 hours.

The art history chair reports that the teaching free semester has been extremely beneficial for the individual faculty member who pursues scholarship and for increasing collaboration and collegiality among faculty in the department “to make the project work.” For the chair, however, it was a different matter. The credit “banking” system required increased long-term planning and was a management challenge. Limitations imposed by classroom seating capacities and significant planning of course offering frequency, especially for art history majors, required more time and faculty planning discussions than are necessary under routine semesterly and yearly planning.

Physical Therapy

The Physical Therapy Department project consisted of an inventory and analysis of the varied teaching roles that faculty must play to effectively deliver the PT curriculum. Lecture, clinic, professional development, and administrative roles are equally important in this successful program. Although faculty specialize to a certain degree in these various teaching roles, in order to balance their work in responsible and fair ways, an assessment of the functions within each of these various activities was necessary. Scholarship and professional development are also essential and expected. During the period of the workload project, the department also conducted a curriculum review aimed at addressing new accreditation standards. At the conclusion of the review of their departmental work, the faculty were able to more equitably distribute their work and reduce their teaching load to 21 load credit hours within the existing faculty.

Physics

The Physics Department analyzed and assigned weight/credit values to the professional activity and service responsibilities related to its major that faculty must undertake. The department was unable to move beyond the analysis stage of the project due to a succession of retirements that had occurred or were planned during the period of the FWP. The faculty will experience an almost complete turnover by 2003-04. However, they will have a well-developed model for assigning workload credit as they begin to restaff and review their curriculum.

Future Plans: Linking the Faculty Workload Project to Academic Program Assessment and Planning

During the course of the Faculty Workload Project, several progress reports were made to faculty, chairs, and deans. This enabled the campus community to follow the ongoing discussions, questions, and problems the steering committee members were confronting and the strategies that were being considered to create more effective work patterns. A day-long final report out to the campus community, “Concluding the Faculty Workload Project: Strategies and Solutions,” was given on May 10, 2002. The members of the steering committee shared the results of their department projects, framing the discussion by focusing on review of: departmental mission and goals, curriculum--including alternative course delivery approaches, and faculty work assignments.

During the second year of the FWP, 2000-01, an Academic Program Assessment and Planning initiative⁹ was implemented at the College as part of the second phase of the Institutional Planning process. Issues associated with academic program assessment and planning and departmental staffing connected with the problems being addressed in the FWP and it was decided that the Academic Program Assessment and

Planning initiative would serve as the vehicle for systematically implementing the FWP in the remaining departments. With this in mind, the May 10 report out on the FWP was also planned to provide information that would guide departments as they conduct assessment and planning projects.

Campus implementation of the FWP will follow the schedule of departments conducting assessment and planning. During 2001-02, five departments undertook the project: English, History, Sociology, OCLD, and Therapeutic Recreation and Leisure Services. During 2002-03, eight additional departments will take on the exercise: Cinema and Photography, Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology, Exercise and Sport Sciences, Health Promotion and Human Movement, Economics, Philosophy and Religion, Politics, Psychology, and Physics. Of the 35 academic departments and units at the College, approximately two-thirds remain and they will conduct assessment and planning projects during the next three to five years.

An important component of the differential work model presented in *A New Academic Compact* is the “circle of value.”¹⁰ Addressing Gene Rice’s concern in the Foreword to the book that there is a “disconnection between faculty priorities and institutional purpose,” the circle of value aligns “institutional mission, policies affecting faculty, faculty reward systems, and the actual work that faculty members do.” A component missing from the FWP was the element of reward. Seeing the success of the FWP for change in the faculty work culture during its first year of implementation, interim provost Bill Scoones, introduced a rewards program into the project that directly addresses departmental needs and institutional goals. Departments that completed the FWP and could achieve a 21-hour teaching load without additional staffing would receive a reward of \$20,000 to be added to their operating budget for three years. Both the psychology and physical therapy departments were eligible to receive this reward. Other workload project departments, which through curriculum and staffing review, could demonstrate the need for additional staffing in order to achieve the 21-hour load for all full-time continuing faculty were awarded a non-tenure eligible faculty line for three years. As part of the annual budget process, \$1.2 million has been earmarked for the first round of departmental assessment and planning projects.¹¹

Linking learning from the FWP to Academic Program Assessment and Planning has provided both additional direction for departments undertaking assessment and planning and the means for implementing the FWP throughout the rest of the college. Solutions for longstanding workload problems are based in review of college and departmental mission statements and curricula, while exploring approaches to improved student learning and increased collaboration among faculty within a department. Linking two college-wide programs with the Institutional Plan not only connects project purpose with mission, but also increases institutional learning across segments of the faculty and administration. All of the outcomes contribute to collaboration, collegiality, and a sense of community within the college.

Summary

Participation in the ANAC Faculty Workload Project has benefitted the college in several ways. During the preliminary phase of the project, Ithaca College faculty who attended the ANAC Summer Institutes in 1997 and 1998 had the opportunity to discuss workload issues with their colleagues at other ANAC institutions and learned that their concerns were not unique. They learned that the combination of liberal arts and professional programs, characteristic of ANAC institutions, contributes to a complex mix of disciplinary methods and work approaches, and that scholarship and professional activity vary considerably among the disciplines making it difficult to support “one size fits all” approaches to balancing faculty work. These initial conversations were particularly beneficial in motivating faculty to participate in

the Ithaca FWP. With essential support from President Williams and the Board of Trustees, a project that was practical and had great potential for duplication has resulted with a variety of approaches that will enable faculty to examine their work practices in all aspects, teaching--both in- and out-of-class, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

An important part of this study for faculty has been the emphasis on departmental collaboration as a means to achieve collective goals. The Psychology Department has demonstrated the importance of this aspect of the FWP in agreeing to review their curriculum fully with complete candor, review and agree on each others' annual work plans, and making strategic decisions in all areas of work that would allow them to achieve an 18-hour annual teaching load, which should be the ultimate goal for the college in the not-to-distant future. FWP departments have shared their projects and findings over a period of three years and have made continuous progress in achieving both departmental and larger institutional project goals. Extraordinary opportunities for sharing the Ithaca FWP have not only made public the success of the project, but have also increased institutional visibility in important national higher education venues.

A final benefit of the project is that it has demonstrated that linking larger campus projects can reinforce the mission of the college and increase institutional learning. The FWP carried with it a continued conversation over three years that considered improved student learning, innovative approaches to teaching and learning, increased collaboration and flexibility in designing faculty work--removing barriers to more effective use of faculty time and talents, and possibilities for making the College more attractive to new faculty. The focus of Academic Program Assessment and Planning, the vehicle for implementing the FWP in the remainder of the College, is curriculum review and the collection of data that will help direct change in program goals and courses taught. Within the context of ongoing institutional planning, these rich conversations will increase student, faculty, and administrators' awareness of issues that need attention and direct our collective energies and resources to improving the college's environment as a learning community.

Endnotes

1. The Ithaca College Faculty Workload Project was part of the larger Associated New American Colleges Faculty Workload Project that was funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts. The ANAC-Pew project was conducted from 1998-2000 by faculty and administrators from ANAC member institutions and focused on three project-oriented discussions of faculty development, service and governance, and differential work. The project resulted in *A New Academic Compact: Revisioning the Relationship between Faculty and Their Institutions*, edited by Jerry Berberet, Executive Director of the Associated New American Colleges, and Linda McMillin, associate professor and chair of History at Susquehanna University, and published by Anker Publishing Co. in January 2002.
2. Presentations on the Ithaca College Faculty Workload Project were made at the American Association for Higher Education Faculty Roles and Rewards Conferences in 1999 and 2002 and at the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges and Universities in 2001. The project was also presented at the ANAC Faculty Workload Project Dissemination Conference which was hosted by Ithaca College in June 2000.
3. Ithaca College is a comprehensive college that is comprised of five schools, Business, Communications, Health Sciences and Human Performance, Humanities and Sciences, and Music, and a Division of Graduate Studies. There are 37 departments and academic units, 18 of which are in the four professional schools.
4. In Spring 1997 ANAC institutions participated in the Carnegie Faculty Survey that included a supplement designed specifically for faculty in ANAC schools. Data show that faculty spend approximately 52-53 hours per week on teaching, scholarly/creative, and service work. Additionally, while faculty enjoy their teaching and out-of-class work with students, the data show that they are frustrated by their inability to do their other work well because of increasing expectations from students for more time and from the college to conduct research and participate in service activity.
5. The ANAC Faculty Workload Project participating institutions were: Belmont University, Butler University, University of Dayton, Drake University, Drury University, Hamline University, University of Hartford, Ithaca College, Mercer University, North Central College, University of the Pacific, Pacific Lutheran University, Quinnipiac University, Rollins College, The Sage Colleges, Susquehanna University, University of the Redlands, St. Mary's College of California, and Valparaiso University.
6. Rice, R. Eugene. (1996). *Making a Place for the New American Scholar*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. Wergin, J. F. (1994). *The Collaborative Department: How Five Campuses are Inching Toward Cultures of Collective Responsibility*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. Other sources included: Berberet, Jerry and Wong, Frank. "The New American College: A Model for Liberal Learning." *Liberal Education*, Winter 1995. Coffman, James, Downey, Ronald, and Dyer, Ruth. "Individualization of Faculty Work at Kansas State University." Paper presented at Academic Chairperson's Conference, Orlando, 1999. Coye, Dale. "Ernest Boyer and the New American College: Connecting the 'Disconnects.'" *Change*, May/June, 1997. Edgerton, Russell. "Higher Education White Paper." Unpublished, 1997. Krahenbuhl, Gary. "The Integration of Faculty Responsibilities and Institutional Needs." <http://clasdean.la.asu.edu>, 1997. McMahon, Joan and Caret, Robert. "Redesigning the Faculty Roles and Rewards Structure." *Metropolitan Universities*, Spring 1997.
7. Problems with defining workload solely in terms of the teaching load emerged at Ithaca College in the early 1980's. As the academic culture at the College began to change with increased expectations for traditional scholarly activity and the perceived need for more involvement in governance, faculty began to express concern about the 24-hour annualized teaching load. In response, two workload studies were commissioned by the provost. The first, in 1983-84, was a fact-finding study that investigated teaching load at a group of institutions used by the College for comparison purposes. The results reinforced perceived as well as factual differences in the teaching load and

scholarly expectations between Ithaca faculty and faculty at these institutions and a reassigned time program that reduced annual teaching load to 21 hours in exchange for a scholarly project was established in 1988-89 . The second study, from 1989-91, reviewed the success of the reassigned time program and resulted in a plan that would provide a 21-hour teaching load to all faculty by 1994 through the accrual of 53 faculty lines. This plan was discontinued when a precipitous enrollment decline that occurred in the mid-1990's necessitated budget reductions that eliminated the reassigned-time program.

8. The average age of the tenured faculty at Ithaca College for the 2001-02 academic year was 53.2 years and their age range, 35-72. For all full-time faculty the average was 48, with an age range of 24-72. During the past five years, the average retirement age has been 62.3 years.

9. Using an institutionally adopted set of guidelines (attached as Appendix D), academic departments, while conducting a review of their academic programs and setting out a three- to five-year plan, will also consider workload revision as part of their planning.

10. The “circle of value” emerged in the discussion of the role that faculty play in adding value to the academic department/unit, the school, and the college as a whole. The “circle” is completed when the institution rewards a faculty member, completing the relationship between faculty and their institutions. The traditional reward system in colleges and universities provides faculty with intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. The awarding of tenure and promotion is an extrinsic reward for academic accomplishments in day-to-day work that faculty accomplish over a period of years for which they receive intrinsic rewards. The reward system also includes such benefits at sabbaticals, faculty development grants, and financial support for departmental needs.

11. Through the FWP and other planning programs, six academic departments/units will schedule a 21-hour teaching load beginning 2002-03. It is anticipated that a similar number of the remaining departments will also be able to achieve that goal through the Academic Program Assessment and Planning initiative. With this information, the \$1.2 million budgeted amount was thought to be an informed projection on the cost for achieving a 21-hour load for all faculty at the college. This compares favorably to \$2.2 million, which is the cost for 53 faculty lines targeted under the 1994 reassigned time plan.

Appendix A

Ithaca College Faculty Workload Project Proposal

Balancing Workload: A Faculty Development Model ANAC/Pew Faculty Workload Project, Phase II 1999-2002

Background

Among the results of the first phase of the ANAC/Pew Faculty Work Study (1997-98) was an understanding that faculty work in ANAC institutions generally has increased over the past decade. Add on responsibilities have increased the professional commitment of faculty, though there has been little or no recognition of this additional work in the institutional literature which addresses faculty work and the reward system. ANAC institutions typically identify faculty work in terms of teaching load, while responsibilities such as advising, committee work, etc., either are assigned or are taken on as a professional obligation. The vastly varying nature of faculty teaching assignments, a result in part of the wide-ranging disciplinary makeup and differing types on instruction necessarily associated with these disciplines, further complicates the situation. Most institutions use a modification of the standard three-credit model or a weighted load to compensate for these differences, resulting in a one-size-fits-all mentality. Faculty at Ithaca College, as at other ANAC institutions, have expressed concern about the apparently increasing expectations that have resulted from working to maintain excellent in teaching and related out-of-class obligations, the sense that greater levels of accomplishment are required in the area of scholarly/ professional activity for tenure and promotion, and increasing amounts of time required for service.

Project Statement

As its Phase II project, Ithaca College will undertake a three-year experiment to balance faculty workload through a faculty development model. Eight to ten departments from the college's five schools will participate. Using an individualized work plan/differential work assignment/growth contract model, each participating faculty member will design a three-year work plan which takes into account all of the professional activities in which he or she will engage during that period. Faculty members will assess their progress by means of an annual self-evaluation which will be discussed with their chair and/or dean. Full accountability for the project will be evaluated at the department level. It is hoped that a variety of successful approaches to defining full-time faculty workload will emerge, with the result that the college as a whole may adopt new workload models.

Rationale

Ithaca College uses teaching load as the single factor in determining workload, yet myriad other time-intensive activities are considered integral to faculty members' work and are evaluated as part of salary, tenure, and promotion decisions. These expectations are clearly considered in various performance reviews, but neither are they formalized for accountability purposes nor is there any attempt to use them to the institution's advantage. The college has essentially boxed itself and the faculty into a one-size-fits-all approach which does not reflect the reality of higher education in the twenty-first century. The

proposed Phase II project will provide faculty the opportunity to explore alternatives to the current system and will thereby encourage them to consider innovative instructional approaches that will result in greater teaching efficiency and more reasoned approaches to other aspects of faculty work.

Timeline

The three-year project schedule is as follows:

- C 1998-1999: Preliminary discussion; selection of participating departments
- C Year 1 (1999-2000): Project design in departments and approval
- C Year 2 (2000-2001): Implementation and assessment
- C Year 3 (2001-2002): Continued implementation and final assessment

Detail

Depending on the number of proposals received, eight to ten departments from the college's five schools will be selected to participate in the project. Each faculty member will design an individual work plan for the three-year period. Department faculty will discuss the work plans collectively to ensure that there is balance among them and that all departmental responsibilities are accounted for. A 21- to 24-credit hour annual teaching load will form the basis of each work plan, with other duties, based on individual plans, interests, talent, and departmental needs and obligations (including specified student credit generation number), taken into account. Departments will be encouraged to explore innovative alternative approaches to traditional instruction as a means for achieving its goals. The experimental course format may be used so these new approaches to pedagogical method and course delivery can be tried. A steering committee consisting of chairs or a designee of the participating departments will provide leadership for the project; the associate provost will serve as the project coordinator.

Terms and Conditions

The project will be a partnership among participating faculty/departments, the deans, and the provost's office. Faculty will be free to explore options that allow creative flexibility in designing workload but within existing faculty resources. Additional faculty lines will not be created. However, resources that will support innovative and alternative approaches to instruction, such as technology, may be requested through the annual budget process. Faculty in participating departments will be given full support in all review processes, including tenure and promotion, and will not be penalized for the experimental nature of their work.

Appendix B

Summary of Faculty Workload Department Projects

Art History

The art history faculty decided that their teaching and research time would be more productive and economical if they could design a multi-year staffing plan that would provide a “teaching-free semester.” The teaching-free semester would allow each full-time continuing faculty member in the department time to pursue a research project/s in depth. At the same time it would economize teaching time vis-a-vis the specified student credit hour quotient. A student credit hour “banking” approach was devised in which each faculty member would teach an average of five additional students per class. With seven full-time, continuing faculty in the department, the credits for each faculty member are amortized over six semesters, thereby generating the same number of student credit hours over the seven-semester period. During the “teaching-free semester” faculty agree to be available for all other responsibilities. This approach has resulted in a 14-percent reduction in teaching time that can be reallocated to research.

Organizational Communication, Learning, and Design

The OCLD faculty have focused on developing new instructional strategies, curricular innovation, and the utilization of technology in both their undergraduate and graduate programs. The department’s goal is to maximize instructional effectiveness while making more efficient use of faculty time. Building on previous experimental work in on-line communication, a capstone course was taught through a combination of lecture, class discussion, and on-line laboratory work rather than the lecture format which had been used previously. Similarly, interactive technology is being implemented in certain courses to reduce repeated lectures and provide more individualized, self-paced instruction. A more fully developed internship program for both undergraduate and graduate students will be introduced that will link student projects with community groups and organizations that have communications needs. Finally, faculty will explore the possibility of forming interdisciplinary linkages with other departments to create programs such as health communication and environmental communication. A succession of sabbaticals hampered the department from accomplishing fully its project agenda.

Physical Therapy

The physical therapy faculty has been working on establishing benchmarks for crediting all aspects of its work as they revise the physical therapy curriculum. Part of the effort will be to quantify each work activity and to design formulas that will make possible more equitable and balanced loads. The enrollment in physical therapy is substantial and the curriculum is complex, combining both professional preparation courses and liberal arts study. The faculty perform a wide variety of teaching tasks that extend beyond traditional classroom instruction, making credit bench marking essential for equity and balance among their loads.

Physics

The faculty in the physics department are undertaking a similar project to that in physical therapy.

They have analyzed all of their work components and assigned weighted values. A unique aspect of the physics workload is that, while the number of majors is small, a substantial amount of teaching and related activity is in courses for the non-major, primarily astronomy. A complicating factor that has prevented implementation of the department project fully is that two of its faculty are participating in the retirement incentive program during the implementation phase of the workload project.

Psychology

Of the department projects, the Psychology Department has come the closest to the differential work model proposed by the ANAC Faculty Workload Project. The department's goals in participating in the project were to: accept the principle of differential work, i.e., that faculty may have different workloads in a given year and from year to year; adopt a nine-hour per semester teaching load; acknowledge internship and independent study supervision within faculty workload; and link workload to merit and promotion. To make its work more efficient and fully credited, the faculty undertook an analysis of the curriculum for both majors and non-majors and compiled an inventory of its non-teaching work. After review and discussion of the full work complement, the faculty streamlined its curriculum with a goal of eliminating duplication and redundancy and distributed the work with a view towards expertise, equity, and faculty interests. Each faculty member writes an annual workload agreement that plans teaching, research, and service for the next year. The plans are reviewed by all members of the department and approved by the chair. This has reduced the faculty teaching load by 25 percent for the academic year.

Sport Science

Departmental restructuring and related issues limited the sport science faculty from pursuing the workload project fully. Redesign of certain curricular areas and reconfiguration of staffing and course enrollments have provided opportunities for greater efficiency in the teaching load of some faculty. As well, the faculty are exploring the use of Internet technology to establish consortial relationships with a number of international universities that have sport science programs, thereby expanding course offering for Ithaca College students and enabling international students to take IC courses.

Writing

As the writing faculty continued to develop and refine courses for the general student and the writing major, participation in the workload project enabled the department to pilot a program where students in a designated number of sections received a fourth hour of tutoring each week in a writing lab from a student assistant, usually a writing major. This supplemented faculty instruction and provided the faculty member with time to perform other departmental work, including their own writing.

Appendix C

Sample Assessment Questions

Writing

Students:

1. The fourth hour in your writing class was designed to provide you with further opportunities for you to improve your writing skills. How have you benefitted from the extra class time in each of the following areas: brainstorming ideas; researching; drafting your papers; revising your papers; refining specific skills; interaction with the professor or your student tutor?
2. Do you have specific suggestions for how the fourth hour could be more helpful to you in improving your writing skills?
3. Would you recommend an academic writing course with a fourth hour to your peers? Why or why not?

Faculty:

1. Do you find that students have more time to pre-write, do research, compose, and revise in the classroom? If so, does this benefit their writing? If so, how do you know? How do you measure student progress?
2. How do the students respond to the fourth hour, in terms of participation, attitude, and commitment to the tasks assigned?
3. Has the pilot program enabled you to spend more time in class with individual students? Has this extra time been beneficial?
4. How does teaching Academic Writing I in the pilot program differ from teaching AWI as a three-hour class in terms of student performance and engagement?
5. What have been the benefits of having the fourth hour in a networked classroom?

Psychology

Impact questions:

...on students and learning:

What has been the impact on the number of majors and minors?

the
What has been the impact on the number of student statements (course evaluations) at
end of the semester?

Has there been any impact on the number of honors projects, independent studies, and internships?

Has there been any observed difference in student learning?

...on the College:

Has there been a change in student credit hours generated by the department?

How has the change affected cost of instruction?

How has the workload project affected faculty service to the college?

...on the department:

How has the workload project affected staffing flexibility?
Have there been changes in the perceived amount of work?
Have there been changes in scholarly productivity?
How has participation in the workload project affected faculty job satisfaction?

Physical Therapy

Faculty perspective:

1. How do you currently perceive your workload? Are you generally satisfied or dissatisfied?
2. Have changes been made over the last ten years (especially since conversion to the M. S. degree program) that have affected you?
3. Do you feel that a decrease in contact hours dramatically affected (or would affect) your workload? (Given the same number of students in three versus four sections.)
4. If you were given release from one lab section each week, list three projects that you would pursue during the extra two or three hours (e.g., clinical practice, course development, grant writing).
5. Do you feel that your non-teaching responsibilities (advising, committees, etc.) constitute a reasonable share of your workload?

OCLD

Student learning:

1. How do student view the reorganization of the affected classes?
2. How do students view the co-curricular webteam activity, including its service learning component?

Faculty participation:

1. How has teaching and preparation time been affected for courses that are part of the workload project?
2. How have teaching strategies been affected?
3. How has perceived student learning been affected?
4. How has the use of technology changed and what has been the perceived impact on student participation as a result?
5. To what extent has faculty and student flexibility and use of time been affected?

Appendix D

Ithaca College Academic Program Assessment and Planning Guidelines

“Assessment is a process that focuses on student learning, a process that involves reviewing and reflecting on practice as academics have always done, but in a more planned and careful way.” (*Assessment Essentials*, Palomba and Banta, p.1)

Introduction: The continuing quality and strength of its academic programs* ensure that Ithaca College will remain a vital and attractive learning community. One means for the college to preserve the quality of its academic programs is to review and assess its curricula and student and faculty accomplishments periodically, using a variety of established and reliable measures of success. Some disciplinary accrediting bodies have adopted a student outcomes assessment model for certifying their programs, and various state, regional, and federal accrediting and funding organizations are increasingly using outcomes assessment as a basis for determining program effectiveness. One of these is the Middle States Commission, which requires that Ithaca College implement an institutional outcomes assessment program during the 2001-02 academic year.

Information gathered through assessment can be beneficial for planning the future direction of an academic program or department. Program strengths and weaknesses can be identified through a comprehensive assessment in order to enhance quality or address problems. To bring focus to the Academic Program Assessment and Planning effort at Ithaca College, the mission statement and goals set forth in the Institutional Plan (Fall 2000) developed by the Planning and Priorities Committee will serve as the basis for individual department and program assessment and planning projects, the guidelines for which are given below.

Self-study: The most common method for reviewing and assessing an academic program is to conduct a self-study once every five or six years. To address our Middle States obligation we will begin the cycle of program assessment and planning during the 2001-02 academic year with approximately seven academic departments/units conducting a self-study and reporting the results by May 2002. With the goal of fostering objective review and thoughtful planning, the academic department/unit should consult closely with the dean or appropriate administrator throughout the process and submit its report to the dean or appropriate administrator with a copy to the provost and vice president for academic affairs. A comprehensive presentation on assessment in higher education is found in *Assessment Essentials* (1999: ISBN 0-7879-4180-8, Jossey-Bass) by Catherine A. Palomba and Trudy W. Banta.

Timeline: The department in consultation with the dean will decide on the year during which it will undertake the assessment and planning project. The assessment and planning project should be initiated at least one year in advance of submitting the report. Generally, the department should organize its project and begin to gather data during the spring semester a year prior to the final report date, make analysis and drafting assignments for the following fall semester, and compile the final report during the spring semester of the report year. The report should be submitted to the dean and provost no later than June 1.

*An academic program is the courses and curricula offered by an academic department or unit.

Guidelines and Format for Self-study Report:**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (one or two pages)

INTRODUCTION:

Overview narrative

- C Describe the process used to establish the assessment and planning procedure.
- C Identify the information sought that is the basis for the assessment, the questions asked in the process, and the sources that were used to provide this information.
- C How will the information be used to positively influence student learning outcomes?
- C How will the assessment results be used to influence program planning in the department/unit during the next 3-5 years?
- C Other

ASSESSMENT:

A. Program mission and goals

- C What are the program mission and goals?
- C Relate the mission and goals to those in the college's Institutional Plan and the respective school mission.
- C Describe progress toward the attainment of the program goals.
- C Identify specific program strengths and weaknesses with proposed remedies.
- C Identify innovative program features/developments.
- C Describe the most critical issues and challenges facing the department and the steps planned to address them.
- C Describe departmental efforts in place to participate or assist in student recruitment.
- C Describe the relationship your department has with internal and external programs and/or organizations.
- C What relationship does the department have with other fields or disciplines within the college (e.g., interdisciplinary courses, programs, minors, etc.)

B. Curriculum structure and review

- C Describe the structure of the curriculum and how it was determined.
 - How is the curriculum structured at the introductory level?
 - What is the structure and rationale of the intermediate and advanced courses?
 - Identify the capstone course(s) and give their goals.
 - In what ways are the students involved in research and/or creative activities?
- C Discuss ways in which the curriculum meets standards and expectations established nationally within the discipline.
- C Review and assess the department's curriculum. Describe the ways in which

the department assesses the degree to which it meets its mission and goals.

- C How does the department assess the success of its individual courses and programs?
- C Has the department identified student learning outcomes that are to be achieved (e.g., performance standards, skills levels, etc.)?
 - What means are/will be used to measure their accomplishment?
 - What meaningful data are available and how can they be obtained from sources in the field for the purpose of determining how well the program is preparing students for their work in the field?
 - When did the most recent curriculum review occur and what was its impact?
 - What plans are there for future curriculum review and revision?
 - What do alumni think were their most beneficial experiences?

C. Student learning outcomes

- C Identify student learning outcomes that are to be achieved (performance standards, skill levels, and culminating projects and/or activity).
- C What means are being/will be used to measure their accomplishment (e.g., student test scores on final exams or standardized tests; review of portfolio or senior projects; student focus groups; exit interviews; alumni feedback and accomplishments)?

D. Faculty profile

- C Provide a current *curriculum vitae* for each faculty member that includes scholarly and professional accomplishments for the last 3-5 years.
- C Detail the future direction for this activity, identifying both individual and collective plans.

E. Quantitative data and analysis (for the last three years)

- C application, acceptance, and enrollment data
- C annual student credit hours generated by majors
- C annual student credit hours generated by program
- C annual FTE faculty (breakout full-time, part-time, and adjunct)
- C annual cost for instruction based on FTE faculty (FTE salary total divided by the number of student credit hours generated)
- C annual faculty-student ratio
- C annual number of degrees awarded
- C program components that add value to the college community or student learning environment
- C student placement record
- C market trend analysis
- C How does this information influence program planning for the next five years?
- C Provide information on placement and accomplishments of departmental graduates in the last five years.

F. Resources

- C Summarize the departmental budget over the last three to five years considering operating, capital, library expenditures.
- C Summarize anticipated departmental personnel, space, and specialized resource needs based on the information presented in this self-study.

G. Outside consultant's/evaluator's assessment (specialist in the academic discipline familiar with the program philosophy and institutional context). The outside consultant/evaluator should be provided with information on the curriculum, faculty accomplishments, and student outcomes with an explanation of anticipated future direction and plans. A campus visit should be planned as part of the assessment. If the Introduction and Assessment portions of the self-study are complete, they may be sent as the documentation for the outside consultant/evaluator's review. The consultant/evaluator's report should consist of an oral presentation for the department and dean at the conclusion of the visit and a written report submitted to the dean within one month. The dean will share the report with the department.

H. Assessment of student preparation by persons in the field (student field experience supervisors, alumnae/i, employers, etc.) An inventory and/or anecdotal information, including recommendations, from the assessors may be used.

I. Analysis and Interpretation: summary of assessment information and conclusions that will influence planning for the future

ACTION PLAN:

Provide a report that details the department's plan for the next three to five years in the areas of curriculum and program development, student learning outcomes, staffing, resource needs, and other aspects of the department's work. This plan should result from analysis and assessment of the information and data gathered locally by the department, the external consultant/reviewer's report (Item G, above), and information from persons in the field who are able to assess student preparation (Item H, above).

**Depending on the nature of their course offerings and degree programs, some departments/units may not be able to address specific items in the report format. A brief explanation will satisfy the discussion.

GLB:3/01

Approved by APC: 4/20/01