

# ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO AND OPERATIONS REVIEW

## SCHOOL/COLLEGE PHASE 1 TEMPLATE

Name of school/college: School of New and Continuing Studies

Date: July 22, 2016

### Contents

Introduction .....	1
Context for standard teaching load .....	1
Context for section sizes .....	2
Commentary and recommendations regarding current status.....	3
Opportunities for change.....	4
Other .....	4
Attachments to the school/college report .....	5

### 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 policies impacting teaching load of our two instructors in the Web Development program are those for full-time non-tenure track instructors, or seven courses per academic year with no research expectation. Instructors teach hybrid courses, in which about 75% of their teaching is done online; they are also required to meet twice a week for two-hour evening labs. Full-time instructors in the web development program are also tasked with creating, updating and maintaining all online components of the courses they teach—as the field changes very quickly, this is very important and time-consuming task.

### **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:

We cap our section sizes at 20 students; this is in line with best practices for online instruction, as well as those for lab-intensive technology courses. We must also bear in mind that NCS students are by definition “high risk” and may require more instructor attention than traditional students. As of now, there are no externally imposed constraints regarding class size in online or hybrid courses. Those may, however, be in the offing. It should also be noted that the WATS courses we offered in AY 2015 as 1000-level courses have been renumbered as 3000-level courses.

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: Perhaps NCS/hybrid, to account for the delivery method and student profile?

## 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: Faculty workload is the same across all programs. No difference between actual and adjusted teaching loads. As far as staffing goes, we are short on administrative support. We have one administrative coordinator (who also serves as budget manager) and no other admins for the entire school. Because we have no other administrative support, the dean and associate dean spend a portion of their time on such tasks as data entry and file management.

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 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: We have over the last year built out positions and policies for advising, recruitment, and admissions. We will hire a director of marketing this year, but have no dedicated advancement position—this position would be helpful to raise scholarship funds since we have no institutional aid. We also have no dedicated technology management position, but for now have enough native knowledge to muddle through. Perhaps most importantly, we have no budgetary or operational support—coupled with our lack of administrative support, this means the dean and associate dean spend much of their time on operational matters, often related to such matters as policy and process development, business process reviews, the enrollment funnel, the CRM and ERP implementations, and scheduling. This leaves very little time to attend to academic matters.

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: Currently we use our student worker funds to help students who are experiencing financial shortfalls, most usually as receptionists or to help maintain the college web site. As we have only \$10,000 in student worker funds, there is not much they can do to replace staff support.

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:

## **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 eventually need more funds for faculty as our enrollments grow, but presently we are in need of administrative help, specifically at the administrative assistant and Director of Budget and Operations positions. We will also need an advancement officer sometime in the near future. Fewer resources would impact morale, enrollments and retention in an extremely negative fashion.

## **Other**

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

Response: I am not sure how useful this process will be for the School of New and Continuing Studies. When the 14-15 academic year began, NCS had just been approved by the Board of Trustees and had two employees—Rick Fehrenbacher, the Director of COPE, and Shawn Rider, the WATS program director. We offered only six courses over the course of AY 14-15. During the course of that fiscal year NCS added more faculty and staff; however, the majority of those hires were made very late in the academic year. It occurs to me that due to these circumstances—the “start-up” nature of the school, the

few courses offered, the limited amount of faculty, staff, and students—the data available is limited, anomalous, and unreliable at best.

We are, however, happy to participate in this exercise and offer commentary and recommendations (though given the nature of available data, these may not be as data-driven as desired).

### **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: