

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO AND OPERATIONS REVIEW

SCHOOL/COLLEGE PHASE 1 TEMPLATE



Name of school/college: College of Arts & Sciences

Date: July 15, 2016

Contents

Introduction	1
Context for standard teaching load	1
Context for section sizes	3
Commentary and recommendations regarding current status	5
Opportunities for change	9
Other	11
Attachments to the school/college report	11

Introduction

Schools and colleges are asked to begin their work with careful review of the reports, data sets and guidelines provided by the university. This template is intended to inform the Workload and Operations Phase as explained in the [Process Outline](#).

Schools and colleges are required to respond to the questions below and are free to provide additional comments and analysis where worthwhile. Please note that this template is only one of the deliverables from schools and colleges in Phase 1 and is not intended to present a complete picture on its own.

Responses to the questions in the latter part of this template should be informed by completed department/program templates. Schools/colleges are encouraged to distribute the department/program templates before beginning work on the questions below.

Context for standard teaching load

First complete the [Faculty Category Overview](#) by articulating the categories of faculty employed in the school/college as well as the standard teaching load and other responsibilities for each faculty category.

Please provide the additional information needed to understand how the school or college defines or calculates instructional workload. Responses will vary by school/college but will typically address the questions below.

- What policies or practices impact faculty teaching load?
- What types of instruction are included in workload calculations? Is any credit-bearing instructional activity not counted?
- Are other instructional activities such as thesis supervision and project oversight included in the standard teaching load?
- Is your standard instructional workload based on the number of courses taught or the number of credit hours? If based on the number of courses, are there any circumstances in which the credit hours have bearing (e.g., 2-credit courses)?

Response:

The College of Arts & Sciences taught 93,840 credits in 32 majors and 7 graduate programs in AY 2014-15. The expenses that are and are not included in each school/college budget vary across campus. However, it is worth noting that A&S taught these credit hours, approximately forty percent of the total credit hours taught at the university, with a budget of \$22M including benefits. Before getting into college-specific standards, it is important to note that the breadth of variability within the College of Arts & Sciences across a host of domains is much closer to the variability seen across the entire university than it is to the variability seen within any other Seattle University school or college. There are many instances where a department has a characteristic unique within the college but similar to another college or even to a non-academic component of the institution. The lecture-lab structure within the Sport and Exercise Science program is more similar to arrangements in Science & Engineering than to other departments in A&S. The clinical supervision in the baccalaureate Social Work and graduate Psychology programs share characteristics with clinical training programs in the College of Education, College of Nursing and School of Theology. Both of our arts departments - Art & Art History and Performing Arts & Arts Leadership – produce many events wherein they engage the residents of Seattle as an audience, more similar in that regard to Athletics than to any other academic program in the university, in addition to providing full academic programs. All of these activities involve widely different staffing responsibilities, resources and overall needs. Thus, while we will attempt to convey college standards where they exist as well as the most typical approaches used across the domains covered by the AAPOR report, the answer to the question of what is standard in the College of Arts & Sciences is nearly as broad and variegated as that same answer is for the university as a whole.

I return to the above questions with that clarification in mind. We base our standard instructional workload on the number of courses taught and the level at which they are taught. We typically define “one course” as a standard five-credit undergraduate course, a four-credit undergraduate University Honors course or a three-credit graduate course. There are exceptions to this policy such as the case of private music lessons, where a certain number of contact hours add up to count as a one credit hour.

The primary credit bearing instructional activities that are not counted in workload are summer courses and independent study courses. Thesis supervision is typically not counted in workload at the

graduate level (I understand this is an issue across several schools and colleges), but at the undergraduate level several departments have departmental honors programs wherein a faculty member teaches an honors seminar course that involves overseeing honors thesis projects. In departments with low numbers of majors, faculty members supervise individual honors projects outside of their standard faculty workload. Internships and practicum placements work differently across A&S departments and programs, largely depending upon the number of credit-bearing internships/practica overseen by the department/program. We do have a standard approach for counting internship supervision at the undergraduate level as course instruction, where supervising a certain number of for-credit internships counts as a course. In programs where credit-bearing internships/practica are taken by large numbers of students (particularly in several of our graduate programs where they are required), an identified faculty member oversees the internship selection process, maintains relationships with the placement sites and supervises students while they are on internship. This typically counts as part of the course workload for that faculty member and there may or may not be some degree of staff support for the faculty member managing that responsibility.

The most significant practice impacting teaching load in the college is the historic practice of considering all workload to be captured within a base teaching requirement of seven courses, with one of these “sevenths” committed to scholarly/creative work for scholarly active tenure-track faculty. Thus, scholarly/creative-active tenure track faculty (the vast majority of TT faculty in A&S) have six courses in their standard load with additional service expectations; full-time non-tenure track faculty typically teach seven courses with additional service expectations but no scholarly/creative requirements or expectations. There is a category of full-time, non-tenure track faculty who teach eight courses and have no service expectations. This category, Teaching Intensive Instructor, is an historical artifact maintained at the request of the faculty in that category when the Faculty Titles Document was initially proposed. We will not hire any future faculty in this legacy category. However, this unusual category highlights the point that we in fact require full-time faculty to engage in eight identifiable responsibilities – seven courses and service, six courses, scholarship and service, or eight courses and no service – without recognizing that “eighth” responsibility in any formalized way as part of regular faculty workload for two of the three full-time categories.

Context for section sizes

Please review the [Course Section Size Report](#) and [Summary Data Tables](#). These reports show, for sections at each level (1000, 2000, 300, 4000, and graduate), the distribution of course sections by size.

Informed by this review, explain your understanding of the drivers behind this distribution of sizes.

Responses will vary by school/college but will typically address the questions below.

- What policies or practices govern section sizes?
- Are there externally imposed constraints from an accrediting or licensing agency? If so, explain.
- How does the physical inventory of rooms and their characteristics factor into section sizes? Are section sizes constrained by the size of a lab?
- What pedagogical considerations inform preferred course section sizes?

Response:

The College of Arts & Sciences is committed to close direct engagement between faculty and students consistent with a quality liberal arts learning experience, with the vast majority of courses enrolling between 13 and 29 students (see CAS Summary Data Table). To answer the last question first, there are many pedagogical considerations that “inform preferred course section sizes” toward the ultimate goal of academic excellence and the College of Arts & Sciences has some general standards we strive to follow. However, a variety of factors - including the wide intra-college disciplinary variability noted above - require flexibility and judgment when applying those guidelines. We run a few courses with over 30 students, but those are generally at the introductory level and in cases of unusually high enrollment rates. There are two outer bounds for course size, the *minimum course enrollment* (the lowest number of students in a course needed to run the course) and the *maximum course cap* (the highest number of students allowed to enroll in a course). The general standard for course sizes in the College of Arts & Sciences is a *minimum course enrollment* of 13 for undergraduate courses and 10 for graduate courses. We do grant exceptions to these numbers in case of exceptional need (e.g. running a course that students need in order to graduate) or space limitations (e.g., one studio classroom in the Fine Arts building only seats eight students, another seats only sixteen). The *maximum course cap* is more variable depending upon the nature of the course, but is typically between 19-35 students for undergraduate courses. The college has instituted a guideline that the lowest maximum course cap is 19 except for unusual circumstances (e.g. an accreditation requirement on course size, the studio classrooms that only seat eight or sixteen students, or chamber music ensemble courses). Some courses, such as internship supervision courses in the Social Work program, do have limits set by external accrediting bodies on course size. Individual programs have exercised latitude in specific course caps depending on the nature of the course with oversight from the dean’s office, where we do our best to prioritize pedagogical need while working within overall resource availability.

The presence of labs does affect section size in various disciplines across the college in different ways. The number of computer stations precisely restricts the section sizes for the Psychology statistics lab, for example, but increasing the section sizes of those labs by more than one or two more students would not work well for pedagogical reasons. Sport and Exercise Science is facing a different challenge in managing lab sections. They run large lecture courses with smaller associated lab sections. As that program is simultaneously growing at a significant pace and enhancing its academic rigor, they are exploring ways to account for the lecture-lab responsibilities in faculty course load.

It is important to understand that the policies associated with the new Core curriculum have also depressed section sizes in two notable ways. First, the 19-student cap for 1000-level Core courses required us to run more course sections with fewer students per section. Using one department as an example, the History department offered seventeen 1000-level Core courses in 2014-15. Under the previous cap of 28 students, twelve sections would have been sufficient to serve the same number of students. Art and Art History report noted the same impact for some of their courses; lower overall core enrollment with a concurrent need to run more sections. This change significantly increased the amount of time faculty members can devote to individual students. It is a quality enhancement made to support the writing-intensive nature of those Core courses, but it is important to understand that this systemic change forced a college-wide reduction in faculty-student ratio, significantly contributing to the decline in student-faculty FTE ratio. Given the very large number of core courses we provide, the temporary

increase in the course caps for 2000 and 3000 – level courses from 28 to 30 students for AY 15-16 was a notable help both in preserving resources and in providing some flexibility in very fully enrolled core courses. I urge the university to consider making that change permanent.

A second policy change in the Core curriculum has also reduced section size and required an increase in section offerings. In my opinion, this second change merits reconsideration. The University Core requires that students take a capstone course *specifically in their major and in each of their majors if they are a double major*. Roughly 50 of our approx. 450 students per graduating class in Arts & Sciences have a double major each year. The structure of the capstone requirement results in the college running a large number of small 4000-level courses. In 2014-15, the College offered sixteen sections that were below the usually-required minimum of thirteen students specifically because they were capstone courses and we had to run at least one for every major. While I understand and support the rationale for a capstone providing the opportunity for perspective on the full undergraduate experience, the rationale is less clear around why the university a) requires that the capstone course be associated with the student's major and especially b) requires multiple capstone courses for students with multiple majors. The second point in particular seems to mitigate directly against the goal of the capstone course being a unifying experience.

If one or more of the course groupings provided in this report contains courses with different drivers for optimal section sizes such that a different method of grouping would be more informative, please identify the appropriate alternate way of categorizing course sections and provide this information to the Office of Institutional Research (IR). IR will then provide a revised report that will serve as the basis for your explanation to the questions immediately above. The section size categories (original or modified) will at a later stage be used as the basis for the [Scenario Planning Model](#).

Response: We contacted Institutional research, requesting and receiving a summary data table that includes course enrollment cutoffs of 10 and 13, to better reflect the standards of the college.

Commentary and recommendations regarding current status

Making use of the information in the completed [Faculty and Staff Workload Profiles](#), please describe your sense of the equity of faculty and staff workload distribution. Responses will vary, but will generally address questions along the lines below:

- Is faculty workload relatively evenly distributed across your departments and programs?
- Is there a difference between the adjusted teaching loads (standard load minus any releases and leaves, as calculated in the [Faculty Workload Overview](#)) and the actual teaching loads (as calculated in the [Faculty Course Sections Report](#))? What circumstances led to this?
- Are there departments or programs that face particular challenges and how would you propose to resolve these?
- Is the current distribution of staff resources within the school/college optimal for accomplishing the work of the school/college? If not, how would you revise?

Response:

We as a college and a university should continue to strive for an optimal distribution of faculty and staff resources, grounded in the understanding that what is optimal will be persistently shifting in ways that will be minor and dramatic at different levels and across time. One of the most significant challenges to optimizing the workload is the absence of concrete recognition of service workload in faculty workload accounting. We clearly acknowledge course/teaching expectations with workload allotments. Documents note the course requirements for different categories of faculty. In the College of Arts & Sciences Full-time, non-tenure track faculty are expected to teach seven courses and scholarly/creative active tenure track faculty are expected to teach six courses. The scholarly and creative work expectations for tenure track faculty have time apportioned to them in the workload of tenure track faculty as a “seventh”. The department reports note that many of our faculty have remarkable accomplishments in their scholarship and creative works given they theoretically occur within 14% of their time commitment to the university. In A&S we have one group of full time faculty, “teaching-intensive full time non-tenure track faculty” who are not expected to provide service beyond the office hours and student engagement that is part of their coursework. They teach eight courses and have no service requirements, a legacy option that was available prior to the current Faculty Titles document and is not open to future hiring. While service is clearly required of all other full-time faculty and considered as one of three critical components of faculty eligibility for tenure, it is not allotted any space in standard faculty workload.

A review of the department/program reports will provide evidence of a substantial amount of service provided by faculty as part of their contributions to their department, the college, the university, and their respective disciplines. It is my opinion that we should immediately recognize a standard volume of service responsibility as an “eighth” responsibility of full time faculty. The Faculty Handbook already outlines service as a clear and significant responsibility without an allotted place in the workload. Such recognition would allow an opportunity to develop better standard expectations for faculty service contributions, and perhaps clearer guidance on when and how we formally shift faculty time from a course responsibility to service responsibility. It may also be a way to shift from the awkward language and math of “sevenths” to a conceptualization of workload being proportional via representation in percentages (or at least a transition from sevenths to eighths) providing a vastly more functional, even-numbered denominator, while validly recognizing a piece of workload presently invisible in time allotment. There is a problem with the language of “eighths” in that it could give the appearance of adding more work rather than communicating my intent of recognizing existing work. A change to percentages may mitigate that problem and I understand informally that other colleges may have adopted that approach. In either case, a constructive next step after that initial recognition would be for the university or college to develop a standardized means of categorizing service activities according to the degree of time and commitment required.

There are many cases where faculty are engaged in service above the regular level of service work required in their specific faculty categories. In those cases where extra time is provided (e.g., department chairs, university-wide administrative leadership positions) faculty members do have workload commitments shifted from teaching to service time. The volume of service that we consider “standard” varies somewhat across departments for tenure track faculty, but the variability in that standard is wider for full-time non-tenure track faculty across departments. The requirement that all

FTNTT faculty members engage in service (beyond holding office hours develop about five years ago with the advent of the “Titles Document” and college-wide standards have not yet been developed.

There are two types of challenges faced by various departments around teaching loads, equally difficult for different reasons. The first challenge is in departments that have experienced significant enrollment growth, without commensurate faculty growth, at either the undergraduate (e.g., SPEX) or graduate (e.g. Criminal Justice) levels. The other challenge is faced by programs that have seen a reduction in student enrollment either due to changes in the core curriculum and/or in number of majors, such that they face challenges with finding courses for the faculty in their program. Given that a measure of impermanence surrounds us concerning enrollment levels within and across programs, it would likely be impossible to “resolve” these challenges permanently as the question is phrased. However, the key to managing these issues is careful attention to allotment of faculty FTE, balancing the issues of course coverage, staffing stability, staffing flexibility, staffing quality and of course academic excellence in program delivery.

It is not clear whether “the current distribution of staff resources within the school/college” is “optimal for accomplishing the work” of the College of Arts and Sciences. We strive to hire and position staff based on programmatic needs as best we understand them. Some of the factors in that determination are included in the AAPOR “Staff Workload Profile” spreadsheet, such as the number of faculty FTE, program majors and overall student FTE supported by individual staff members. However, some other major factors are not included. For example, the degree of public engagement by our two Fine Arts departments requires much more staff time and very different staff activity than that needed by other departments of the same size that do not regularly produce plays, exhibitions or concerts. Another important consideration is that graduate programs require more staff support per student FTE compared to undergraduate programs because the grad program faculty and staff have a much larger role in recruitment and admissions processes than is the case for most undergraduate programs. The AAPOR has demonstrated that it would be productive to engage in a review of staffing levels and individual staff member workloads across the college. I plan to explore that issue with an appropriate committee in the near term and we will need to add considerations such as those noted above to the data in the Staff Workload Profile form before reaching and moving forward with actionable conclusions.

Schools and colleges have a number of needs and responsibilities beyond the core academic functions of teaching, research and creative work, and scholarship. Examples include academic and career advising, marketing and student recruitment, technology management, and development/fundraising. The resources for such functions are in located variously within the department/program the school/college, centrally located or managed through a blend of these.

- What observations and recommendations do you have regarding your ability—and the support you receive—in meeting all such needs and responsibilities?

Response: Each of these domains provide challenges in different ways and while staff and faculty are doing good, hard work in all of these areas we do have room to continue to grow and improve across the board. Our internal academic advising office is small proportional to the size of our college overall and provides varying types of support to faculty and staff depending upon their department/program.

We have increased the degree of coordination with career advising. I believe that continued integration between foundational liberal arts education and professional preparation - as opposed to building the two as separate streams within the college and university - is critical to our mission and the future of our students in the 21st century.

Concerning marketing and recruitment, the area of greatest need is in several of our programs that require targeted recruitment (e.g., graduate programs and undergraduate programs that have more targeted audiences and unique admissions processes such as the Strings program). We also have a need for improved marketing support for our community-facing arts activities. Growth in graduate scholarship availability has been a boon to our graduate programs, but there are some places where we still offer fewer incentives than programs of comparable quality at other institutions (e.g., we are one of only two Top 20 nationwide MSAL programs that does not provide work placement, due to internal resource limitations).

Technology management is a domain that feels very much outside the purview of the college under the current university-wide approach to technology management. We have seen significant improvement in this area, but significant challenges remain. Canvas and online course training provided by CDLI are notable positives. Three areas that could benefit from continued growth are in-room support (both for classes and special events/presentations), computer refresh and software/technology acquisition for non-standard and higher end users.

Development/fundraising is a domain of continuing growth for the college. Our final fundraising total for FY15-16 was \$1.98 M, the highest one-year total for the college since the fundraising campaign for the Lee Center. As with all of the areas noted above, more resources would improve results, enhanced staff support for our major development officer for example, but it is my sense that we are doing well relative to our resource availability. Increased responsibilities for the dean do create needs for support in the dean's office for other activities.

Please provide an overview of the role of student workers in the school/college, responding to the questions below:

- What types of work do your student workers do? E.g., graders, administrative support, research support, etc. (This supplements the student worker information in the [Staff Workload Profile](#).)
- What logic or strategy determines which departments/programs receive student support? Is this periodically adjusted? (The [Budgeted Resource Overview](#) contains student wages by department.)
- To what extent do students replace staff support?
- Are your student wages/FTE more than you need, appropriate to your needs, or insufficient?

Response: Across the College of Arts & Sciences, the roughly 150 student workers employed in AY 2014-15 engaged in a wide variety of work activities, from serving as tutors in the Writing Center to working on marketing and recruitment for graduate programs to working for faculty on their research and creative works. Broadly speaking, the resource needs of the department/program determine where we student support, with some exceptions noted below. The aforementioned graduate marketing and recruitment activities are an example of a significant need for several graduate programs that was

addressed (in some measure) with graduate student workers. In that case, students did not replace staff support but we hired student workers rather than hiring staff due to budgetary considerations. There are some exceptions to a strict “resource needs” approach. The students who work for faculty on research and creative work are not allocated based on resource needs. A faculty committee that reviews faculty proposals and awards the student worker time based in a competitive review process allocates them. Our student wages seem roughly appropriate to our needs.

Non-salary funding:

- The majority of the Portfolio and Operations Review is about people: faculty, staff, and students. What, if anything, is important to add regarding non-salary funding?

Response: Non-salary funding is a very important but disproportionately small percentage of the overall resources of the College, roughly 3.7% of our total budget at present and down from 5% two years ago. In the two recent budget adjustments, non-salary funding shouldered a disproportionate amount of the actual reductions, 10% of the adjustment in AY15/16 and 16% of the adjustment in AY 14/15. These reductions are in the face of significant increases in catering charges and certainly have limited what we can do in a variety of ways.

Another challenging issue in non-salary funding has to do with management of course fees. The university charges course fees are directly to students in a specific course, and the idea behind those fees is that they should be used directly toward materials needed specifically for that course, whether that be canvasses for a painting course or video equipment for a Film Production course. Thus, the amount collected by the university relates directly to the number of students in a given course and could cover the costs proportional to the enrollment in particular sections. However, the university presently routes those fees into the general university budget and the amount received by instructors is a fixed budget amount, not impacted by increases or decreases in course enrollment. One of my concerns about this traditional SU approach is in covering expenses when sections are larger than projected. Another concern is that this lack of relatedness between course fee collection and availability of collected funds for the specific course is unique among higher education institutions in my experience. It is also unique in the experience of other SU deans and faculty who have relocated here from other institutions with whom I have spoken. Our experience is that most universities use fees associated with a specific course to support the needs of that specific course, in a way that is much more precise than the approach that is appropriate for more general, university-wide fees such as technology or fitness center fees, for example.

Opportunities for change

What else would you like to share regarding opportunities for change?

- If you had additional resources, what would you adjust operationally to improve? What would be the impact? At this time, we are not interested in academic program changes (refer to Phase 2 in the [Process Outline](#) for more about the academic program portfolio review), so focus your response on the other aspects of school/college operations.

- If you had fewer resources, what would you adjust operationally and what would be the impact? Again, in this phase, we are not interested in academic program changes.
- Are there ways that with your current level of resources, you could improve quality, effectiveness, or equity within your school/college?

Response:

We will always be able to do a better job in educating our students and pushing the edge of knowledge in scholarship and creativity when we have more resources. At the same time, we must continue to steward our resources carefully, making difficult decisions about resource allocation with the greater good of our endeavor at the base of our decision-making. I believe the college and university are doing well so far in meeting the challenges of resource constraints that are now a permanent part of providing higher education in the 21st century. Fundamentally, we should put new resources toward meeting our mission and strategic goals. Part of that approach relates to program changes in the direction of new program growth, but this form specifically excludes such recommendations. It is worth noting that the university has done a good job of solidly resourcing our most recently developed new programs (e.g., the MSW program, the University Honors revision) and I believe that work will result in these programs getting off to a good start and enrolling strong students. There are of course a host of opportunities for operational improvements that can elevate our academic experience to an even higher level of excellence. One such large and complex resource issue is space. Particularly among our growing programs (e.g., Criminal Justice, Film Studies, Social Work and others), we have a need for space which can house the faculty and staff of these programs together as units, rather than faculty and staff in a single program being housed across spare spaces in other department wings. I also think it would be helpful to regularize the salary equity adjustment process in a 5-7 year cycle. That being said, in terms of a systemic change within my purview as dean I would first adjust stipend compensation for department chairs and program directors, as I know it lags notably behind comparable leadership positions at other institutions and I suspect within the university. Next, I believe our graduate student recruiting, admissions-specific undergraduate programs and arts programming would significantly benefit from additional resources for marketing and recruitment activities. It is worth mentioning that a non-operational priority meriting attention for the coming year is the university commitment to inclusive excellence; the college will be dedicating existing resources to supporting that work within A&S.

In the instance of fewer resources, it would be very difficult to make a major adjustment without considering academic program changes, which again this exercise excludes from consideration. Given that restriction, I would first work with the University Core leadership and the Provost's office to advocate reinstating the shift from a max cap of 28 to 30 students in 2000 and 3000 level core courses. This change would allow us to reduce the number of core sections offered at those levels by about 6% or roughly 21 sections based on the CAS Summary data provided for this review. We would also become even more active in our ongoing work to reduce the number low-enrolled courses and explore other places where we could combine courses or offer them in alternating years without significant disruption to student graduation timelines.

Other

Please share any other information, concerns, or opportunities valuable to this process.

Response: First, I must acknowledge the hard work that many department chairs, program directors, faculty and staff put into examining, checking, and interpreting the very large amount of qualitative and quantitative data that went into this set of reports from Arts and Sciences. I appreciate all their work and the work of Sarah Curtis-Tilton in particular in leading the data organization

Second, and more concretely within the context of the approach taken by this process, it is important to note that AY14-15 is a low point for A&S in undergraduate student credit hour enrollment across the past six years, AY10-11 to AY15-16, just as AY13-14 was a low point in graduate student enrollment for the college. From AY14-15 to AY15-16, our Undergraduate Student Credit Hours increased from 84,342 to 86,457 and our Undergraduate Student FTE increased from 1,874 to 1,921.

Third, and more generally, this process has been particularly valuable as a process in exploring data and the challenges with our current data collection and evaluation processes. The 20+ department chairs and program directors who wrote reports specific to their units and I encountered several data issues as we developed our respective reports. In order to note specific issues (which range from reporting data errors to interpretive considerations) we have provided a second "A&S Data Issues" report along with this required report. I think this exercise provides a valuable opportunity to change and improve data recording and reporting as we are in the beginning of the RevSU process.

This notation on data issues leads to another, perhaps more important point in interpretation: this process is collecting and reporting data that are at least one level deeper than can be constructively interpreted. One of the concerns of department/program leaders as they wrote their departmental reports is that this data set might be considered sufficient for decision making on its own. The level of interconnectivity among our undergraduate programs in particular make it difficult beyond consideration to attempt to examine and act upon individual program reports provided in this process. It is a first attempt and college-level program reviews and I believe it is a good first run at such work. It is my hope that it will also help all community members to have better understanding of the university at the broad college and university levels.

Any process such as this review will invariably focus on the areas for growth and improvement far more than areas of continuing excellence and stable strength. We face a fascinating and difficult challenge. From the external perspective of those who see (and particularly those who pay) our tuition, we are a very resource-rich institution. From an internal perspective, many faculty and staff have a sense that resources are scarce for the particular aspirations, plans and needs of the programs in which they engage and to which they have dedicated their careers. We must balance the competing challenges of breadth, depth, quality and resource availability as we decide how and where to engage the resources entrusted to us by the students and their families toward the academic mission we and they hold so dear.

Attachments to the school/college report

Attach any school/college policies relevant to this process, e.g., definitions of research activity, service expectations, or course release policy. Please list the documents below.

Response: Please see the attached Data Issues Report for more information about issues we encountered in the various AAPOR data sets.