ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO AND OPERATIONS REVIEW

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM PHASE 1 TEMPLATE

Name of school/college: School of Theology and Ministry
Name of department/program: Doctor of Ministry
Date: June 9, 2016

Introduction

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 from departments or programs for well-informed analysis and recommendations. Such material falls into two categories:

1. Workload and operations information that is held (or largely held) within the department/program rather than the school/college or central university data sources, such as faculty service performed within the department/program.
    a. Recruitment-monthly emails, phone calls, updates to inquirers
    b. Recruitment- monthly emails, phone calls, updates to applicants
    c. Interviews of people interested and applying to the program
    d. Production of program materials including: handbook, materials related to final project and oral defense, arrangements for binding dissertation projects and securing copyright through ProQuest.
    e. Orientation of students including handouts, powerpoint presentations, and securing all items needed to start student on campus.
    f. Arranging faculty needs during immersion/ residencies- on campus in summers and at Dumas Bay twice a year.
    g. Securing snacks, books, computers, wifii, teaching materials, and other faculty and student needs to have available during intensive residencies.
    h. Arranging for classrooms, teaching needs, managing all internet connections for students at a distance, securing Zoom invitations and ensuring people are logged on and have the right equipment, minor editing of recorded class sessions and posting to appropriate places in Canvas for faculty and students.
    i. Assisting students and faculty in using, designing, and maintaining course content in Canvas.
    j. Writing two grants to fund student scholarships and move the program toward more public theology focus. This entails monitoring expenditures and strategies employed to meet the goals of the grants. It also involves writing annual reports to the granting agencies (foundations).
    k. Finding ways to meet potential ministers toward recruiting them to pursue doctoral studies. So far this includes participating in events where such persons are expected to gather, meeting referrals for coffee in outlying areas- Burien, Tukwila, Yakima, the Washington Peninsula, Seattle. It will involve Portland, Marylhurst, Spokane, and

potentially other places. This involves travel, reimbursements, making arrangements, securing referrals and following up, etc.

l. Participating in national and international groups that keep STM visible and offer the opportunity to meet referrals. So far this includes: the Academy of Religious Leadership, Association of Clinical Pastoral Educators, the Association of Theological Schools, Association of Directors of Doctors of Ministry, and the International Leadership Association.

2. Information, perspectives, and concerns that the department/program believes should be considered as part of the broader review, such as challenges inherent to teaching within a particular discipline.
    a. Managing doctoral projects requires broad and deep knowledge bases. The university needs to devise a way to compensate its tenured faculty for their ability to nurture next generations of researchers, faculty, and high-level professionals. Chairs of doctoral project committees need to spend extra time reading in areas not necessarily their own expertise. They also need time to be more vigilant in monitoring potential issues of plagiarism. They have great access to a library system that is essential to their work, and they need time to use the system adequately in pursuit of expertise driven by doctoral candidate's exploration. Ultimately, the time needs to be compensated as part of a course release or overage. Currently, there is no mechanism for this.
    b. It would be helpful if every doctoral program on campus had a representative from its faculty on the IRB review board. Discussions related to new developments in research are essential to assist in all research on campus.
    c. It would be helpful if we had a research faculty who taught a variety of methods and methodologies for all doctoral programs. The schools (Education, Nursing and STM) could send students every quarter for both qualitative and quantitative methodologies and could populate classes that would encourage interdisciplinary explorations. At this time, only a few faculty in each college or school is able to offer research consultation and oversight to student learner/ practitioner's who are pursuing doctoral work. Thus, those few need assistance in keeping their own skills up to date, with resources that are renewed in both purchasing of texts and potential conversations with each other.
    d. Annual faculty development needs to increase – in our department more than double- to allow for the kind of travel to conferences needed for the doctoral faculty and director to stay engaged in peer discussions of current and future research in their fields. The current allocation of $900 doesn't cover even one conference, and as director I'm involved in at least three groups that impact the doctorate.

The questions below reflect the baseline information that meets the criteria above. Schools and colleges should feel free to add to these questions as appropriate. Please note that this template is part of the Workload and Operations phase; each department/program will have another opportunity to provide information relevant to the Portfolio Review.

Department/Program Review

Please address the questions below and add whatever information deemed relevant to this process.

To the extent that this information is not already available in the template for your school or college, advise regarding the parts of the workload for your faculty not captured by course load and credit generation measures. In particular, if there is any research/scholarship/creative work or service that distinguishes the contributions of the faculty in this department or program from others in the school/college and university, please describe it.

In the doctoral program the faculty must have an area of expertise: leadership, theology, spirituality, counseling and therapy, education, chaplaincy, etc. These are normal expectations of every faculty at SU. In addition, doctoral faculty need to broaden their own areas of interest to expand to new ventures in research. Thus, participation in discussion groups, alternative scholarly areas at AAR/SBL, alternative organizations, and the publishing and presenting in these needs to be encouraged and awarded.

As a person working in this area, I'm also keenly aware of recruiting opportunities- and have accepted some appointments- to the Board of Trustees of CCS/CHS so that our exposure is higher and more broad in Western Washington.

As director I think it would be valuable for me to visit some of the practitioners at their congregations or organizations. They are researching and writing in these organizations and presence helps them and reinforces understanding among the faculty and Director at SU. I think this is somewhat like arranging student teaching and practicum for counseling sites and visiting them for their efficacy.

Response:

Is there information that needs to be considered as a part of an analysis of the "teaching productivity" of the department or program? Are there differentiators in the kinds of instruction taking place or the population of students being educated that impact the ability of faculty to generate credit hours?

We are using intensive residencies, hybrid distance education, synchronous and asynchronous education modules. Supporting each of these is essential to the overall success of the program. Ongoing support for faculty and students adapting to SU technologies is essential to our success. There can't be enough support.

The Doctoral program is very "hands on" as people take time from their leadership roles to pursue this highest level degree. Interestingly, they need more frequent advising, and when they are in the project process, they need almost bi-monthly advising. This is not considered in distributing workloads.

The Doctor of Ministry students are “high touch” leaders who lean heavily on emotional intelligence and interpersonal skills. They require faculty willing to be the same. This means that faculty spend more time in personal conversation, follow up for assignments, remembering what each student is pursuing, and finding and sharing resources with a diverse group of students.

Response:

What unrealized opportunities do you see? Are there ways that the contributions of the department/program to the mission and financial health of the university could be improved?

We have a program that will allow a lot of independent studies. There is no place in the system for faculty to offer independent studies. These studies gather tuition dollars with no expense to the university for faculty remuneration or for facilities used in teaching and learning. I can help more students take more credits using independent studies if there were some stipend available for faculty to earn above their regular teaching contract.

Response:

What particular constraints or challenges does the department/program face?
IT support and synchronous learning at a distance support. This is essential to the success of the program and is universally denied at SU.

The second biggest limit is the restriction on paying STM and SU faculty overages for additional teaching. At this time, STM refuses to hire its own faculty for summer when every other college and school in the university does so. In addition, a Provost’s policy adopted several years ago stopped faculty from accepting additional teaching or administration for additional pay. These policies drive core faculty away from the university in pursuit of stipends and salaries that can support lifestyles in a very expensive city-Seattle. Our faculty leave on the day after commencement and object to any volunteer or teaching or independent study work until mid September. Our students, on the other hand, look for core faculty year around and are confused when they are refused the opportunity to continue to work on projects, research, independent studies, or even courses they could take in their degree programs. This policy was intended to assist faculty in meeting their research demands, but it has harmed faculty morale, the opportunity to make a viable living wage, and student access to core faculty.
Response:

Is there anything else you would like to put on the record?

Response: