ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO AND OPERATIONS REVIEW

SCHOOL/COLLEGE PHASE 1 TEMPLATE

Name of school/college: Albers School of Business and Economics
Date: June 7, 2016

Contents

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: For full-time faculty members, we start with the university standard of a seven course load and give one course release for faculty members who are classified as "Scholarly Academics," or SA. The SA classification is based on our **Faculty Qualifications** document, which is attached as an appendix. Course release is also available for endowed chairs and professorships, administrative appointments such as department chair or program director, and for university level activities such as Academic Assembly or Faculty Athletic Representative. Other issues related to course release are addressed in our **Course Release Policy**, which is included as an attachment.

For full-time faculty members who are not Scholarly Academics, the standard seven course load is assigned. This includes faculty members classified as a Practice Academic, Scholarly Practitioner, or Instructional Practitioner.

Workload calculations are done on the basis of courses taught, except in the core curriculum of the Professional MBA and in the Introduction to Business course (BUAD 1000). The former is a team taught course and workload is calculated based on the number of sessions taught. The latter is a two credit course and credits are accumulated into five credit chunks that are considered the equivalent of one course.

Thesis supervision is not an instructional activity in the Albers School. Project oversight is handled as part of a project based class or as an independent study (for which faculty do not receive course release).

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: Undergraduate classes have a soft cap of 35 students and a hard cap of 40. Enrollment over 40 must receive the approval of the Dean. We are targeting undergraduate classes to average 30+ students. One exception is the Introduction to Business course, which is capped at 60 students.

We do face caps as a result of the university core curriculum. The UCOR 2910 Ethical Reasoning in Business course is capped at 28 students. If we had our way, we would set the cap to be consistent with our other undergraduate classes. Other courses we deliver in the university core are typically capped at 19 students, which seems low to us unless there is pedagogical research to support that the benefits exceed the costs. IS 3150, a course required in the business core, is capped at 29 students due to lab size and computer availability.

Most graduate classes have a soft cap of 35 and a hard cap of 40. Enrollment over 40 must receive the approval of the Dean. We are targeting PMBA, MSF, and MPAC graduate classes to average slightly below 30 students. Exceptions are the MBA 5110 Teams and Leadership course and the Professional MBA 5205 course, both capped at 28 because of limits imposed by facilitation challenges. Consulting classes are capped at 18 students. Bridge MBA is capped at 30 and the Leadership MBA is capped at 35, but we have never hit those limits.

There are no class size constraints imposed by our accrediting body, AACSB.

Almost all class rooms in the Pigott Building and the Eastside campus accommodate these caps, although there are some classrooms that cannot accommodate 40 students. We do face one constraint with Pigott 328, our computer lab. It can accommodate 29 students, which forces us to cap computer lab based classes at this lower level. For some of these computer based courses we are able to request Pigott 207, which accommodates 34 students.

Our preferred course size of +/-30 students is based upon past experience and the recognition that this number works well in our courses. A course with 40 students is not preferred, but sometimes necessary to meet student needs. In many courses, less than 20 students is too few to support the class discussion and interaction faculty members wish to have with students.

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: N/A.

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: In terms of number of courses taught, workload is evenly distributed across departments and programs. In terms of number of course preparations in an academic year, some faculty no doubt bear a higher burden than others. This is more likely to manifest itself in disciplines supporting specialized degrees, such as accounting and finance, but may show up elsewhere. In terms of number of students taught (or number of credit hours taught), some faculty face a higher average course enrollment and therefore face a higher workload. Finally, the proportion of undergraduate courses to graduate courses taught also creates potential workload issues given that contact hours are much higher for undergraduate courses. Most full time faculty members teach a mix of undergraduate courses and graduate courses, so that imbalance tends to even out. However, a few faculty members teach only undergraduate or only graduate classes, and therefore carry a heavier or lighter burden, as the case may be.

The Department of Accounting faces the most challenges in terms of course preparations because it supports a large undergraduate program, a large specialized master's program, and several popular certificates (Internal Audit and Valuation). This can be seen in the table below, which presents 2014-15 data on course loads by department, including what can be named the "course prep index," which divides the number of course preparations by the number of courses taught. The higher the index value is, the larger the burden on faculty members.

Department	Course Prep Index Average	Number of faculty with 4 or more preps	% FT faculty with 4 or more preps
Accounting	.67	5	45%
Economics	.59	1	8%
Finance	.59	3	30%
Management	.54	3	18%
Marketing	.53	3	23%

The Course Prep Index is distinctly higher across the accounting faculty, followed by economics and finance, and then management and marketing. An index value of .53 means that for every two courses one teaches, there is approximately one course preparation. The number of faculty teaching four or more preps in the academic year is shown in the third column. Again, there is a larger burden falling upon accounting faculty. The same is true for the last column, which shows that the percentage of department faculty with 4 or more preps is higher in Accounting. Of course, one's total load determines how many preps one can have. A faculty member with a six course load is not directly comparable to a faculty member with a three course load due to release time, since the former obviously has more "opportunities" for multiple preps, but nevertheless the data in the table is instructive.

The Department of Economics teaches predominantly undergraduate courses, so faculty members in the department teach a higher number of contact hours. Business communications and business ethics faculty face a similar situation.

These issues can be illustrated with what can be called the "full load index," which takes the number of contact hours a faculty member produces (number of students x course contact hours), divides by number of courses, and then projects that average to a seven course load. This calculation was done for the **2015-16** academic year in Albers. The resulting estimates produce wide variation both within and between departments, with the Department of Economics in particular standing out, a result of high course enrollments and predominantly undergraduate teaching. This can be seen in the following table, which *is estimated for only full time faculty in 2015-16*:

Department	**Full Load Index Average**	**Full Load Index Range**
Economics	967	567-1185
Marketing	858	420-1202
Finance	808	523-1079
Accounting	801	456-1058
Management	770	465-1162

There is a no unit in the school in which we have underutilized teaching resources. Rather it is a situation of relative scarcity, with the challenge being who faces the largest scarcity of teaching resources.

With respect to the impact of release time, the **Faculty Workload Profile** shows that release time has a significant impact on Albers. For 2014-15, full time faculty members taught 328 classes and had 107 sections of course release, or a ratio of one section of release for every three courses taught. In some ways, 2014-15 was an unusual year for sabbatical leave in the Albers School. We had 28 sections of sabbatical release and 8 sections of pre-tenure sabbatical release, for a total of 36 sections of sabbatical-related release, or 34% of all releases. That is a significant leakage of teaching resources. We had 23 sections of administrative release, amounting to 21% of total releases. Twenty-three sections is more than three full-time positions, and could include another five sections given to program directors, which altogether would amount to four full-time positions dedicated to administrative duties. The table also shows that Albers faculty members received seven sections of release for university service, the equivalent of one full-time teaching position.

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 located within 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: For many years Albers has provided professional academic and career advising within the school. Despite being under-resourced, these services have been offered at a high level and the degree of student satisfaction is relatively strong. This model works very well for us and for our students. As other reports will show, we have a particular need for an additional undergraduate student professional advising position.

It should be noted that 1.5 FTE in the Albers Placement Center are not part of the school base budget, but are paid from other sources (2.5 FTE are in the base budget). The two FTE staff in the Innovation and Entrepreneurship Center is also not supported by the base budget, but is funded from other sources. One graduate advisor is funded by revenues generated by the GMAT/Calculus prep budget, so the position is not funded by the tuition base budget.

We have professional academic advising as a way to support the high teaching and research expectations we have for Albers faculty members. Absent a formal advising roll, faculty members have more time for meeting the course-specific needs of their students and for pursuing their scholarship.

Decentralized career advising and placement services have been delivered in the Albers School for many years because these services are always a high priority for business schools. Having staff in both academic and career advising has also helped us to integrate these two into the student experience.

We have a marketing and communications position in Albers, but rely on MARCOM or outside vendors for creative work. Ideally, we would receive a higher level of support from MARCOM than we do. There is also a difficult dance being done between marketing the school and its Albers brand and marketing of the university. We believe the balance may have swung too far to the university side, because there will always be a need to market graduate programs separately given their distinct target markets.

We have an IT staff member in Albers, but rely on ITS for some services. Our in-house staff provides outstanding service and we would be lost without her. Utilizing her technical expertise, she also helps us to communicate and collaborate with OIT in a way that we would not be able to ourselves. It is clear that our level of technology service and satisfaction would be much lower if we did not have this in-house expertise.

We have two University Advancement employees assigned to Albers, but they are clearly overwhelmed and are struggling to meet our needs. Alumni relations and fundraising would be stronger with more resources assigned to Albers.

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: We use student workers for a variety of tasks, including reception positions, New Student Mentors, Undergraduate Advising, clerical duties, report writing and analysis, faculty research support, and event planning and execution. They sometimes are filling roles previously filled by staff positions that have been eliminated from the budget.

The Albers student worker budget is allocated across departments and programs on an annual basis. New allocations are based on past utilization and an analysis of the existing tasks performed by students. Proposals for new ways of utilizing students are vetted against current utilization to determine where the most value can be added by student workers.

We estimate that student workers replace at least five FTE staff – one in undergraduate advising, one at the third floor service desk, .5 FTE in marketing, .5 FTE in CLF, one in the placement center, and one for University Advancement fundraising and alumni relations.

Our student worker budget is less than needed. Taking the FY16 budget as a base, we estimate we require an additional $28,000 to meet all our needs for FY17.

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 levels are low and are heavily supplemented by gift income and endowment income to a lower extent. In FY16, our tuition-based non-salary funding is $1,127,405, but we will end up spending $2,097,280 on non-salary items. The difference is the amount covered from these other sources.

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: If we had additional resources, we would employ them as follows:

- Raise tenure track faculty salaries to market levels – will improve faculty hiring, retention, and morale
- Raise adjunct faculty course payments – will improve the quality and retention of adjunct faculty.
- Hire an additional undergraduate advisor – improve the undergraduate advising experience.
- Hire an additional graduate advisor and recruiter (a half-time hire is proposed in the FY17 budget) – improve graduate student advising experience and improve graduate recruiting efforts.
- Hire an additional staff member as Associate Director in the Albers Placement Center – improve service to graduate students and international students.
- Increase student worker funding – use in the areas of marketing and communication and support of faculty scholarship.
- Restore summer funding for new hire faculty members – compete more effectively in faculty recruiting and improve scholarly productivity.
- Hire an additional development officer – increase fundraising and donations for the school and university.
- Hire a half-time social media staff member – curate the Albers website and social media site, develop videos for the website and social media sites, etc… -- will improve the marketing of the school and its programs.

If we had to cut spending and that could not be done with academic program changes, we would start with academic advising to undergraduate and graduate students. The impact would be a sharp deterioration in the quality of academic advising provided to students, as well as a decrease in recruiting activities and success.

A second step would be to reduce the level of services provided in the Albers Placement Center. This would mean fewer internships and jobs for students, so those metrics would deteriorate sharply. It might also jeopardize the scope or existence of the Albers Mentor Program, which is staffed by the placement center.

We have not observed any ways to reallocate existing resources to improve quality, effectiveness, or equity within Albers, but we are certainly open to any suggestions anyone may have in this regard.

Other

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

Response: None.

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:

Add Faculty Standards documents for TT and FT NTT faculty members.

Add Course Release Policy.

Add Faculty Qualifications document.