ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO AND OPERATIONS REVIEW
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Introduction
Seattle University is undertaking a comprehensive review of its programs and operations. This review is part of a set of activities aimed at positioning the university for continued academic excellence and financial sustainability within a changing and challenging environment. Other activities include the development of new academic programs, finding ways to increase non-tuition revenue, and developing stronger financial planning and management tools. For more information regarding the expectations and goals of the Portfolio and Operations Review, refer to the “Background and Purpose” document.

Recommendations from stakeholders during the March 2016 campus review reflected a preference that work products and deliverables from the review be made available to faculty and staff. In response to these calls for transparency, datasets, completed templates from departments/programs and colleges/schools, and the final reports from the Analysis and Recommendations Committee and the Provost will be made available. Information relating to the workload of specific individuals will not be shared.

Phase 1: Operations and Workload Review—April 8-June 8, 2016
Phase 1 is divided into three sections that address A) operations and workload review in the schools and colleges, B) review of areas outside of the schools and colleges, and C) formation of the Analysis and Recommendations Committee. These three activities will take place this spring. (Phase 2, portfolio review and scenario planning for schools and colleges, will take place in fall 2016.)

School/College Operations and Workload Review
The goal of Phase 1 is to better understand operations and workload such that comparisons can be made both within the school/college and across the university. Schools and colleges will be presented with reports from central data systems and asked to supply additional data and context. There are four processes within this phase. Each process, as outlined below, involves some combination of reviewing
data and reports, commenting on or adding to those reports, and providing appropriate context, perspectives and recommendations.

1. Faculty workload
   a. Teaching and instruction
   b. Scholarly and creative work, service, and other aspects
2. Staff workload
3. Department/program reviews
4. School/college commentary and recommendations

Each school/college will be provided with a series of reports relating to different aspects of its operations, including Summary Data Tables that contain basic facts about the school/college and each department/program. Each school/college can decide how to share these reports with its faculty. When possible, three to five years of data will be included.

**Faculty Workload: Teaching and Instruction**
The first process undertaken by the school/college will allow the university to better measure and manage faculty teaching and instructional workload. Schools and colleges will be given data sets relating to teaching loads, total sections taught, class sizes, and credit hours generated. They will also be given tools to help them analyze these data.

Using these data and tools, the schools and colleges will be asked to do the following.

1. **Create faculty categories and define teaching loads for each category:** The university employs different types of faculty. The most fundamental differences relate to tenure eligibility and full- or part-time status. Within schools and colleges, there are additional distinctions; examples include clinical faculty and instructors vs. lecturers. To foster a better understanding of faculty instructional workload, each school or college will:
   - Provide an overview of how it defines or understands instructional workload. What policies and practices drive definition of instructional workload? What is the relationship between the number and level of credits in a course section and the amount of work “credited” to the faculty member? What types of instruction are included in workload calculations? Is workload adjusted based on the method of instruction or class size? How does workload reflect other instructional or related activities, such as thesis supervision, project oversight, and advising? Are there any significant variations across departments/programs?
   - Outline the categories of faculty that it uses as part of its ongoing operations (hiring, workload assignment, and evaluation) and define the teaching load that is standard for each category. Record this information in the Faculty Category Overview.
   - The faculty categories will be used later to customize the Scenario Planning Model, described below.
2. **Correct the teaching load designation:** Our central information systems do not indicate whether or not each section “counted” toward a faculty member’s teaching load. The Faculty Course Sections Report contains a row for each course section in academic year 2014-15. Using the instructional method description (e.g., seminar), Column O has been populated to make an educated guess about whether the instructional activity is included in the teaching load of the faculty member. Each school/college should review this column and revise entries as needed to align with the course sections that actually counted toward a faculty member’s teaching load. Pay particular attention to course overloads and course types other than lectures and seminars.

3. **Complete the Faculty Workload Profile:** Each school and college will receive a spreadsheet that lists faculty and their contracted FTE for academic year 2014-15. The school/college will add:
   - faculty categories (established above) and the corresponding standard teaching load
   - course releases and leaves, included a summary of the work enabled
   - other instructional activities such as thesis supervision and project oversight
   - advising loads

4. **Provide information relating to the distribution of course section sizes:** The Course Section Size Report contains a table on the average section size by standard category (e.g., 1000 level, 2000 level, etc.). The Summary Data Tables contain tables on distribution of class sizes by these categories into size buckets (0-9 students, 10-19 students, etc.).
   - If a school/college thinks of its courses in a way that is different from the standard categories (for example, a need to break out clinical courses or labs, or distinguish between different instructional methodologies), it should provide Institutional Research with its logic so that the reports can be re-created with the more meaningful categories.
   - These categories will be used to create a customized version of the Scenario Planning Model and schools and colleges should review this file to understand how the categories will be used. One sheet in the workbook will present the school/college’s AY2014-15 actuals; the other will be set up as model that can be adjusted.
   - The school or college should then provide any information important to understanding its distribution of class sizes. What internal policies or practices govern section sizes? Do accreditation requirements, the physical capacity of instructional facilities, or other factors impact this distribution?

At this point, the school/college will have explained how it defines and measures instructional workload. It will have provided a detailed analysis of how, in one academic year, its definition of faculty workload, distribution of faculty by type, policies and practices relating to course releases and section sizes, and enrollments combined to drive its student/faculty ratio.

In addition to the data and reports outlined above, the school/college will also be provided recent historical data about student and faculty FTE, class sizes, and teaching loads through the Summary Data Tables. The school/college will be asked to articulate its understanding of what the detailed one-year
analysis, considered within the context of recent trends, tells us relating to instructional workload levels across the school/college. Both the data and the school/college deliverables will be used in Phase 2 to analyze instructional workload levels across the university.

As mentioned above, the faculty and course size categories have an additional purpose. The Office of Institutional Research will apply these categories to AY2014-15 actuals to customize a model that shows how variations in key factors (faculty instructional workload, distribution of faculty by type, and class sizes) drive changes in the student/faculty ratio. This model will be used for scenario planning in Phase 2. A preliminary version of the Scenario Planning Model is available for review.

**Faculty Workload: Scholarly and Creative Work, Service, and Other Aspects**

Any analysis of faculty workload must give appropriate weight to non-instructional responsibilities, primarily advising, research/scholarship/creative work, and service.

The first step in this process is to complete the Faculty Category Overview by completing those columns addressing these components of total faculty workload. Such descriptions should be based on the faculty categories defined above such that each category reflects the average level of work performed. Use the Faculty Category Overview to:

- Clarify standards relating to research or creative productivity, including standards for providing additional workload credit.
- Clarify standards around advising and service for each category.
- Clarify standards and expectations for providing administrative releases (school/college funded only; not university).
- If possible, indicate the proportion of time faculty are expected to spend on each area of their major responsibilities. Some school/colleges consider advising part of instruction and others part of service; this analysis will help us understand these differences.

Note that this is a summary of average workload levels at the school/college level and there will be variation within each school/college. Each department/program will have an opportunity to discuss how well this average aligns with their experiences.

**Staff Workload**

The Portfolio and Operations Review will address levels of staffing and staff workloads across the division through the Staff Workload Profile, which will enable an analysis of staff workload comparable to the work done above with faculty. Schools/colleges will complete the profile to show the distribution of staff resources across major categories of employment (administrative support, advising, lab supervision, marketing, etc.) and, where possible, measure workload levels (e.g., number of advisees per advisor) such that comparisons can be made both within a school/college and across the university.

**Department/Program Reviews**
As the school/college reviews and builds out data sets provided by the university, it will also solicit, in a manner appropriate to the organization and culture of that school/college, the information needed for well-informed review and recommendations. At minimum, departments/programs should have the opportunity to address the questions included in the Department/Program Template.

The template will allow departments or programs to speak to contributions unique to their discipline or area; examples might include clinical care or social services provided to the community, contributions to public policy or economic development, or activities that contribute to the cultural life of the city and region. It will also allow departments or programs to identify opportunities, make recommendations, and articulate concerns that should be considered.

Because the schools and colleges at Seattle University vary in culture and organization, it is incumbent on each to determine an appropriate way of distributing data and the department/program templates to ensure that all parts of the school/college have voice in the process.

School/College Commentary and Recommendations
The final deliverable from the school/colleges is the School/College Template, which contains a range of questions relating to the above. Some questions are narrow and direct, for instance, what logic or strategy determines the distribution of student wages? Others are open-ended, asking for context, analysis, opportunities for change, and areas for further investigation.

Assistance
For help with datasets, contact Bob Duniway. For everything else, contact Heather Geiger.

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL/COLLEGE DELIVERABLES
1. School/College Template
2. Department/Program Templates
3. Faculty Category Overview
4. Faculty Course Sections Report
5. Course Section Size Report
6. Faculty Workload Profile
7. Staff Workload Profile

Operations and Workload Review outside of Schools and Colleges
As the schools and colleges are engaged in their Phase 1 work, the other areas across the Division of Academic Affairs will undertake a parallel process. These areas include the Library, Student Academic Services, University Core, etc.

These templates are based on the department and division assessment reports used in the non-academic review process in the summer and fall of 2015. Departments identify their primary activities
(core responsibilities), explain the intended impact of their work, evaluate their success, and assign resources (people and dollars) to each activity. Then departments explore their opportunities for change, including how their work and services might be different if resources levels changed or if they reorganized. The associate provosts will complete a similar report that asks similar questions about all of the departments they oversee.

The University Core coordinates instruction offered by the schools and colleges, and its report will include analysis of this function. (Core courses and the faculty who teach them are included in the school/college data and analyses.) The English Language Learning Center offers both credit and non-credit instruction, and its report will be a hybrid of the school/college and non-instructional templates.

Formation of Analysis and Recommendations Committee

The final key activity of spring quarter will be to constitute an Analysis and Recommendations Committee. In Phase 1 the committee will familiarize themselves with the process and materials. Phase 2 contains a complete description of the role of this body and its charge.

Phase 2: Scenario Planning and Portfolio Review—Fall 2016-Winter 2017

In this phase, schools and colleges will be given additional materials to support scenario planning and portfolio review. These include customized versions of the Scenario Planning Model, plus financial and market demand information. As the schools, colleges, and other parts of the Division of Academic Affairs work on Phase 1 in spring 2016, the Planning and Design Committee will complete design Phase 2, including specific criteria for the portfolio analysis and templates for departments/programs input.

School/College Scenario Planning

One of the goals of the Portfolio and Operations Review process is the identification of metrics (or ranges) that indicate a resource level healthy for both the school/college and the university as a whole. Establishing these metrics at the school/college level has several advantages. First, the majority of resource decisions within a school/college is made at the dean’s level. Second, it minimizes the year-to-year variation that can be misleading at the department/program level. Third, our data are more consistent and complete at the school/college level.

Agreement on what constitutes a health resource level first requires understanding how different measurements are linked. The most fundamental metric for understanding levels of faculty resources across the schools and colleges is the student/faculty ratio (S/FR). The S/FR is itself the product of three factors: workload definition, distribution of faculty by type, and distribution of course section sizes.

Schools and colleges will use the Scenario Planning Model to investigate the impact of these three factors on the student/faculty ratio. The model is intended to provide a tool to better understand our current reality and to investigate the impact of changes in any of the key drivers. What is the
appropriate mix of these key drivers to appropriately support student learning and faculty scholarship and creative work in a resource-limited environment?

Because the model cannot be tested until after it is customized for each school/college, it is likely that the preliminary version will be modified for better functionality, or we may find a different approach is more effective at modeling the interconnected nature of these factors or better suited for ongoing use.

**School/College Academic Portfolio Review**

The portfolio review will follow the following general outline and broad principles.

- It will build from the Undergraduate Strategic Enrollment Plan Academic Subcommittee Report, which articulates the benefits of such a review and provides a list of criteria for consideration.
- The portfolio review will be thoughtful, rigorous, and comprehensive, but it will not take the form a strict prioritization of academic programs. The process will not include forced rankings of academic programs or quotas for percentages of programs to be reduced or eliminated.
- The portfolio review will use clear criteria for evaluation of programs as well as recommended changes, and it will be structured in ways that enable informed comparison across programs.
- The portfolio review will take into account both financial elements, including revenues and expenses, and other considerations such as contribution to the mission, the quality of student learning, and contributions to the community. It will consider and reflect market demand for academic programs and factors relating to the changing environment of higher education.
- The portfolio review will be informed in appropriate ways by peer data. At a minimum, it should be informed by the ratio of the number of academic programs offered at Seattle University (including degree programs, certificates, and specializations) to the overall size of the university and how that compares to peers.
- The process will bolster the goal of supporting the strongest programs, investing in areas of potential growth, and strengthening the ability of the university to pursue its academic mission.
- Any changes to the academic program portfolio recommended or endorsed through this process will go through the established governance processes before implementation.

The Planning and Design Committee will complete design of the portfolio review in spring 2016. It may be further modified by the Analysis and Recommendations Committee based on Phase 1 deliverables.

**Analysis and Recommendations Committee: Role and Report**

The final key activity of spring quarter 2016 will be to constitute an Analysis and Recommendations Committee, the successor to the Planning and Design Committee. It will be responsible for managing the later stages of the review and for making to the Provost final recommendations based on the reports developed in Phase 1 and Phase 2. (A more detailed charge is below.)

The voting members of the committee will be constituted as follows. Appointments will be made consistent with the sequence outlined below, such that later appointments can be made with an
awareness of appointees at earlier stages, helping to better effect reasonable representation across the schools and colleges.

- Academic Assembly will select four tenured faculty members.
- The Provost, in consultation with the appropriate Deans, will select three tenured faculty members.
- The deans (or the Provost) will select one dean.
- The members selected through the process above will select one non-administrative staff person from the division of academic affairs.
- The members of the committee will select the co-chair to work with the ex officio position appointed by the Provost.

The committee will be co-chaired by an administrator or senior staff person appointed by the Provost. This person will serve in an ex officio non-voting capacity and, working with the other co-chair, will be responsible for managing logistics and process, including scheduling, agenda setting, outreach and follow up to schools/colleges as needed, and leading the development of the report from the committee.

The Analysis and Recommendations Committee will be charged with the following.

1. Review the data and information used in this review process, including the completed templates and other deliverables from the schools and colleges.
2. Work with the schools and colleges to revise deliverables such that they are sufficiently complete and consistent to allow analysis and recommendations across the university.
3. Summarize workload standards across the university and indicate whether the variation is problematic or not. Upon completion of Phase 2, the Workload and Operations Review, provide to the Provost a preliminary analysis and recommendation on this topic.
4. Guide and oversee Phase 2, scenario planning and portfolio review.
5. Receive and review all work products from Phase 1 and Phase 2.
6. Issue a report that includes recommendations on a range of topics, including:
   a. Reallocations to improve equity and impact, and adjustments to/standardization of workload expectations.
   b. Changes to the academic program portfolio.
   c. Targets for student/faculty ratios for each school and college that reflect their unique situations while promoting equity and sustainability, and other metrics as appropriate. (“Targets” may include ranges.)
   d. Any policy changes identified as needed or beneficial through the work of the review.
   e. Recommendations for how outcomes of the process should be incorporated into the sustained management and planning of the Division of Academic Affairs.
   f. Other recommendations, including areas for further investigation and analysis.

The Analysis and Recommendations Committee’s work will take place in a time frame such that the Provost will be able to report to the Board of Trustees in February 2017.