

John Carroll University

Academic Planning Task Force Phase II Report

March 25, 2013

Academic Planning Task Force Steering Committee

Lauren Bowen	Associate Academic Vice President
Lindsay Calkins	Associate Dean, Boler School of Business
Jeanne Colleran	Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Gwen Compton-Engle	Associate Professor of Classics; Director of Core Curriculum
James Krukones	Associate Academic Vice President
Anne Kugler	Professor of History
Mike Martin	Associate Professor of Biology
Dave Mascotti	Professor of Chemistry
Maryclaire Moroney	Associate Dean for Student Services and Academic Advising
Mindy Peden	(past member); Associate Professor of Political Science
Nick Santilli (co-chair)	(past member); Associate Academic Vice President (past); Associate Professor of Psychology (past)
Tom Short	Professor of Mathematics
Tom Zlatoper (co-chair)	Professor of Economics

Contents

I. Executive Summary	3
II. Working Group Reports:	
Curriculum	7
New Programs and Interdisciplinarity	12
Teaching Excellence	57
Advising	65
Faculty Workload and Recognition	70
Academic Prioritization Protocol	81

In its January 2010 report *Academic Excellence: A Framework for Renewal and Innovation*, the Academic Planning Task Force (APTF) articulated an academic strategic plan. To achieve the goals of this plan, the APTF suggested that the Academic Vice President establish five working groups--Curriculum, New Program Development and Interdisciplinarity, Teaching Excellence, Advising, and Faculty Workload and Recognition--and a steering committee. Membership of the working groups and steering committee was completed by November 2010. Dr. John Day, Provost and Academic Vice President, convened a workshop for all members of the working groups on January 14, 2011, which marked the formal beginning of Phase II of the APTF.

This document summarizes efforts undertaken by the five working groups and the steering committee from January 2011 through May 2012. Part I provides an executive summary of issues addressed by each group and overarching goals. Part II includes detailed reports for each group, indicating charges, accomplishments and recommendations.

I. Executive Summary

A. Issues Addressed by Working Groups

The Curriculum Working Group has concerned itself with the following issues since January 2011: (1) Does our current curriculum adequately address the Institutional Learning Outcomes? (2) What curricular models can we envision or investigate to address the themes of foundational competencies, integration, the Jesuit educational tradition, and global learning? (3) What are faculty perspectives on these four themes? We solicited faculty input through a faculty-wide workshop, an online survey, visits to all academic departments, and faculty discussions on foundational competencies and global learning. The Working Group has already submitted preliminary reports on activities (1) and (3).

The New Programs and Interdisciplinarity Working Group undertook a prioritization project to identify current interdisciplinary activity at John Carroll and initiated a brief benchmarking of other institutions. A SWOT analysis was performed to assist our thinking of what administrative and philosophical structures would be needed to develop and sustain curricular innovation at John Carroll.

The Teaching Excellence Working Group spent much of its time considering high-impact pedagogies, the recognition, support and reward for good teaching, and the development of a common student evaluation of teaching (SET) for the College of Arts and Sciences. Of all the topics discussed, measurement, recognition, reward and support of teaching was, perhaps, the one that garnered the most attention. In the final phase this spring, the group discussed concerns about the use of SETs in general and the possible adoption of a common SET across all departments in arts and sciences. Selection of evaluation questions, mode of delivery, and utilization of the resulting data were the main topics of conversation.

The Advising Working Group was charged with examining the strengths and weaknesses in our current advising model, with particular attention to how we as advisors can facilitate a more intentional, integrative, and individualized selection of courses for our students. The Working Group developed a mission statement for academic advising at John Carroll, and recommended establishing and supporting a transparent, effective, and coordinated university-wide advising program, designed to maximize guidance and assistance for students, and provide appropriate recognition for faculty advisors. We concluded by articulating the expectations we have for an academic advising center, our understanding of how to monitor its efficacy, and our assumptions about the role technology will play now and in the future for advising.

The Working Group on Faculty Workload and Recognition initially concentrated on investigating and articulating areas of faculty workload that have been potentially out of balance. This led to an examination of independent studies/theses and committee service and the ways in which the former in particular are compensated at other institutions. Subsequently turning to a more integrated model of faculty work, we developed a baseline model of what faculty do that could be applied to some degree across the University; identified elements of faculty work fell into the basic categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. We also surveyed a wide array of comparable institutions to see if they had achieved a comprehensive understanding of, and policies around, faculty workload. The results varied but clearly showed “faculty workload” to be a meaningful concept that has received serious attention. Finally, we discussed specific ways in which faculty work could be more effectively recognized on campus and promulgated to the wider community.

The APTF Steering Committee has begun to develop an academic program prioritization protocol to facilitate the evaluation and prioritization of academic programs. Thus far, we have: (1) read and discussed Robert C. Dickeson’s *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services: Reallocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance*, which suggests ten criteria to serve as guidelines in the development of prioritization protocols as well as methods of rating programs and services common in academic affairs; (2) participated in “Academic Program Prioritization: Integrating Academic and Financial Planning,” a webcast by Robert C. Dickeson and Larry Goldstein; (3) discussed the ten criteria for prioritization provided in the Dickeson book and weighted them to

determine their relative importance in the John Carroll environment; and (4) drafted a prioritization protocol, discussed the draft and suggested revisions.

B. Overarching Goals

The APTF Steering Committee recognizes that decisions regarding the structure of the curriculum and the scope of interdisciplinarity must be made and that these decisions will substantively impact John Carroll's academic landscape. Regardless of the timing and nature of these decisions, we recommend that potential reallocation of both capital and human resources leads to a firm commitment to the following overarching goals:

- Equitable distribution and proportional reward in faculty workload. We believe this will require establishment of consistent assessment mechanisms across the University, including, for example, assessment of teaching, advising and programs.
- Intentional alignment of the curriculum with the recently approved learning outcomes. We believe this will require support for innovation and interdisciplinarity.

II. Working Group Reports

Curriculum Working Group Report

Members:

Matt Berg, History

Santa Casciani (former member), CMLC

Jeanne Colleran (co-chair), Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Gwen Compton-Engle (co-chair), CMLC; Director of Core Curriculum

Kathleen Lis Dean, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness

Kathy DiFranco, Registrar

Doris Donnelly, Theology and Religious Studies

Penny Harris, Sociology and Criminology

Graciela Lacueva, Physics

Beth Martin, Psychology

Patrick Mooney (former member), Philosophy

Dan Palmer, Mathematics and Computer Science

Mark Storz, Associate Dean, Graduate School

1. Original Charge from Phase I APTF Document

Our charge from the original APTF Phase I document was broad and multi-faceted. Below are the passages from the Phase I document relevant to the curriculum working group.

From Phase I p. 7: “APTF recommends a comprehensive review of the curriculum that addresses the questions raised in Appendix D and produces a report with clear recommendations concerning the goals, structure and function of the JCU education.

The Academic Planning Task Force recommends that the Academic Vice President commission a faculty committee to review the curriculum in light of the learning outcomes. It recommends that the committee address the questions in Appendix D, undertake consultation where appropriate, and pursue other relevant issues as they arise. The APTF suggests a preliminary report, with specific recommendations concerning curricular change, be given to the AVP and to the faculty in December, 2010.” [Note: our working group was *formed* in December 2010.]

From Phase I Appendix D, pp. 14-15:

Recommendations:

1. The APTF strongly recommends that the entire curriculum be evaluated and that core reform should not be the exclusive focus of this study.
2. It further recommends that the Curriculum Committee map the current curriculum to the institutional learning goals.
3. In consultation with the AAVP for Planning, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, it urges the Curriculum Committee to evaluate JCU against peer, competitor, and aspirant institutions.

4. It requests that the AVP to make funds available to send a cohort to relevant AAC&U or other meetings.
5. Finally, it suggests that a set of common readings on curricular reform be assembled by the AAVP for Planning, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness and made available to the committee.

The APTF [Phase I] suggests the following issues for discussion and recommendation; they are not prioritized.

1. Overall credit hour; 120 hour model. Should we move to 120 credit hours for graduation? Would doing #1 above make such a move more or less practical? What changes in Core and majors would be necessary to move to 120 hours?
2. Should we go to 4 credit hour courses? What are the pedagogical benefits of students focusing on 4 courses per semester versus 5 or 6? What are the practical difficulties in making such a move and do they outweigh potential pedagogical benefits?
3. Can the curriculum better harmonize and integrate liberal arts and sciences, professional studies, and social justice and social action? The committee should perform a critical review of all the academic programs currently offered by JCU. Are all the programs in line with the academic mission of JCU and are they in demand by our constituents?
4. Core: What would a non-distributive Core look like? What can such a Core accomplish that could help JCU achieve its learning outcomes? Should we move in that direction? Is the present core too large?
5. Is the curriculum CURRENT: does it reflect changes in knowledge, information exchange, disciplinary procedures due to such influences as globalization, information technology; biotechnology; cybernetics and virtuality; global symbolic economy; emergence of non-state actors; religious conflict; new ethical and moral dilemmas; reconsideration of political rights , environmental issues, climate change, rise in entrepreneurship, etc.
6. Is the curriculum RELEVANT: does the coursework enhance critical thinking skills and decision making; does it allow students to align their courses so that meaningful intersections emerge?
7. Is the curriculum INNOVATIVE? Does it allow students sufficient freedom to follow individual interests and areas of specialization? Does it balance traditional pedagogies with experiential or other high impact pedagogies? Encourage risk-taking and discovery?
8. Size: Have the requirements for any of the pre-professional majors become too large? Are there any departments that could reduce the size of their majors and still meet accreditation and licensing requirements through creative measures?
9. Does the curriculum sufficiently address issues of internationalization, inclusion, and diversity? Are these issues consigned to individual courses rather than woven throughout the curriculum?
10. Is there a sufficient technology component? Do courses raise critical awareness of technology's effect on the human experience?
11. How should the curriculum incorporate on-line learning? Consider the appropriateness of such different models as: full on-line instruction and degree programs, mixed methods which include in-class and on-line learning and other forms asynchronous instruction.
12. What should be the specific learning outcomes of FYS? Does our current model achieve those outcomes?

13. Do our students possess adequate skills in managing information, fluency in multiple forms of information identification, acquisition and presentation.
14. How will interdisciplinarity affect the core?
15. How creative thinking, production, and fine arts appreciation be better represented in the core? Will courses in Music Theory, The Symphony, American Music, Music in the Classic Period, Opera, Dance, Photography, Film, Painting, etc., attract more students? How might they be made available in partnership with Student Affairs?
16. Is the current core inflexible? Do students view completing the core curriculum as something to “get through” or as a “menu” rather than an essential component of the JCU education? The Committee might consider what kind of foundation the current liberal arts core provides in relation to the rest of the student’s academic experience.
17. Can a relatively firm three-year rotation of courses be designed?
18. Can the University better communicate the value and relevance of a liberal arts education in the twenty-first century? Further, can a student be given greater independence and responsibility for determining some aspects of how core requirements are fulfilled?”

2. Charges Attended To and Accomplishments

The Curriculum Working Group has worked conscientiously and vigorously since January 2011 to attend to its charge of a “comprehensive review of the curriculum.” Our work has been guided by the Phase I Institutional Learning Outcomes and attentive to the mission of the university. Given the scope of our initial charge, the group could not attend fully to all eighteen “issues to consider” from the Phase I report. Below we detail the activities that we undertook to attend to our charge, and we also specify which issues we chose not to address.

Activities:

a. Curriculum-Mapping (Spring 2011). During the Spring 2011 semester, the group began by mapping the current curriculum to the Institutional Learning Outcomes, as recommended in Phase I Appendix D. Many of the 18 questions listed in Appendix D (especially #4-7, 9-10, 12-16) were raised in the curriculum-mapping process, since the learning outcomes themselves reflect many of these concerns. The result of this curriculum-mapping exercise was a report created in March 2011, submitted to the APTF Steering Committee Co-Chairs, presented at the May 20, 2011 APTF workshop, and later presented to the faculty as a whole. This report presented the group’s evaluation that our current core curriculum falls short of meeting the learning outcomes in several areas.

b. Exploration of Core Models (Spring-Summer 2011; Spring 2012). In order to address question #4 in Appendix D, as well as the Phase I APTF recommendation that we “evaluate JCU against peer, competitor, and aspirant institutions,” the working group examined model core curricula from other colleges and universities in Spring 2011. During Summer 2011, the working group began further consideration of four main themes that arose from the discussions of those core models: integration; the Jesuit educational tradition; foundational competencies; and globalization. These themes formed the basis for our conversations with faculty in 2011-12 (see

below). In Spring 2012, the group again took up the question of core models and began to further develop a curricular model informed by the four broad themes articulated above and the feedback received from faculty (see below). Our work on this model has also addressed some of the more pragmatic questions raised in Appendix D, such as the number of credits toward graduation, number of credits per course, and relative size of the majors and the core.

c. Soliciting Faculty Perspectives (Fall 2011-Spring 2012). While this was not an explicit recommendation of APTF Phase I, it became clear to the working group that any recommendations concerning curricular change would need to be well-informed by the perspectives of faculty throughout the university. Therefore the working group undertook extensive consultation with the faculty at large, including the following: the faculty-wide APTF workshop on August 26, 2011, which focused on curricular issues; hour-long visits to every academic department in fall 2011 to discuss curricular integration (questions #3 and 14 from Phase I Appendix D); an online survey open to all faculty; a set of faculty discussions on Foundational Competencies in January 2012 (#6, 10 and 13 from Phase I Appendix D); and a set of faculty discussions on Global Learning in February 2012 (#5 and 9 from Phase I Appendix D). The working group compiled a report on the feedback we received in all of these discussions and released the report to the entire faculty in March 2012. That report is also available on the Faculty-Sensitive Business Blackboard site.

Issues We Have Chosen Not to Address:

- a. The working group quickly recognized that it did not have sufficient expertise to evaluate curricular issues within majors, not only the explicit question about size of majors (#8 from Phase I Appendix D) but also the relevance of all of the questions above to major programs. We do believe that this evaluation of major programs is necessary, but we recommend that it be conducted by individual departments (see under recommendations below).
- b. Our discussions have not at all addressed the issue of online learning (#11 from Phase I Appendix D), nor do we anticipate making any proposals about online learning.
- c. We have not discussed the feasibility of a 3-year rotation of courses (#17 from Phase I Appendix D).

All of the other questions raised for our working group by APTF Phase I have been and will continue to be a part of our group's discussions. The major charge that we have not yet completed is that the committee should make "specific recommendations concerning curricular change." Because any such recommendations were dependent on the Institutional Learning Outcomes, the working group thought it best to hold back on specific recommendations until those learning outcomes had received full faculty approval. Since that approval was granted by faculty vote in May 2012, the working group can now proceed with developing specific proposals as outlined in the recommendations below.

3. Recommendations and Next Steps

The APTF-Curriculum Working Group recommends the following:

- That this working group continue for the 2012-13 academic year.
- That in September 2012, the working group put forth one or more specific core proposals for faculty discussion. The proposal(s) should align with the Institutional Learning Outcomes, support the mission of the university, and accommodate a 120 cr. rather than 128 cr. minimum number of credits for graduation.
- That the APTF-Curriculum Working Group work together with Faculty Council leadership and the Committee on Academic Policies to hold hearings on the proposal(s) in October 2012.
- That no later than March 2013, a faculty-wide vote is held concerning one or more models for curricular change.
- That if a faculty-wide vote approves substantial curricular change, the implementation of the new curriculum will be the responsibility of either a new committee or the University Core Committee.
- That individual departments and programs examine their own curricula with the following questions in mind, and report back to their appropriate dean:
 - How does their departmental curriculum align with and support the Institutional Learning Outcomes?
 - How would their major requirements fit within the parameters of a 120 cr. model?
 - What impact might a new curriculum, if adopted, have on their majors, and what adjustments to the major might be necessary?

New Programs and Interdisciplinarity Working Group Report

Introduction and Context

The Academic Planning Task Force Working Group focused on New Programs and Interdisciplinarity was charged in January 2011.

Members:

Lauren Bowen (co-chair), Associate Academic Vice President

Donna Byrnes, Associate Dean of Students

Ruth Connell, Grasselli Library

Kathleen Manning, Education and Allied Studies

Jim Martin, Associate Dean, Boler School of Business

Dave Mascotti (co-chair), Chemistry

Phil Metres, English

Scott Moore, Economics and Finance

Roger Purdy, History

Walter Simmons, Economics and Finance

Steve Vitatoe, Executive Director of Enrollment

We met approximately every month during the spring 2011, fall 2011 and spring 2012 semesters. We started from the premise that the student learning outcomes articulated in phase 1 of the Academic Planning Task Force would best be attained with an infusion of new academic programs and with a structure that promotes and rewards interdisciplinary endeavors. We accepted the premise that interdisciplinarity is synonymous with substantive and positive change in the 21st century academy. The recommendations included should be read in that spirit – that fostering an interdisciplinary campus culture will require changes in our policies, processes and structures. Strengthening and sustaining that commitment will likely require a reallocation of resources both human and financial. A serious reexamination of structures and policies as they relate to hiring, tenure, workload, etc. are essential to determining the degree of commitment to interdisciplinary education at John Carroll. We would argue that some change in these processes and structures are essential to advance a commitment to interdisciplinarity inquiry. Should such changes not be viable politically or fiscally, a modified vision of program development and understanding of collaboration across disciplines will be warranted.

While not explicit during our meetings, our conversations in many ways mirrored the work of Julie Thompson Klein in *Creating Interdisciplinary Campus Cultures: A Model for Strength and Sustainability* (2010) who begins her text with the assertion that “interdisciplinarity has become a mantra for change in the twenty-first century” (p.1). In particular, she distinguishes between simple and complex models of interdisciplinarity (p.39). It became apparent to us that John Carroll has virtually all of the features of the simple model which may explain the disconnect between those arguing we lack an interdisciplinary culture and those suggesting that we have a wealth of interdisciplinary programs and any lack of vibrancy indicates a lack of interest by students in interdisciplinary pursuits.

The members of the task force aspire to move JCU from the simple to the complex in terms of structures, process, resource allocation, and curriculum. For example, the simple model includes interdisciplinary majors and minors housed in departments and programs while the complex model adds to the simple model the features of shared facilities and data emanating from problem-focused research topics and projects. The recommendations included herein are with that larger goal in mind. Additionally, in the spring of 2012, we adopted the conceptual framework of Project Kaleidoscope in its summary report entitled “What Works in Interdisciplinary Learning in Science and Mathematics” to organize our recommendations and their rationale and relied upon the four frames of structures, resources, politics and symbols (collapsing politics and symbols).

1. Charge

The Academic Planning Task Force Phase I report tasked the working group on new programs and interdisciplinarity with the following:

- a. Examine how academic programs can best be created, prioritized, evaluated and sustained.
- b. Identify areas of collaboration with the division of student affairs and admissions to enhance student learning and development.
- c. Create a plan to address the existing barriers to the design, implementation, and sustainability of innovative or interdisciplinary program and course development.

2. Charges Attended To and Other Issues that Emerged

- a. In response to 1a, we finalized the template for creating and approving new academic programs. That template was submitted to the Committee on Academic Policies which held open hearings during the spring 2011 semester and revised it accordingly. The template was approved by the faculty in May 2011.

How to best prioritize, evaluate and sustain academic programs was assumed by the APTF Steering Committee who undertook a prioritization project.

- b. Item 1b (identifying areas of collaboration with Student Affairs and Enrollment) was approached by conducting an informal current inventory:
 - i. AR 197 – Experiential College
 1. This program was begun in the spring 2011 semester by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and enjoyed great success in terms of faculty involvement and student engagement.
 - ii. “Soft Landings” Program for International Students

1. This program was created jointly by Enrollment, Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to help create a successful transition to U.S. higher education for F1 visa students. The student affairs component included peer mentoring, intentional roommate selection and housing as a community and professional development for student affairs professionals. The academic dimension included intensive academic advising and placement into sections of English composition and First Year Seminar designed to provide additional support to international students. Faculty development in terms of cross-cultural differences in learning and communication styles was also provided.
- iii. AR 120: Purpose and Place and Other Student Success Initiatives
 1. An outgrowth of the Ohio Access Initiative (OAI) was a course entitled Introduction to Service that was developed by the Center for Service and Social Action. That course has evolved into Purpose and Place and is designed to help foster a successful transition from high school to college. While all students are eligible to enroll in the course, those students who may not have social networks in place to help facilitate that transition are especially encouraged to enroll. In practice on the JCU campus, that means inviting students who are first generation, are Pell-eligible, identify as students of color, are matriculating from the Cleveland Municipal School District or were identified as “at-risk” academically at the time of admission to take advantage of this opportunity. The course is designed to foster financial literacy and cultural competence as well as build the skills necessary to succeed academically in college. It is jointly taught by professionals from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Enrollment. Other academic support and student success initiatives are being imagined and undertaken collaboratively including peer study circles and the creation of an Academic Support Center in Grasselli Library.
 - iv. Service Immersion Trips
 1. Trips are organized and supported jointly by the Center for Service and Social Action and Campus Ministry.
 - v. Theme Based Housing
 1. Academic programs have designated housing for students enrolled in their programs working collaboratively with the Office of Residence Life. The Entrepreneurship Program and the Honors Program have availed themselves of this opportunity.

Because the working group allocated much more time to items 1a and 1c, this is as far as we moved on this item.

- c. Creating a plan to address the existing barriers to the design, implementation, and sustainability of innovative or interdisciplinary program and course development or 1c commanded the vast majority of the time and attention of the working group for the duration of its existence. A SWOT analysis was conducted with Nick Santilli facilitating our discussion (See 3b). That analysis informed the plan that we formulated and is included in the recommendations section below (See 4.)

3. Accomplishments

- a. The academic program template was approved by the faculty. The goal of the template is to create a culture where program development does not exist in isolation of resource allocation. Learning outcomes must be articulated at the outset with a plan for assessing student learning made clear before a new program is adopted. Both those efforts also ensure that programs are not developed in isolation but are collaborative efforts. (See Appendix 1).
- b. We conducted a SWOT analysis to ascertain the opportunities to create new academic programs and foster a climate of interdisciplinarity. (See Appendix 2.)
- c. We reviewed programs at aspirant and comparator institutions by examining their websites. (A summary is included in Appendix 3.)
- d. The recommendations in section 4 below are the culmination of the greatest portion of our working group's discussions. The greatest impediment to creation of that plan, in retrospect, was the lack of campus consensus about the desirability of the presumed campus-wide culture shift necessary to foster new program development and interdisciplinarity. Therefore, the following assumptions were made.
 1. That new program development is desirable and
 - a. will map intentionally to institutional learning outcomes;
 - b. will meet the needs of contemporary students; and
 - c. will energize faculty.
 2. That interdisciplinarity is the frame within which (most) new programs should be developed.
 - a. This is consonant with the work of the curriculum group.
 - b. This is consistent with trends and best practices in higher education.
 - c. We have the capacity to draw on faculty imagination and expertise.
 - d. We already have more of an interdisciplinary foundation than is appreciated.
 - e. Some existing programs will need to be eliminated or modified.

4. Recommendations

Drawing upon the work of Project Kaleidoscope and AAC&U and in particular the implementation of PKAL work at Lafayette College, we used the “four frames” of structure, resources, politics and symbols to craft our recommendations and observations. Our recommendations, then, speak to structural and procedural change as well as resource (re)allocation. We identify where possible the office best equipped to implement the recommendation. We also offer our observations about political and symbolic factors that both animated and constrained our recommendations.

a. Structural/Procedural Recommendations

i. Hiring Procedures

1. Include commitment to interdisciplinarity in job description.
[Responsible party: DEPARTMENT CHAIRS]
2. Give priority to requests that emphasize interdisciplinarity.
[Responsible party: ACADEMIC DEANS]
3. Include program directors in request to hire process.
[Responsible party: DIRECTORS]
4. Share lines across departments.
[Responsible party: ACADEMIC DEANS and DEPARTMENT CHAIRS]
5. Create more flexible hiring streams to accommodate emerging programs.
[Responsible party: ACADEMIC DEANS and FACULTY WRIT LARGE]
 - a. Create additional lines for Visitors.
 - b. Authorize Professors of Practice.

ii. Promotion and Tenure

1. Institute evaluative process that includes voice from multiple disciplines, perspectives.
 - a. Optimally this would be college/university P&T committee.
[Responsible party: FACULTY WRIT LARGE]
 - b. If not 1, then allow voice/vote of interdisciplinary faculty on department committee (can be included in job description).
[Responsible party: ACADEMIC DEANS]
 - c. OR Create shell of department of interdisciplinary studies that can serve as departmental tenure committee.
[Responsible Party: ACADEMIC DEANS]

iii. Coordination/Administrative Support across Programs

1. Reporting Line to Academic Dean(s) and participation in chairs meetings as currently exists as it equates interdisciplinary programs with departments.
[Responsible party: PROVOST and ACADEMIC DEANS]
 2. Creating body of program coordinators separate from chairs' meetings should give greater synergy to interdisciplinary programs.
[Responsible party: ACADEMIC DEANS]
 3. Administrative assistance will be necessary; however, sharing administrative assistants may involve some cost sharing.
[Responsible party: ACADEMIC DEANS and PROVOST]
 - iv. Encourage or require formal declaration of minors and concentrations to enhance visibility of programs.
[Responsible Party: CAP]
- b. Resource – Human and Financial – Recommendations
- i. Scheduling
 1. Chairs and Program Directors working collaboratively to build schedule so that departmental offerings aren't privileged.
[Responsible party: ACADEMIC DEANS/ ASSOCIATE DEANS]
 - ii. Workload
 1. Teaching Assignments
Incentivize Team Teaching via
 - a. a stipend for Course Development; OR
 - b. count as course toward load for both participating instructors at least for inaugural offering.
 - iii. Class Size
 1. Cap as other courses.
 2. Set minimum enrollment as other courses.
 - iv. Advising
 1. Ensure faculty advisor knowledge of new programs.
 2. Encourage consideration of minors.
- c. Leadership Succession Recommendation
- i. Viable and vibrant programs should be considered important enough to outlast the "person-based" model of new program development. This component should be clearly articulated during the development of interdisciplinary programs.
- d. Annual Evaluations/ Compensation Recommendations

- i. Positive involvement in vibrant interdisciplinary programs should not inhibit faculty growth with respect to tenure/promotion/compensation.
 - ii. The corollary to this would be that faculty not actively involved in interdisciplinary programs should not be penalized.
- e. Capacity Recommendations
 - i. Set goals for team-taught courses per semester.
 - ii. Develop process for vetting applications for team-taught courses to ensure distribution throughout curriculum.
- f. Faculty Development Recommendations
 - i. Course Development
 - 1. Grant writing encouraged. Internal grants optimal to incentivize process if cultural change deemed favorable.
 - 2. Workshops needed to help develop faculty expertise and perhaps buy-in. Financial allocation is needed for costs associated with this.
 - ii. Pedagogy. Context is needed for interdisciplinary programs which would necessitate the involvement of Chairs/Directors/Deans to create better fitting pieces of the puzzle to the overall picture.

5. Political and Cultural Considerations

- a. Emphasis on Departmental Autonomy in ways that
 - i. can limit growth of interdisciplinary courses and programs and scholarship;
 - ii. culture can be characterized as feudal and territorial as manifested in hiring, tenure, promotion and (to a lesser extent) evaluation.
 - iii. Changing structures might change this culture; however, one must be mindful of the persistence of this culture when imagining structural change.
- b. Perception of a lack of interdisciplinary culture may create reality of one.
 - i. We encountered and assumed a widely held perception that we lack an interdisciplinary culture perhaps because of the power of departmental autonomy as our cultural touchstone.
 - ii. However, as our work continued we acknowledged this perspective was possibly erroneous based on our informal assessment of the number of interdisciplinary endeavors already occurring on our campus (see d. below).
- c. There are numerous concentrations that are moribund as measured by the number of students that they have graduated in recent years.

- i. Many of these purport to be interdisciplinary yet are better described as multidisciplinary as courses from multiple departments are included.
 - ii. They lack resources and support which may in part explain their dormancy; however, there is no evidence that these programs undertake program evaluation and are revised to reflect a dynamic approach to the topics at hand.
 - iii. Need mechanism to decide which to eliminate and which to strengthen.
[Responsible party: APTF STEERING COMMITTEE]
 - iv. How to strengthen – perhaps renewal of “weak” programs would proceed through the same process as beginning a new program application. If it passes the same tests, it would be deemed viable.
- d. It is appropriate to acknowledge interdisciplinary strengths and use such programs as our model.
- i. Those longstanding interdisciplinary programs that could serve as models include
 1. East Asian Studies,
 2. Neuroscience.
 - ii. More recent additions to the curriculum that can serve as models in terms of program development include
 1. Peace, Justice and Human Rights,
 2. Leadership,
 3. Entrepreneurship,
 4. International Business with Language and Culture,
 5. Populations and Public Health.

Conclusion

In sum, the APTF working group on New Programs and Interdisciplinarity focused its efforts on articulating how best to realize a stated commitment to enhanced interdisciplinarity at John Carroll. Acknowledging that we have many interdisciplinary structures in place yet lack an interdisciplinary culture, working group members concluded that if we want a more complex model of interdisciplinary learning on campus, some structural and procedural changes are needed primarily in the areas of hiring, tenure and promotion. If those changes are not politically or culturally viable, then perhaps the most to which we can aspire is what Klein describes as the “simple” model of interdisciplinarity. Additionally, the working group submits that a process for prioritizing programs and determining when/if to eliminate moribund programs be undertaken to help ensure the vitality of thriving programs. Resource (re)allocation to support the more complex model in terms of courses and programs can then foster an interdisciplinary campus culture.

Appendix 1. Protocol for Requesting Approval of a New Academic Program

NOTE: Proposal from Lauren Bowen; amendments made as a result of open hearings highlighted in yellow; amendments approved in a meeting of the General Faculty highlighted in blue.

I. Narrative

A request from the faculty members organizing a new academic program including new majors and minors should be made in writing to the chair of Faculty Council and copied to the chair of the Committee on Academic Policies. These requests should be accompanied by a narrative that provides all supporting information justifying the new academic program.

The narrative should detail the following:

1. Context for Addition of New Program

- Background
 - Justification for Program
 - Prevalence of Program at similar institutions
- Purpose of the program
 - Contributions to the student experience
 - Ways in which new program strengthens academic mission

2. Curricular Requirements

- Course of Study to complete program
 - Rationale and Justification of Inclusion of Courses
 - Prerequisites and Sequencing of courses
 - Courses to be Developed
 - Timetable and mechanism for their development
 - Mechanism for approving new courses for program

3. Organization and Administration of Program

- Job Description for Director
- Recommended line of reporting
 - Relevant Dean(s) or Department Chair
- Structure of governance
 - Advisory Board
 - Composition (Constituencies to Include)
 - Appointment process

4. Implementation Timetable

- Three Year Plan Inclusive of
 - Assessment Plan (*to be reviewed by CAP*)

- Likely student learning outcomes
 - Program level
 - Course level
- Anticipated method for assessing them
- Program evaluation and review **(to be reviewed by CAP)**
 - Likely program outcomes
 - Key indicators of program success
 - Enrollment
 - Course evaluations
- Budget (Expenses) for Year 1, Year 2, Year 3 and ongoing **(to be reviewed by CAP and the UBC)**
 - FTE Faculty and Benefits
 - (Note: New courses have instructional costs if new faculty – full or part time – are being hired to teach them or to teach other courses to allow existing faculty to teach in the new program.)
 - Administrative/Staff Support
 - Capital Equipment
 - Computers
 - Laboratories
 - Other Technology
 - Library Support (must be discussed with Library Director)
 - Annual Operating Expenses
 - Travel
 - Supplies
 - Conferences
 - Programming
- Budget (Revenue) for Year 1, Year 2, Year 3 and ongoing **(to provide information to CAP and to be reviewed by other appropriate university offices)**
 - Projected Enrollments
 - Enrollment Services data
 - Documentation of similar programs at overlap schools
 - Likely Demand for Graduates by Employers
 - Assumption that each new student enrolling at JCU will generate approximately 14k in net tuition revenue
- Marketing and Communication Plan **(to provide information to CAP and to be reviewed by other appropriate university offices)**
 - Web and Print Materials
 - Collaboration with Enrollment Services
 - Articulation of ways new program complements, reorganizes and/or replaces existing programs

II. Administrative Support

Relevant offices should be aware of the program and should **provide feedback** prior to submission to Faculty Council. Letters of support from the following including pertinent information as described below should accompany the narrative:

Chairs of Academic Departments in Which Courses Being Offered

- Likely frequency with which departmental courses that support new program will be offered
- Mechanism and timetable for developing any new departmental courses needed to support new program
- Specifics in terms of how department will support new program with human and financial resources

Academic Deans

- Support for requested release time
 - Faculty reassigned to new program
 - Administrative work of director

AAVP for Planning and Assessment

- Viability of assessment plan
- Resources available to support assessment of program

AAVP for Academic Programs

- Curricular Integrity of Program
- Relationship of New Program to Overall Curriculum

III. Approval Process

The Committee on Academic Policies will review the proposal and evaluate as a matter of academic policy. That review will consider the overall quality of the program with an emphasis on curricular requirements and integrity, the assessment and evaluation plan, and the resources necessary to support the program (operating budget). Revenue streams, marketing plans, and implementation plans should be included in the narrative to provide information to CAP; those aspects of the proposal will be reviewed and evaluated by other university offices. CAP will organize open hearings.

The University Budget Committee will have the responsibility of reviewing the proposal to make resource allocation decisions. This review will take place concurrent to or immediately after CAP's initial review but prior to a vote of the full faculty.

The entire faculty will consider the proposal at a faculty meeting. If sufficient support exists, the proposal will be voted on by the faculty via ballot. Those proposals receiving majority support will be forwarded by the chair of Faculty Council to the president for a final decision.

Approved programs will be expected to undergo academic program review. Newly approved programs should be reviewed in the third year of implementation.

New Programs and Interdisciplinarity Working Group

Final Report
Appendix 2
June 2012

SWOT Analysis

- Strengths
 - Creativity in Faculty
 - Emerging Culture of Program Development
 - Curriculum/Core Revision Underway
 - Energy and Innovation in Academic Affairs
 - Administrative Support for New Program Development
 - Successful Interdisciplinary Programs in Place
 - Quality and Reputation of JCU
 - Dolan Science Center
 - Boler School of Business
 - Sense of Mission
 - Size for Impact

SWOT Analysis

- **Weaknesses**

- **Culture**

- Lack of Harmony between Liberal Arts and Pre-Professional programs
- Lack of Trust between Faculty and Administration
- Inconsistent messaging and language in presentations of JCU internally and externally

- **Structures**

- Faculty Governance not Nimble
- Decentralized Organization of Academic Affairs
 - Weak Partnerships and Collaborations Across Divisions
 - Inefficient Organizational Structure (CAS)

SWOT Analysis

- Opportunities
 - Connections to NE Ohio Region
 - Economic Development
 - Partnerships with Not for Profits
 - Relationships w/CCF and CMSD
 - Extensive (and underutilized) local alumni base

SWOT Analysis

- Threats

- Marketing to 16-18 year olds
- Supply and Demand dynamics for new programs
- Competitive Environment
 - Population decline of HS population
 - Number of Higher Ed Options

Appendix 3a. Review of Programs at Aspirant and Comparator Institutions - Interdisciplinary Carnegie II schools

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														Inter disciplinary
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	
Alverno College		1									0		0		1
Augsburg College											1	0	3	2	6
Bemidji State University		1									1		3		5
Benedictine College		0		0		2					0		0		2
Bethel University		1		1		1		2			3		0		8
Caldwell College		2		5		8		7		4	7		6		39
California Baptist University	3	31		4							36	1	31		106
Carroll University		2		2		3	1	3			1		0		12
Castleton State College		20		24		19		15		4	30		15		127
College of Saint Elizabeth		17		18		12		7		5	27		19	3	108
Colorado Christian University		5		4		10		5		5	13		7		49
Columbia College		220		84		39		32		26	169	1	272		843
Concordia University		15	0	12	1	24	3	18		22	16		15		126
Cornerstone University						1	1	2		1					5
Delaware State University		0		0		0		2		1	1		1		5
Eastern New Mexico University- Main Campus		0		1		1				2	1		0		5
Elmhurst College	2	1	3	0	3	15	0	1	1	21	0	2	18	1	68
Emmanuel College	0	16	0	15	1	7		10		13	16	2	13	3	96

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Graceland University-Lamoni	0	4	1	6							0	2	3	1	17
Heidelberg University	1	1	0	1	2	1					1	2	6	0	15
Hodges University		69		54		35		20		5	72		90		345
Keene State College	1	21		20	2	12	4	7	1	15	12		19		114
King's College	4	16	3	4	5	14	4	18	3	20	11	4	7	4	117
La Sierra University											0		4		4
Life University		3		6		6		19		10	12		8		64
Lock Haven University		4		2		3		2	7	5	4		5		32
Maharishi University of Mgmt		0		1							0	0	3	0	4
Mary Baldwin College	1	6	0	4	4	7		5		6	5	0	6	0	44
Mercyhurst College		43		55		33		7		12	79		69		298
Minnesota State University-Moorhead	1	60	3	19	2	37	2	56	1	10	34	2	45	1	273
Mount Mary College	1	1	1	2		5		2		4	2	0	4	0	22
Mount St Mary's College	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0			2		8		11
Ohio Dominican University		2		1							2	1	1		7
Park University		0		0		0		0		4	1		1		6
Point Loma Nazarene University	1	2		0		0					7	0	9	1	20
Prescott College	0	1	1	1		2		3	1	2	1	1	2	0	15
Ramapo College of New Jersey		3				1					1		3		8

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Regis College	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	6		3	8	0	2	1	26
Salve Regina University	0	10	0	6	0	9	1	3		4	9	4	8	1	55
Savannah State University															0
Schiller International University		1		4		3		8		8	3		0		27
Southern Utah University		12		18		13		15		6	17		21		102
Southwest Minnesota State University													1		1
Southwestern Oklahoma State University		9		12	0	7		4			17		10		59
Spring Hill College		4		5		12		14			1		1		37
SUNY College at Oneonta		1		1				3		1	2		2		10
SUNY Empire State College		137		149		111		133		123	107		119		879
The Evergreen State College		130		157							129		154		570
University of Arkansas at Monticello		3		4		1		4			2		7		21
University of Evansville		5		3		1					4		6		19
University of Maryland Eastern Shore		16		20		26		22		34	5		4		127
University of Mobile										52					52
University of Phoenix-Oregon Campus				1							5				6

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
University of Phoenix-West Michigan Campus											4		2		6
University of Saint Francis-Ft Wayne		8	0	8	1	6		4			16		11		54
University of the Southwest		1		0		0		6		11			0		18
University of Washington-Bothell Campus		201		224		211	2	181			206		193		1218
Upper Iowa University											1				1
Valparaiso University	10	12	4	12	2	21	3	25	8	17	15	5	17	2	153
Wheeling Jesuit University		5		6		1		8		7	3		4		34
Whitworth University	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	1		13	2	3	1	27
Woodbury University		3		4		7					6		4		24

Appendix 3b. Review of Programs at Aspirant and Comparator Institutions - Interdisciplinary Bachelors schools

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Adrian College		2		1		0		1		1	0		1	0	6
Agnes Scott College	4	9		4		6		7		3	6	0	3	2	44
Albion College	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	2	6	6	0	5	1	28
Albright College		16		15		6		8		12	12		15		84
Alderson Broaddus College															0
Alice Lloyd College		1		1		1		3		4	1		2		13
Allegheny College	6	21	3	30	3	19	4	38	5	34	31	10	34	7	245
Alverno College		1									0		0		1
Amherst College	2	20	3	24	3	23	4	10	2	11	18	3	23	3	149
Ashford University					0	4	0	2	1	4					11
Athens State University	1	36	4	32	2	34	2	26	4	41	27		36		245
Atlanta Christian College															0
Atlantic Union College	0	2		1		1					0	0	0	0	4
Augsburg College											1	0	3	2	6
Augustana College	3	10	3	5	4	12	3	23	4	24	3	5	5	2	106
Augustana College											0	2			2
Austin College	6	15	6	5	2	7	8	7		12	29	2	14	7	120
Averett University		1		0		0		2		3	0		0		6
Baker University	3	5	1	1							4	1	6	3	24

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Baptist Bible College and Graduate School		12		13		7		19			14		12		77
Bard College	2	31	2	34		28		28		28	39	1	30	3	226
Barnard College	1	31	3	28	1	13		28		22	33	0	14	0	174
Barton College		7		1		2					3	0	6	1	20
Bates College	0	22	0	15	2	46	0	30	1	18	24	0	24	2	184
Beloit College	5	5	0	5	1	8	0	5		6	13	5	7	1	61
Bemidji State University		1									1		3		5
Benedictine College		0		0		2					0		0		2
Bennett College for Women		5		3		5		1		6	8		11		39
Bennington College	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	7		7	2	1	3	0	24
Berea College	1	13	4	12	4	10	7	14	1	10	16	1	16	2	111
Berry College		11		10		16		18		16	11		11		93
Bethany College	1	11											15	0	27
Bethany College	1	18		17		4		5		5	12	0	8	0	70
Bethany University		6		12		16		11		10	6		8		69
Bethel College															0
Bethel College	0	2	1	5	3	4	0	3	1	3	0	0	2	1	25
Bethel University		1		1		1		2			3		0		8
Bethune-Cookman University		13		10		7		2	1	10	13		6		62
Birmingham Southern College		26		21		34		34		35	15		27		192

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Blackburn College	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Bloomfield College		1		1						4	1		1		8
Blue Mountain College											0		1		1
Bluefield College		4		5		4		2		9	14		13		51
Bluffton University	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	3			1	0	1	0	11
Bowdoin College	1	26	6	18	5	14	0	13	2	13	22	1	22	2	145
Brescia University		6		5		4		3		6	1		1		26
Brevard College	0	15	1	9	1	10	0	32	1	42	20	10	18	1	160
Briar Cliff University											0		3		3
Brigham Young University-Hawaii		74		77		67		76		12	81	1	67		455
Bryan College		2		1		2		3		7	1		1		17
Bryn Athyn College of the New Church		7		6		10		3		10	10		3		49
Bryn Mawr College		11	1	12	1	7	1	13			8	1	7	1	63
Bucknell University	1	4	1	2	2	5	1	14	2	14	21	3	7	7	84
Buena Vista University	45	85	25	70	31	100	30	65	17	71	74	29	100	41	783
Burlington College		12		12							18		9		51
Caldwell College		2		5		8		7		4	7		6		39
California Baptist University	3	31		4							36	1	31		106
California State University-Monterey Bay		9		12		7		12		10	27		19		96
Calvin College	4	31	2	28	5	31	4	25	1	31	28	7	29	1	227

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Carleton College	2	7		6		8		7		8	2	0	4	0	44
Carroll College		4		5		4		2	3	3			0		21
Carroll University		2		2		3	1	3			1		0		12
Carthage College	5	4	3	3	5	4	4	3	1	3	3	4	5	1	48
Castleton State College		20		24		19		15		4	30		15		127
Catawba College		0		0		1		0			1		4		6
Cedar Crest College	0	5	0	4	0	3	0	5	1	4	4	0	5	1	32
Cedarville University	0	16	0	6	0	10	1	6		5	10	2	12	0	68
Centenary College of Louisiana	0	5	0	2	2	9	0	3		5	6	0	6	0	38
Central Christian College of Kansas		4		3							6		1		14
Central College	2	9	1	4	3	6	0	1			6	1	7	1	41
Central Methodist University-College of Graduate & Extended Studies		1									6		0		7
Central Methodist University-College of Liberal Arts & Sciences		7		8		11		10		8	8	0	11	1	64
Central State University															0
Centre College	4	8	5	5	5	12	3	14			10	6	11	5	88
Chadron State College		15		15		12	0	15		2	11		11		81

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Chowan University	0	1	0	1	0	0					2	0	1	0	5
Christopher Newport University	0	0	0	4		6		3		4	7	1	4	0	29
Claremont McKenna College	0	29	1	21	2	21	1	22	1	27	25	1	23	0	174
Clearwater Christian College	0	9	1	9		5		10		5	5	0	10	0	54
Coe College	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	4	2	2	3	4	4	25
Colby College	5	24	3	11	3	10	3	12	1	7	16	1	16	2	114
Colgate University	1	34	1	41	3	29	5	25	4	26	37	11	38	3	258
College of Saint Benedict	1	14	1	13	1	18	1	15	1	15	31	4	16	1	132
College of Saint Elizabeth		17		18		12		7		5	27		19	3	108
College of the Atlantic		68		74		61		49		50	74		68		444
College of the Holy Cross	7	11	7	10	12	4	8	10	3	5	7	7	8	11	110
College of the Ozarks								1			1	1	2		5
Colorado Christian University		5		4		10		5		5	13		7		49
Colorado College	1	22	2	39		31		24	1	23	16		26		185
Columbia College		220		84		39		32		26	169	1	272		843
Concord University		7		15		12		17		27	10		6		94
Concordia College at Moorhead	3	3	2	0							7	1	8	10	34

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Concordia University	2	2	4	10	1	5	5	6		5	1	9	5	2	57
Concordia University		15	0	12	1	24	3	18		22	16		15		126
Concordia University Texas										5					5
Connecticut College	2	21	5	22	4	13	3	19	3	14	15	4	17	2	144
Corban College		11		7		15		21		21			0		75
Cornell College	7	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	1		0	0	4	5	28
Cornerstone University						1	1	2		1					5
Covenant College	0	7	1	14		18		16		15	21		23	0	115
Crichton College				1		41		20		14					76
CUNY York College						4		6		8	15				33
Curry College		0		0		2		0			1		1		4
Dakota Wesleyan University	1	1		0		0		3		1	0	0	0	0	6
Dana College	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	2			1	1	1	1	10
Davidson College	0	10		12		10		11		11	12	0	9	0	75
Davis & Elkins College	0	0	1	0							0	0	0	0	1
Defiance College	0	0		2				1			1	1	1	0	6
Delaware State University		0		0		0		2		1	1		1		5
DePauw University	2	8	4	9	1	9	0	3	2	7	8	2	7	1	63
Dickinson College	1	5	3	20	5	22	2	18	4	14	16	2	11	3	126

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Dickinson State University		41		35		48					49		46		219
Doane College	0	1	0	1	0	1		0		1			3	0	7
Dordt College		0									0	1	0		1
Drew University		39		27		24		27		34	21		26		198
Earlham College	1	41	0	18	1	25	1	26	1	19	26	5	29	2	195
East Texas Baptist University				0		1		4			32		21		58
Eastern Mennonite University	2	5	3	11	2	13	2	10	1	10	8	1	6	1	75
Eastern New Mexico University- Main Campus		0		1		1				2	1		0		5
Eckerd College	1	0	0	1		3		0			1	0	1	0	7
Edward Waters College		0		0		5				1	0		0		6
Elmhurst College	2	1	3	0	3	15	0	1	1	21	0	2	18	1	68
Elmira College		3		1		1		3		5	3		2		18
Embry Riddle Aeronautical University- Prescott		4		10		7		14		20	12		23		90
Emmanuel College	0	16	0	15	1	7		10		13	16	2	13	3	96
Emory and Henry College								0		2	2		1		5
Endicott College											4		2		6
Eureka College										1					1

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Fairmont State University		0		1		0				1			0		2
Felician College		5		5		9		3			15		12		49
Florida Memorial University		16		14		12		4		9	4		10		69
Florida Southern College											2	0	2		4
Fort Lewis College		23		30		17		65		57	39		30		261
Franklin and Marshall College	6	44	1	52	3	42	0	46	6	62	64	7	56	2	391
Franklin Pierce University											0	0	2	1	3
Furman University	1	24	1	20	1	11	5	13	2	17	26		31	0	152
Georgetown College	0	3	0	2	0	8	0	4		4	9	1	13	0	44
Gettysburg College	6	8	2	14	2	9	2	14	5	19	21	18	10	5	135
Glenville State College		0		3		2		5		4	0		0		14
Gordon College	1	0											1		2
Goshen College	1	10	0	16	0	9	0	17		13	9	0	17	0	92
Goucher College	2	8		5		8		4			12		11		50
Grace Bible College		2		1		1		4		1	4		2		15
Grace College and Theological Seminary								1		1					2
Graceland University-Lamoni	0	4	1	6							0	2	3	1	17

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Granite State College		38		41		61		50		76	66		55		387
Green Mountain College		3	0	6	0	3	1	7		12	9		7		48
Greensboro College		7		0		5		4		8	1	0	2		27
Greenville College	0	2	0	3	0	2	0	4		4	11	1	3	0	30
Grinnell College		6		9		6		8		11	12		8		60
Grove City College		0		0		1		0		1	0		0		2
Guilford College	5	14	5	13	4	12	3	9	1	3	7	4	16	5	101
Gustavus Adolphus College		2		3		2		1		1	1		1		11
Hamilton College	0	14	3	13	2	13	1	12		13	19	2	7	0	99
Hampden-Sydney College									1		1		1		3
Hampshire College		3		0		6		10			13		3		35
Hanover College	0	4	1	3		6		4		4	9	0	6	1	38
Harris-Stowe State University		7		15		29		36		34	6		6		133
Harvey Mudd College	1	8	1	11	0	4	1	10		4	6	0	7	0	53
Hastings College	0	15	0	12	9	17		10		9	11	0	17	0	100
Haverford College	0	3	0	2	4	8	1	10		5	5	0	3	0	41
Heidelberg University	1	1	0	1	2	1					1	2	6	0	15
Hendrix College		10	1	10		4	2	7		7	6	1	7		55
High Point University		1		2		3		2			1		1		10
Hiram College	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		1	3	0	2	1	8

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Hodges University		69		54		35		20		5	72		90		345
Hollins University	0	4	0	5	1	12		8	1	7	2	0	5	0	45
Hope College	6	20	9	15	9	8	6	10	5	15	20	9	18	7	157
Houghton College				2		1									3
Huntingdon College	0	3	0	6	1	3	1	1	1	3	1		2		22
Huston-Tillotson University	0	13	0	13	0	6	0	7		3	11	0	12	0	65
Illinois College	8	21	3	11	2	3		2			23	8	25	10	116
Illinois Wesleyan University	10	15	2	2	0	0	0	0		2	7	4	2	0	44
Indiana University-East		2		3		4		1		1	5		10		26
Indiana University-Kokomo		4	1	2		5		5		3	1		5		26
Jamestown College							0	1							1
Jarvis Christian College		5		13		3		7		7	15		19		69
John Brown University		8		11		3	0	4			9		6		41
Johnson C Smith University		13		6		16		3			3		4	0	45
Judson College	0	1	0	0	1	2		2		2	0	0	1	0	9
Judson University	0	2	0	4	0	0	1	3		6	5	0	0	0	21
Juniata College		32		21		23		15		9	19		16		135
Kalamazoo College	3	10		0		2		0			6	0	6	1	28
Keene State College	1	21		20	2	12	4	7	1	15	12		19		114

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Kentucky Wesleyan College		2		2		0		2			1		2		9
Kenyon College	1	51	3	49	6	39	4	43	3	34	51	4	49	3	340
Keystone College		17		9		7					13		18		64
King College	0	13	1	8		1		1			9	0	4	0	37
King's College	4	16	3	4	5	14	4	18	3	20	11	4	7	4	117
Knox College	1	1	1	0							3	1	5	1	13
La Sierra University											0		4		4
Lafayette College	8	26	4	25	2	29	7	19	1	20	17	3	19	2	182
LaGrange College															0
Lake Erie College	0	11	0	13	0	14	0	3		4	6	0	10	0	61
Lake Superior State University		3		4		8		19		23	1		5		63
Lambuth University	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	3		1	3	0	1	0	12
Lane College		21		15		18		16		21	30		16		137
Langston University			0	0		0					2				2
Lawrence University	6	25	2	22	6	25	6	20	6	27	20	3	28	5	201
Lebanon Valley College	1	5	1	11	1	5		10		10	5	1	6	0	56
Lees-McRae College		0		3		1		1		5	1		2		13
Lenoir-Rhyne University		0		0		1					0		0		1
Lewis-Clark State College		16		17		20		31		23	11		34		152
Life University		3		6		6		19		10	12		8		64
Lindsey Wilson College	0	122	0	140	0	98	0	115		36	176	0	150	0	837

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Linfield College				2											2
Lock Haven University		4		2		3		2	7	5	4		5		32
Louisiana College		1		1		3		0		2	6		1		14
Lourdes College		19		28		18		22		27	23		23		160
Luther College	1	5	2	4	1	1	3	8	1	3	3		2		34
Lycoming College	2	7	2	4	1	9	3	1	3	3	18	5	14	2	74
Lyndon State College		5		7	0	3	0	2		5	9		2		33
Macalester College	13	33	9	29	6	40	8	32	4	4	34	14	38	14	278
Maharishi University of Management		0		1							0	0	3	0	4
Maine Maritime Academy		4		0		1		2			0		1		8
Malone University															0
Manchester College	2	4		4		2		6	1	4	4	1	5	0	33
Marietta College	1	3	1	5							5	1	1	2	19
Marlboro College		30		19		32					1	0			82
Martin Methodist College		0		0		15					23		21		59
Mary Baldwin College	1	6	0	4	4	7		5		6	5	0	6	0	44
Maryville College		5		2		3		2		1	5	1	2		21
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts		12		8		11		9		10	17		24		91
McDaniel College		47		33		35		27		44	34		40		260

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
McMurry University		1		1		4		1		1	0		2		10
McPherson College	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	1		0	0	6
Mercyhurst College		43		55		33		7		12	79		69		298
Meredith College	0	8	1	4	1	3	1	6	1	2	9	0	3	0	39
Merrimack College				1											1
Messiah College	0	12	0	9	1	5	0	4		9	13	0	9	1	63
Metropolitan State College of Denver		304		267		262		257		59	222		255		1626
Mid-America Christian University		4	5	5		0	7	11			43		9		84
Middlebury College	0	24	0	29	1	69		78		53	27	1	20	0	302
Midland Lutheran College	0	2	1	5	2	6					0	2	7	0	25
Midway College		1									9		7		17
Millikin University	0	31	0	36	0	29	0	17		11	6	1	26	0	157
Millsaps College	0	0	0	0	0	1					0	0	2	0	3
Minnesota State University-Moorhead	1	60	3	19	2	37	2	56	1	10	34	2	45	1	273
Missouri Southern State University		0		2		3					6	1	4		16
Missouri Western State University		4		13		18		12		14	6		2		69
Monmouth College	2	6	0	3	0	1	0	0			3	2	3	1	21
Montana State University-Northern		6		2		0		0		2	1		0		11

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Moravian College and Moravian Theological Seminary		17		13		9		12		3	13	1	13	2	83
Morningside College		3		1		1		3		3	4		1		16
Mount Holyoke College	1	28	7	46	3	45	7	43	7	58	42	5	33	2	327
Mount Mary College	1	1	1	2		5		2		4	2	0	4	0	22
Mount Mercy College	0	4	1	4	1	11	1	3		4	5	0	5	0	39
Mount St Mary's College	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0			2		8		11
Mount Union College		2		2						2	4		3		13
Muhlenberg College	2	21	1	15	0	10	0	5		8	17	1	22	0	102
Nebraska Wesleyan University	0	5	0	3	0	6	1	6		5	4	0	5	0	35
Nevada State College		7		2		0					0		5		14
New England College		1									1		5		7
Newberry College		3		2		3		3			1		1		13
Newbury College-Brookline											1				1
North Central University		42		30		21		20		12	33		20		178
North Greenville University		3		4		1		0			0	1			9
Northland College	0	3	0	5	1	2		2		4	3	0	7	0	27

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Northwest Christian University		9		3		2		2		4	3		5		28
Northwest University		6		7		4		3		8	4		4		36
Northwestern College		8	1	3		1					6		8		27
Northwestern Oklahoma State University											1				1
Notre Dame College		1		0		0		1		1	0		0		3
Oakwood University		1		2		0		1		2	2		1		9
Oberlin College	11	18	14	31	4	24	14	17	9	28	26	7	35	8	246
Occidental College	0	9	0	11	0	8	0	13		4	5	0	10	1	61
Oglethorpe University		6	0	8		4		4		2	7		6		37
Ohio Dominican University		2		1							2	1	1		7
Ohio Northern University	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	1			2	0	1	0	10
Ohio Wesleyan University	1	0	2	5	3	3	1	1	2	2	12	2	7	4	45
Oklahoma Baptist University		6		5		9		9		4	10		5		48
Oklahoma Panhandle State University		2	0	0		0		0			1		1		4
Olivet College	0	5	1	6	0	9		4		13	0	0	2	0	40
Paine College		1		0		0		2		1	0		0		4
Park University		0		0		0		0		4	1		1		6

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Abington		19		19		13		9		17	29		16		122
Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Altoona		4		2		5		3		1	2		1		18
Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Berks		23		8		10		7		20	25		13		106
Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Erie-Behrend College		7		7		11		8		6	4		11		54
Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Lehigh Valley		1		2		1					1		2		7
Peru State College		7		11		12		10		8	9		8		65
Pikeville College		0									0		1		1
Pitzer College	6	19	1	29	1	24	0	5		8	30	4	36	6	169
Point Loma Nazarene University	1	2		0		0					7	0	9	1	20
Pomona College	3	42	1	37	1	27		40		67	42	0	35	0	295
Prescott College	0	1	1	1		2		3	1	2	1	1	2	0	15
Principia College	0	3	0	3	1	1	2	2	2	4	4	1	2	0	25
Purdue University-North Central Campus		26		23		8		10			18		30		115

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Quincy University	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			0	0	0	0	1
Ramapo College of New Jersey		3					1				1		3		8
Randolph College	0	0	0	1	1	3		0		3	1	0	2	0	11
Reed College		12		9		8		16		13	18		12		88
Regis College	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	6		3	8	0	2	1	26
Rhodes College		3									8		5		16
Ripon College	2	9	4	3	2	5	1	7	1	6	4	1	2	3	50
Rochester College		19		26		15		6			14		22		102
Rocky Mountain College	0	0	2	2	1	5	0	1	1	4	0	0	2	1	19
Roger Williams University		16		16		8		17		2	8		12		79
Russell Sage College		11		15		35		26		19	10		14		130
Saint Anselm College		7		19		14		14		13	6		4		77
Saint Gregorys University		1		1	0	1		3			1		0		7
Saint Johns University	0	12	3	11	1	17	0	25	1	13	17	0	18	0	118
Saint Josephs College		0		1		3		0		2	1		1		8
Saint Mary's College	1	3	0	1	0	4	2	3		5	1	1	6	1	28
Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1			0	0	2	0	4
Saint Norbert College		1	1	4	2	4		8	1	9	6		8		44
Salem College	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	5	1	0	1	1	16

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Salem International University				0		2				3					5
Salve Regina University	0	10	0	6	0	9	1	3		4	9	4	8	1	55
San Diego Christian College		21		26		39		29		23	12		25		175
Schiller International University		1		4		3		8		8	3		0		27
Schreiner University		6		9		3		0			7		7		32
Scripps College	3	23	1	21	1	15	2	16		14	23	1	15	1	136
Sewanee-The University of the South	0	7	0	6	0	5	0	6	1	7	17	0	15	0	64
Shawnee State University	1	0		0		11		16		22	0	1	0	2	53
Shimer College		3		1		2		1		3	1		1		12
Shorter College	1	1	0	1							0	0	3	0	6
Sierra Nevada College		4		2		1					1		2		10
Skidmore College	1	8	0	2	1	12	0	12		9	9	0	13	1	68
Smith College	0	25	3	26	2	27	1	14	3	21	30	4	30	3	189
Sojourner-Douglass College		0								2	0				2
Southern Adventist University		1		2				1					1		5
Southern Arkansas University Main Campus		1		2		3		21	1	16	1				45

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Southern Utah University		12		18		13		15		6	17		21		102
Southwest Minnesota State University													1		1
Southwestern Adventist University		1		1		1		3			2		3		11
Southwestern Oklahoma State University		9		12	0	7		4			17		10		59
Southwestern University															0
Spelman College		20		18		9		15		6	1		0		69
Spring Hill College		4		5		12		14			1		1		37
St Lawrence University	2	18	1	20	2	27	1	17	1	12	25	2	20	7	155
St. Mary's College of Maryland	3	9	0	9	2	16	1	10		5	12	0	16		83
St. Olaf College	4	3	3	1	6	0	6	1	3	2	3	3	1	1	37
Stephens College			0	6	1	7		8		3					25
Sterling College		1		3		8		9		5	0		2		28
Stevenson University		40		35		33		47		35	44		40		274
Stillman College		0		0		2		2		3					7
Stonehill College	5	6	3	2	5	14	26	7			10	3	9	2	92
SUNY at Purchase College								6							6
SUNY College at Oneonta		1		1				3		1	2		2		10

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
SUNY Empire State College		137		149		111		133		123	107		119		879
Susquehanna University		3						2					1		6
Swarthmore College	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2		2	2	0	0	0	10
Sweet Briar College		2		3		2				3	1	2	2	0	15
Tabor College	0	0	0	4		1					1	0	0	0	6
Taylor University		2		0		1		3		1	0		1		8
Tennessee Wesleyan College		14		8		3		33			13	2	16	1	90
Texas A & M University at Galveston		19		18		19		20		30	11		16		133
Texas Lutheran University	7	0	13	0	6	0	2	0			0	0	0	7	35
The College of Idaho	2	8	0	7	1	9		17	4	3	7	1	4		63
The College of Wooster		3		4		3		1		2	4	0	7		24
The Evergreen State College		130		157							129		154		570
The University of Montana-Western		4		0		1		1		1	4		1		12
The University of Virginia's College at Wise	1	31		29	1	20		34		24	26	1	33		200
Thomas Edison State College		479		475		551		457		391	555		512		3420

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Thomas University											2				2
Tougaloo College		1		6		2		1		1	2		2		15
Trinity College	2	17	1	23	1	14	1	14		19	29	8	29	9	167
Union College		25		18		11		16		7	16		16		109
Union College											1				1
United States Air Force Academy	2	103	6	57	11	108					123	3	97	5	515
United States Military Academy		43		118		118		55		51	37		20		442
University of Arkansas at Monticello		3		4		1		4			2		7		21
University of Dubuque	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		2			0	0	2
University of Evansville		5		3		1					4		6		19
University of Hawaii at Hilo		11		8		6					7		4		36
University of Houston-Downtown		169		108		106		68		41	215		177		884
University of Maine at Farmington	6	54	7	44	8	28	5	34	7	39	7	0	44	1	284
University of Maine at Fort Kent		0		1		8		3		4	9		3		28
University of Maine at Machias		13		23		14		18		15	17		14		114

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
University of Maine at Presque Isle		2			0	13	2	15	1	17	0		2		52
University of Maryland Eastern Shore		16		20		26		22		34	5		4		127
University of Minnesota-Crookston	1	12		9		11		19		9	10		7		78
University of Minnesota-Morris	5	15	8	10	3	11		10	3	11	14	2	21	13	126
University of Mobile										52					52
University of Phoenix-Idaho Campus											1				1
University of Phoenix-Oregon Campus				1							5				6
University of Phoenix-West Michigan Campus											4		2		6
University of Pittsburgh-Greensburg	1	6		9		7		7		11	7		1		49
University of Pittsburgh-Johnstown		4		2		3		4		2					15
University of Puget Sound	3	19	6	21	2	21	2	27	3	21	32	1	28	1	187
University of Richmond	8	24	2	8	5	10		5		2	24	3	23	4	118

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
University of Saint Francis-Ft Wayne		8	0	8	1	6		4			16		11		54
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma		9	3	5	0	1		2		2	5		5		32
University of the Southwest		1		0		0		6		11			0		18
University of Washington-Bothell Campus		201		224		211	2	181			206		193		1218
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay	1	3		3		3		5		4	1		4		24
University of Wisconsin-Parkside	1	5		3	3	3		3		4	3		6	1	32
Upper Iowa University											1				1
Urbana University		0		5		3		0		3	2		1		14
Ursinus College	0	21	3	6	1	9	3	9		8	26	4	9	2	101
Valley City State University						0		0		4					4
Valparaiso University	10	12	4	12	2	21	3	25	8	17	15	5	17	2	153
Vassar College	3	34	3	39	2	53	3	31	2	32	37	3	46	0	288
Virginia Intermont College											40	0	77	0	117
Virginia Union University		1		5		6		4		7	12		4		39

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Virginia Wesleyan College	4	38		29	1	32	0	35	2	38	19	1	24		223
Waldorf College											0	0	1	0	1
Warner Pacific College	0	0	0	3						3	1	0	0	0	7
Warren Wilson College	1	14	0	25	0	16	0	18	1	15	25	0	27	1	143
Washington & Jefferson College	0	3	0	3							0	1	5	3	15
Washington and Lee University	1	10	0	8	0	6	0	6		9	12	2	9	1	64
Washington College		12	0	0				1	1	4	0				18
Wellesley College	8	34	7	35	8	39	9	49	14	45	48	18	49	7	370
Wells College		1		1				1		1	2		1		7
Wesley College		0		1							1		0		2
Wesleyan College											1	0	1	0	2
Wesleyan University	3	21	3	24		17	2	24	1	17	27	4	17	4	164
West Liberty University		13		11		7		9		13	12		9		74
West Virginia State University															0
West Virginia University Institute of Technology		12		1		1		3		4	1		2		24
West Virginia Wesleyan College	1	4									1	1	1	2	10
Westminster College	0	3	1	3		4		0			1	1	4	1	18

Institution Name	Multi/interdisciplinary studies. Bachelor's degree														
	TOTAL C2007_A Second major	TOTAL C2007_A First major	TOTAL C2006_A Second major	TOTAL C2006_A First major	TOTAL C2005_A Second major	TOTAL C2005_A First major	TOTAL C2004_A Second major	TOTAL C2004_A First major	TOTAL C2003_A Second major	TOTAL C2003_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A First major	TOTAL C2009_A Second major	TOTAL C2008_A First major	TOTAL C2008_A Second major	Inter disciplinary
Westminster College	0	6	1	5	1	1		2		2	2	0	2	0	22
Westmont College		4		6		4		0		2			3		19
Wheaton College	0	18	2	18	1	14	0	15		18	5	0	5	0	96
Wheaton College	1	6	0	13	3	10		15		9	3	1	5	0	66
Wheeling Jesuit University		5		6		1		8		7	3		4		34
Whitman College		2		2		1		1							6
Whittier College	1	3		1							2	0	2	0	9
Whitworth University	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	1		13	2	3	1	27
Willamette University	0	11	1	11	2	16	3	16		10	26	6	13	2	117
William Jewell College	0	13	0	15	1	1	0	5	1	4	6	1	10	1	58
Williams College		3		3		3		4		1	5		4		23
Wilson College	0	5	0	6	1	3		3		8	1	0	4	0	31
Wingate University				1		1		2		2	7		1		14
Winston-Salem State University	1	8		3		1		3		1	9		9		35
Wisconsin Lutheran College	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		4	3	0	1	0	11
Wofford College		1		9		8		4	2	9	1		2	1	37
Woodbury University		3		4		7					6		4		24
York College		0		1		0							0		1
York College Pennsylvania		0		1		0		0			33	1	39	1	75

Teaching Excellence Working Group Report (Revised, January 2013)

Members:

Lindsay Calkins (co-chair), Associate Dean, Boler School of Business
Gerry Guest, Art History
Julia Karolle-Berg (former member), CMLC
Marc Lynn, Management, Marketing and Logistics
Mike Martin (co-chair), Biology
Maryclaire Moroney, Associate Dean for Student Services and Academic Advising
John Scarano, Campus Ministry
Linda Seiter, Mathematics and Computer Science
Jeanne Somers, Library
John Spencer, Theology and Religious Studies

Phase Two of the Academic Planning Task Force (APTF) report of 2010 called for the creation of a "Blue Ribbon Committee on Teaching Excellence," whose charge from the APTF included determining how JCU can reward and recognize teaching excellence, connecting teaching excellence to "verifiable methods of defining and validating student success," and employing and tracking "the impact of 'high impact pedagogies'."

CHARGES TO WORKING GROUP FROM APTF PHASE I REPORT

More specifically, the APTF "recommended that the committee consider:"

1. How all courses incorporate and deepen the critical thinking and communication skills that are foundational to student learning,
2. Defining high impact pedagogies and disseminating this information to the university community,
3. Collecting data on what kind of "high impact" pedagogies are used at JCU,
4. Making recommendations on whether there should be an experiential learning requirement,
5. Determining if capstone courses or their equivalent should be required or more widely offered,
6. Examining ways that all courses or their equivalent should be required or more widely offered,
7. How teaching excellence can be better recognized, supported, and rewarded, and,
8. How teaching methods meet differences in student learning styles (including students with disabilities) to maximize student learning, development, and success."

(John Carroll University Academic Planning Task Force Report, Academic Excellence: A Framework for Renewal and Innovation, Academic Planning Task Force, January 19, 2010, Appendix F).

CHARGES ATTENDED TO AND OTHER ISSUES THAT EMERGED

The working group spent the majority of its time considering the following:

- High-impact pedagogies
- Recognition, support, and reward for teaching excellence
- Common student evaluation of teaching for the College of Arts and Sciences

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Part I: Spring 2011

During the spring of 2011, the working group created a Blackboard site, to which numerous working group members uploaded pertinent documents and articles. We met every other week and spent much of the time in discussions of the charges from the APTF and attempting to determine how best to focus the energies of the working group. Topics we discussed include:

High-impact pedagogies:

The working group read two articles discussing these practices and discussed surveying the JCU faculty to determine whether and to what extent JCU faculty currently practice high-impact pedagogies. The working group opted to defer cataloging what is being done on campus.

The CICE report of 1991:

- The working group discussed what had been accomplished since 1991 and what still needed to be addressed.
- We examined data on the number and percent of part-time faculty currently being used by each department, and the working group discussed some of the issues pertaining to the compensation and use of part-time people.
- We compared the number of classrooms in use now relative to the number of classrooms in 1991. Based on the data, there seem to be only 3 more classrooms now (59) than in 1991.

Surveys of faculty (teaching strategies), students (best teaching practices), alumni:

- The working group discussed surveying the faculty about current teaching strategies (what is being used, how effective they are), and surveying students and alumni/ae regarding their perception of effective teaching strategies, but there was not a consensus on whether to undertake these tasks.
- We also discussed the various ways in which data is/has been collected on campus (e.g. First-Year Seminar, Honors Program) that might potentially address these questions about teaching pedagogies. We reluctantly concluded that there is little campus data currently available that pertains to this issue.

The need for better recognition and support of teaching in general:

- Of all the topics discussed by this working group, the measurement, recognition, reward and support of good teaching was, perhaps, the one that the working group believed to be most important and the topic to which the working group returned time after time.
- We discussed the different teaching awards in CAS and Boler.

- We discussed the perception that research is better supported and rewarded, compared to teaching. We also noted that the members of the 1991 CICE Committee wrote of this same difference in perception.
- We discussed the work of the former Center for Teaching and Learning. A number of Working group members urged that the Center be resurrected, arguing that the existing Center for Faculty Development does not give enough attention, nor provide enough support to teaching.

Evaluation of teaching:

- Again, the working group talked about the differences between Boler, which requires that all faculty evaluate each class every semester using a common, faculty-designed evaluation instrument, and CAS, which does not use a common instrument and does not have the same requirements.
- We briefly discussed the report of the Teaching Evaluation Task Force (1999), the goal of which was to “establish symmetry of rewards for research and teaching.”
- The working group also spent a considerable amount of time discussing the evaluation of teaching, how best to do it, and how it is closely related to the reward and support of teaching. A majority of the members of the working group believe that the evaluation of teaching is of critical importance because, without it, it is extraordinarily difficult to recognize and reward excellent teaching.

By the end of the spring semester, however, most of the working group members were clearly frustrated by the lack of consensus, focus and progress. Many, if not most, of the working group members openly questioned the merit of high-impact strategies and were not interested in addressing the issue. The majority also objected to canvassing the faculty on the question of high-impact methods, capstone classes or experiential learning. In an attempt to resolve this stalemate, we surveyed the members of our working group, asking each person to identify what he or she believes ought to be the top priority for this working group. We hoped that this would help us to identify key tasks and better focus our efforts.

Based on the information collected, at the last meeting of spring 2011 we reached a consensus with regard to the following: the status of teaching at JCU needs to be elevated, and the University needs to better recognize, support and reward excellent teaching. Yet, as mentioned earlier, we acknowledged that both statements to a great extent require that the university be able to evaluate and measure teaching. Thus, to further address those two statements, we opted to break up into three sub-groups for the summer:

- Assessment and Reward of Teaching: Mike Martin, Lindsay Calkins, Gerry Guest
- The Environment (physical environment such as facilities and culture): Julia Karolle-Berg, Jeanne Somers, Maryclaire Moroney, John Scarano
- The Support of Teaching: John Spencer, Marc Lynn, Linda Seiter

The working group unanimously agreed to work throughout the summer in their separate groups. Each group was asked to submit a progress report mid-summer, and to submit a report

of its findings by early August. The resulting recommendations, based on the work of the subcommittees, are discussed in Part II, below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Part II: Summer 2011 and Fall 2012

As the result of the work of each of the three Teaching Excellence subcommittees, we were able to make the following general recommendations:

A. Teaching Awards

Over the summer of 2011, the members of the Assessment and Reward subcommittee reviewed the various teaching awards at nine of our comparator schools, as well as the different awards/rewards currently offered at John Carroll. After exploring how these other schools reward and recognize great teachers, we recommend that the university create more awards for excellence in the classroom:

1. Part-time teaching award(s):

It is clear from the evaluation of institutional data that the presence of a large number of part-time faculty is a trend that continues. Given this, we should acknowledge the excellent contributions to the student educational experience that are provided by these individuals.

2. Teaching Commendations:

To further recognize excellence in the classroom, we recommend the establishment of 4 - 6 teaching commendations that would be awarded annually through the Provost's office. All faculty (Boler and CAS) would be eligible. The award would carry a stipend of \$500-1000, and there would be recognition outside the Provost's office (similar to Grauel winners), as well as recognition during a university event, such as Convocation or Commencement.

3. Alumni Award(s) for Teaching Excellence:

This award would be determined by alumni and all university faculty (including retired faculty) would be eligible. Alumni may appreciate a voice in the process of identifying excellent and influential teachers, and it would be instructive for those of us currently in the classroom to hear what alumni consider to be the characteristics of great teachers.

4. CAS Teacher Award:

Students, too, may appreciate a role in identifying good teachers. Thus, we recommend the creation of a CAS Teaching Award (similar to the Boler School's Favorite Teacher Award), the determination of which would be based on student votes.

B. Annual Assessment of Teaching and the Issue of Advising

It is recommended that advising to be considered under service rather than the teaching section of the annual evaluation; however, the working group did not reach a consensus on this issue. The

presence of advising in the evaluation of teaching acts to skew the value of teaching versus research. Under the proposed rubric for faculty evaluation in CAS, the evaluation of teaching is weighted less heavily than is research because advising is included in the overall teaching component. This simply reinforces the perception that research is more important to the administration than is teaching. To correct this, the evaluation of teaching must be on par with that of research.

In addition, many on the working group felt that there might be issues of inequity under the proposed system. For example, new faculty and Grauel recipients typically do not advise students, and new faculty may not have full advising loads until three or four years after their appointment begins. These groups would be penalized under the proposed evaluation process. Furthermore, some faculty members have no responsibilities for advising graduate students or for the direction of theses and essays.

C. Revisit the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)

The working group believes that more support should and could be done by the university and that it makes sense to revisit the idea of a center that is devoted entirely to teaching. We can learn from what others are doing and so offer the following CTL sites at other universities as examples:

- <http://teaching.uchicago.edu/>
- <http://ctl.stanford.edu/>
- <http://ctl.byu.edu/>
- <http://www.units.muohio.edu/celt/resources/strategies.php>
- <http://www.units.muohio.edu/celt/resources/additional.php#VTLC>
- http://www.hofstra.edu/Faculty/CTSE/ctse_links.cfm

D. Technology and Equipment Upgrade

The working group urges the administration to insure that ALL classrooms and seminar rooms are fully equipped with appropriate technology and equipment. Some rooms, especially seminar rooms, are not adequately equipped (equipment must be ordered on an individual basis). In other rooms, the equipment is aging or the room cannot be properly darkened for media presentations.

E. Clarify the relationship between the Center for Faculty Development (CFD) and IT

If teaching is going to move in the direction of a greater usage of technology (including on-line or hybrid courses and increased use of media), there needs to be adequate support for such endeavors. The present situation, with the CFD and Jay Tarby's office operating independently and inadequately staffed, does not provide the needed technological support for innovation. This concern involves not only computer, software, and interface training but also technological support for online courses and for the use of various media.

[Since this report was written in summer 2011, there have been a number of collaborative meetings between CFD and IT, and the CFD has sponsored a number of teaching/technology lunches. We commend the CFD for these initiatives and hope that these collaborative efforts are expanded in the future.]

F. Provide support and incentives for the following:

- working with the CFD
- incorporating new teaching methods or changing one's approach to teaching
- expanding the use of technology in teaching
- teaching interdisciplinary, hybrid and online courses
- exploring the use of social media and networking in learning
- incorporating assessment tools and modifications in teaching based on the results
- greater participation in pedagogical conferences (e.g., International Alliance of Teacher Scholars or the Lily Conference on College and University Teaching)
- increasing access to materials on teaching and learning (e.g., *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*; *The Teaching Professor*; *Peer Review*)

G. Additional Support and Rewards

The university needs to commit to adequate support and reward for improving teaching, re-visioning courses, working to enhance one's pedagogical techniques, and demonstrating excellence in teaching. In part this can be done through items C and F above. However, this support should also include such opportunities as funding for attending conferences, planning and running of workshops on campus, mentoring of new faculty, study groups, and cross-disciplinary discussion of pedagogy. Finally, there must be a clear and precise system incorporated into the annual evaluation that rewards those who work with the CFD and its programs, who seek (and demonstrate) improvement in their teaching, and who exhibit excellence in their teaching. Without the incentive for improvement, it is hard to see how the university is taking the improvement of teaching seriously.

H. Re-centering Teaching

The John Carroll Mission Statement makes explicit the assumption that academic excellence cannot be achieved without teaching excellence. As such, the following features are crucial to a university-wide commitment to teaching excellence:

- The recognition that teaching excellence is fundamental to our academic vision, mission and core values and that a reputation for teaching excellence is one of our most effective recruitment tools.
- An organizational structure that reflects the pre-eminence of the academic mission and in which faculty are valued collaborators in planning, decision-making, and resource allocation at all levels.
- Programs that nurture and support the faculty's ongoing development as teachers throughout their professional lives.
- Policies and processes related to hiring, reappointment, tenure, and promotion that are consistent with the importance of teaching excellence in our vision, mission and core values.
- Consistent and transparent evaluation and reward of the faculty's commitment to teaching excellence.

- Full and meaningful integration of academic and student support services and programs which support a commitment to teaching excellence.

(APTF Summary Statement 5.17.11, "RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TEACHING EXCELLENCE WORKING GROUP, SEPT. 2011")

Part III: Spring 2012

As has been stated earlier, as a group we believe that teaching excellence is critical to our mission and ultimately to our reputation. We also believe that to encourage and promote excellent teaching and innovation in the classroom, the university needs to make a strong commitment to provide the appropriate level of resources and to provide the proper incentives, such as the recognition and reward to teaching. Yet, to reward and recognize excellent teaching presumes not only that we can define it, but also that we can measure it. Though others before us have advocated for a common instrument to evaluate teaching and have not been successful, we believe that the establishment of a common evaluation instrument is essential to a fair and meaningful evaluation of instructors.

Our final task, as determined in a meeting of the APTF Phase Two Steering Group, was to provide support to the Dean of Arts and Sciences as it related to her effort to develop a student evaluation of teaching (SET) instrument for CAS. The working group co-chairs met with the Dean on February 24th where it was decided that our working group would provide more information and advice about SETs in general.

Thus, in the final phase this spring, though we had lost a couple of members and found it particularly challenging to find a mutually convenient time to meet, we discussed concerns that working group members had about the use of SETs in general and the possible adoption of a common SET across all departments in CAS. Selection of evaluation questions, mode of delivery, and utilization of the resulting data were the main topics of conversation. Interestingly, some members suggested that faculty also evaluate their courses (as well as students) because such evaluations could be used to bring to light issues regarding resources and support for courses that require technology (e.g. computer programs, iPads, distance learning) beyond the standards found in nearly every classroom.

We assessed numerous different examples of SETS, including those from the Department of Classical and Modern Languages, Art History, Math and Computer Science and from Boler. In sum, the working group recommends the following in regards to a common SET:

- Both open-ended response and Likert-scale questions should be present.
- SETs should incorporate a student self-assessment section similar to the "Student Information" and "Student's Performance" sections from the Department of Classical and Modern Languages & Cultures evaluation (see Appendix A)
- Students are asked to evaluate the extent to which a course connects to other courses at JCU.
- Faculty should be given an opportunity to evaluate their courses for the appropriate level of support, or any other issue deemed relevant.

- Evaluation of part-time faculty would be mandatory and these evaluations would help to determine the Part-time teaching award(s) – see section II.A.1

Advising Working Group Report

Members:

Laura Atkins, Assistant Dean, Boler School of Business
Rebecca Dinnen, Director of Transfer and International Admission
Malia McAndrew, History
Catherine Miller (past member), Chemistry
Maryclaire Moroney (co-chair), Associate Dean for Student Services and Academic Advising
Doug Norris, Mathematics and Computer Science
Kyle O'Dell, Director of Orientation and Leadership
Mindy Peden (past co-chair), Political Science
Naveed Piracha, Physics
Cynthia Marco Scanlon, Assistant Director, Center for Career Services
Tom Short (co-chair), Mathematics and Computer Science
Elizabeth Stiles, Political Science
Andy Welki, Economics and Finance
John Yost, Psychology

Charge

Our working group's charge appeared in the Academic Planning Task Force (APTF) Phase I Report:

Specifically we recommend the committee consider:

*A. Examining how we can make course alignment more viable both within and between academic programs and the core curriculum to promote: a more holistic and **integrated** sense of their relationship to each other, more **intentional** course selection, and more **individualized** programs of study.*

*B. Determining how advising can facilitate a more **intentional, integrative, and individualized** selection of courses.*

C. Whether to use E portfolios or some other system that asks students to take greater responsibility for demonstrating how they are meeting the institutional learning outcomes and how they are designing their own personal and career goals.

D. Whether the current model of course registration should be modified?

Charges Attended To and Other Issues That Emerged

We began our work by assigning to members of the group chapters selected from the book *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook* (2nd ed). Some members prepared summaries

of the chapters they read, and we discussed the readings in our meetings. These readings formed a common foundation for the rest of our work.

After considering our charge and the readings, we decided that our main tasks would be to formulate a mission statement, to develop goals for the JCU advising program, and to consider alternative models for the advising program.

Accomplishments

We developed the following mission statement:

The primary mission of the academic advising program is to empower individuals to develop meaningful plans through educational, personal, and vocational discernment.

We also developed goals in three broad categories: Expectations, Efficacy, and Technology. The goals are listed below.

Expectations

1. Our advising program will facilitate reflection and integration of learning.
2. Individual students will remain responsible for their own academic programs, with guidance from advisors.
3. There will be a centralized, University-wide academic advising center to coordinate advising across campus.
 - a) The academic advising center coordinator will be a permanent and full-time position.
 - b) The center's staff will articulate the advisor role and advisee responsibilities.
 - c) The center's staff will support pre-major, major, graduate, and special audience advising.
 - d) The center's staff will provide advisor training and opportunities for development that are available to all faculty members and is consistent across academic units.
 - e) The center will provide mandatory training and development for new advisors, including new faculty members.
 - f) The center's staff will maintain consistency in follow-up with regard to warnings and notifications.
 - g) The center will provide referrals for individual students to other offices within the University, as appropriate, including Financial Aid, Housing, and the Counseling Center.
4. All faculty members will share in the responsibility for advising. The advising load will be shared equitably across faculty members, and the process of assigning the load will be

transparent.

5. Advising and participation in development opportunities for advising will be recognized and assessed as part of each faculty member's teaching responsibilities. There will be consistency and transparency in recognition and compensation for advising.
6. The institution will periodically consider alternative advising models (such as advising as a seven-week course for all new pre-major students with a common syllabus).

Efficacy

The following resources will be considered and absorbed into the JCU advising process. Assessment information will be gathered by the Academic Advising Center and then used to maintain and improve the quality of the advising program. The APTF working group recommends that the Academic Advising Center be charged with the following responsibilities:

1. To monitor the rate at which students are satisfying program requirements, and verify that sufficient opportunities exist so that students can satisfy their requirements.
2. To monitor retention of students from semester to semester and from year to year.
3. To document each student's advising experience in a consistent manner.
4. To regularly survey students and advisors about the effectiveness of the advising program.
5. To regularly benchmark our advising program with peer institutions.
6. To monitor the load on faculty advisors and monitor whether the changes in the advising load are associated with the success of the advising program.
7. To coordinate and disseminate the dimensions of senior exit information as they reflect on the advising program.

Technology

Appropriate technology will be made available to facilitate advising. This technology should include the ability to:

1. Outline program requirements and indicate whether they are satisfied.
2. Facilitate communication between advisors and advisees.
3. Maintain electronic trails of documentation, including degree audit reports and e-portfolios.
4. Make available online resources to support advising.

5. Pursue pathways through which students can be reached, such as e-portfolios and social networking opportunities.

In light of our group's charge, we recognize the importance of considering electronic documentation, such as e-portfolios. We chose to develop general goals for technology rather than to emphasize any specific format.

Recommendations

We recommend that the university, and in particular the College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean for Advising and the Boler School Dean's Office, work toward implementing the goals listed above.

Our hope is for a transparent and effective coordinated university-wide advising program, to maximize guidance and assistance for students and to provide appropriate support and recognition for advisors.

Bibliography

- Appleby, Drew C. "Advising as Teaching and Learning" in *Academic Advising: A comprehensive handbook*, second edition (ed. By Virginia N. Goron, Wesley R. Habley, Thomas J. Grites, and Associates). San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2008. 85-102
- Campbell, Susan M. "Vision, Mission, Goals and Program Objectives for Academic Advising Programs" in *Academic Advising: A comprehensive handbook*, second edition (ed. By Virginia N. Goron, Wesley R. Habley, Thomas J. Grites, and Associates). San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2008. 229-241
- Hagen, Peter L. and Peggy Jordan. "Theoretical Foundations of Academic Advising" in *Academic Advising: A comprehensive handbook*, second edition (ed. By Virginia N. Goron, Wesley R. Habley, Thomas J. Grites, and Associates). San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2008. 17-35
- King, Margaret C. "Organization of Academic Advising Services" in *Academic Advising: A comprehensive handbook*, second edition (ed. By Virginia N. Goron, Wesley R. Habley, Thomas J. Grites, and Associates). San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2008. 242-252
- Kuh, George D. "Advising for Student Success" in *Academic Advising: A comprehensive handbook*, second edition (ed. By Virginia N. Goron, Wesley R. Habley, Thomas J. Grites, and Associates). San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2008. 68- 84
- Kuhn, Terry. "Historical Foundations of Academic Advising" in *Academic Advising: A comprehensive handbook*, second edition (ed. By Virginia N. Goron, Wesley R. Habley, Thomas J. Grites, and Associates). San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2008. 3-16

Lowenstein, Marc. "Ethical Foundations of Academic Advising" in *Academic Advising: A comprehensive handbook*, second edition (ed. By Virginia N. Goron, Wesley R. Habley, Thomas J. Grites, and Associates). San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons, 2008. 36-49

Working Group on Faculty Workload and Recognition Report

Members:

Jeffrey Dyck, Physics

Daniel Kilbride, History

James Krukones (co-chair), Associate Academic Vice President

Anne Kugler (co-chair), History

Peter Kvidera, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Richard Mausser, Finance and Administrative Services

Jen McWeeny, Philosophy

Gerald Weinstein, Accountancy

Brenda Wirkus, Philosophy

Charges to the Working Group:

The Academic Planning Task Force Phase I report of 2009-2010 recommended charging a faculty committee with examining faculty recruitment and retention, development and workload, evaluation, tenure and promotion. Accordingly, the Academic Vice President constituted a Working Group on Workload and Recognition in the Fall of 2010 and charged it with: a) coordinating with the Faculty Council Committee on Finance and Compensation to investigate those issues; b) considering the relationship between current workload and curricular reform, advising, new programs, and high impact pedagogies; and c) examining issues of faculty culture.

Charges Attended to and Other Issues That Emerged

We began by considering the kind of information that would be useful to our deliberations, and the areas of overlap we might encounter with other Working Groups and Faculty Council committees. Broadly, the question we addressed was how (if at all) have the nature and the scale of faculty work changed or remained the same over time? Where does it function well? Where are there problems, what kinds of problems, and what can we do about them? Because the Working Group on Teaching Excellence was looking at questions of faculty development and student evaluations of teaching, and because we did not yet have a sense of what curricular reform would entail and thus could not speak to workload implications, we concentrated on: 1) investigating and articulating areas of faculty workload that were potentially out of balance; and 2) developing a baseline model of faculty work that could be applied to some degree across the University.

Accomplishments

We worked from the specific to the general. Since we knew from the Compensation Committee's reports in 2010-2011 that the supervision of independent studies and theses was one area where

workload appeared to be uneven and unrecognized, we began by building on their initial survey of the number and distribution of independent studies and theses across departments where it was determined that faculty had supervised or were supervising approximately 135 theses and independent studies in the Spring semester of 2010, and approximately 127 in the Fall of 2010. These supervisions were without compensation in the form of stipends or credit toward course load, and without clear connection to evaluation for merit increases in salary.

With the assistance of Registrar Kathy DiFranco, the Working Group compiled information on independent studies for 2000/2001, 2005/2006 and 2010. Further, we circulated a questionnaire to department chairs to ask why and how their departments offered and recorded independent studies and theses and we asked the Deans to provide information on which faculty members supervised independent studies and theses and on how such supervision was weighted in evaluation. Methods of recording (or not recording) the supervision of theses and independent studies vary wildly by department. Some departments use a uniform course number; some do not. Some departments use a section number to indicate a particular faculty member; many do not. Some departments offer multiple levels of credit; some do not. Consequently, the number of theses and independent studies per semester is likely to be under-counted, and it is currently nearly impossible to accurately track which faculty supervise which courses.

Nonetheless, it is possible to say that, as a group, faculty typically supervise between 210 and 260 independent studies and theses per year. It is also worth noting that from 2000 to 2010, John Carroll's enrollment declined by about 600 (from 4200 to 3600) students and the number of full-time faculty declined by about 40. Distribution is, however, uneven among departments and within departments over time. In 2000-2001 EN, MML, PS, RL and PL had the largest number; in 2005-2006 CH, BL, PS, and RL.

When the committee turned to the question of compensation for this work, we discovered that within the University, practice was not entirely uniform. Apparently in the Boler School there exists a policy of awarding credit towards teaching load such that 12 credit hours of supervision of independent studies resulted in one course load reduction in a subsequent semester. Within the last two years, the Chemistry Department negotiated a similar arrangement in the College of Arts and Sciences.

We also noted that the Faculty Handbook conceives of the supervision of independent studies and theses and the manner of their compensation as follows:

Section E: Service Load

Due allowance will be made by the departmental chairperson, with the approval of the appropriate dean and the Academic Vice President, for the following: student load, number of preparations, type and level of course, research, essay and thesis direction, laboratory supervision, cocurricular activities, administrative duties and the like. If the time required by such activities is sufficiently great, the teaching service assignment will be reduced, either continuously or periodically, to produce equitable service load.

---Part Three, Section I, E

Outside John Carroll, the committee decided to canvass the practices of a range of schools, from comparators from the UPG peer institution list, to other Jesuit institutions, to schools in Ohio, to schools on the AACSB accreditation comparison list. We asked people at 26 institutions: Denison, Kenyon, Oberlin, Wooster, Ohio Northern, Scranton, Cleveland State, Akron, Case Western, Bowling Green, Miami of Ohio, Ohio University, Kent State, Mount Union, LeMoyne, Baldwin-Wallace, Canisius, Xavier, Loyola Chicago, Hiram, Towson, Indiana State, Louisville, Eastern Nazarene, St. Thomas, and University of Texas at Arlington.

As the summary chart in Appendix 1 indicates (it double-counts where policies are multiple or changing), at seven institutions no compensation is offered; at six institutions (unspecified) credit is awarded in annual evaluations; at eight institutions some form of course load reduction occurs; and at ten institutions independent study and/or thesis supervision carries a stipend.

But here is where our work moved to the general. In arriving at recommendations as to how to treat independent studies and theses as part of faculty workload, (see below), we addressed improvements to record-keeping, reconceptualization of the purpose of these kinds of activities, and specific reward models. We also began to consider related questions of the rate of course load reductions and the rate at which faculty served on committees (see chart in Appendix 2). The further we broke down each of these activities, however, the more separate and piecemeal-like they began to appear. At this moment (Summer 2011), one committee member, Brenda Wirkus, articulated a much more integrated model of where this kind of work fit into faculty life and how it ought to be recognized as follows:

We are professionals. We are also employees, i.e., someone else pays us. But we are not employees like factory workers or middle managers or computer programmers or web designers or sales clerks. We belong to a small category comprised of, historically, only three other groups: clergy, lawyers, and doctors.

What separates professionals from other categories, again historically, is that professionals have great independence and wide latitude in defining their work life. They are self-supervising and self-determining. They develop their professional life according to a set of professional norms and have nearly total flexibility in that development. They do not answer to strict job descriptions. They are not piece workers, nor are they hourly employees. Their workday never ends. Or, perhaps more optimistically, they get to shape their workday and work week and work year and work life. Professors, especially, are never truly "off the clock" because, as we all know all too well, the ideas that haunt us and the projects we want to accomplish do not respect weekends or regular hours or allow us respite and vacation.

If we choose to be professionals along more traditional lines, then there is another task that confronts us. Then, what we need is not to look at compensation for various pieces of our work but rather at our total compensation package. We need to get a competitive salary for a faculty member at our rank and years of service, and **not** based upon individual payment for individual components. This method would allow faculty members more flexibility in their construction of their life, a life that can then be driven by talents and interests rather than by what will make them more money. For example, I might not care that I conduct more independent studies than another colleague if my evaluation includes **recognition** of the value of that contribution. And, most importantly, if our salaries were more competitive.

If . . . I were better paid and believed that my total contribution was seriously considered in annual evaluations, then I wouldn't need to be compensated separately for each of the essays and independent studies. I am a professional; part of what I do is to respond flexibly and compassionately to student needs. But then pay me like a professional. Make my total package good enough that I'm not reduced to quibbling over how many independent studies I do. Under this vision, our goal should be improving the overall compensation package, thereby encouraging individual responsiveness to student and institutional needs, rather than paying for individual bits and pieces of work.

Obviously, the administration of this approach would be more complicated than one that simply quantifies the pieces of faculty work. It would depend upon deans who are willing to spend the time to evaluate the total contribution and who also can balance out different contributions. Perhaps conducting ten independent studies or directing ten M.A. theses should "count" as much as producing one refereed journal article. Flexibility would be required. And, ultimately, faculty would need to trust their deans.

The "total package" option, again, depends upon deans who are willing to justify salary decisions based upon differing contributions of individual faculty members. It puts a big burden on them. But it also acknowledges and encourages the uniqueness of those contributions and respects the freedom of the professional to work responsibly.

Based on this concept of an integrated array of faculty work, the working group began to develop a baseline description of what faculty do that would be applicable across the University. This is not a "merit" definition; rather, it attempts to name all elements of faculty work that need to be carried out for a faculty member to be meeting the expectations of the job. For this project, we paid particular attention to the *Faculty Handbook's* description of "Professional Responsibilities of the Faculty" (pp. 11-12). We also reviewed departmental tenure and promotion policies, an exercise that reinforced for us the variety of ways faculty performance is conceptualized.

In addition, we undertook to survey a wide array of comparable institutions to see if any of them had achieved some sort of comprehensive understanding of, and policies around, faculty

workload. These institutions fell into one of three groups – Jesuit/AJCU; Ohio (and non-Jesuit); and the list of sixteen comparator institutions that were based on IPEDS criteria and that had emerged from discussions of the University Planning Group. This amounted to approximately 75 colleges and universities, within which there was some overlap. E-mailing a senior-level administrator in the office of provost or academic vice president, we described the activity of our working group and then asked whether the institution would be willing to share its definition of “faculty workload,” that is, *if it already had one*. If the school did not have such a definition, the respondent was requested not to create one. Our message explicitly said that manufacturing a definition just to have something to say might actually defeat the purpose behind the inquiry; moreover – and this we did not say outright – the burden of producing an entirely original answer seemed to make a reply all the less likely. In the end, of the institutions we contacted, slightly more than half (39) responded; that number includes 17 of the 27 Jesuit institutions to whom we sent a message.

Like the institutions we had set out to contact, the replies fell into several identifiable categories. A handful said that they had no such definition but would be interested in finding out whatever we might come up with. Nearly half included a link to their faculty handbook or to what the respondent considered the relevant sections from it; often this material duplicated similar passages from John Carroll’s *Faculty Handbook*. Finally, about a quarter of the responding schools sent material of other kinds; these included the institution’s collective bargaining agreement, statements on “faculty roles and responsibilities” (sometimes broken down by the colleges within a university), sample tenure/promotion guidelines, and evaluation criteria for faculty. On the whole, it was clear that “faculty workload” is a concept that has meaning and thus has received attention of various sorts and to varying degrees at many institutions. This in itself reaffirmed the value of the working group’s efforts.

The most extensive response by far came from Elon University, a comparator institution. Some of the material related expressly to Elon and dealt with matters such as contracts, compensation, professional development, teaching load, course releases, and student mentoring. The bulk of their response, however, came in the form of a thirty-four-page “Report of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Faculty Teaching Load,” which had actually been drafted at Creighton in 2007. (Ironically, Creighton was one of the AJCU schools that had not replied to our e-mail.) The fact that Elon had found the report useful spoke to its relevance and quality; significantly, the Creighton report was based on widespread benchmarking. One of the most interesting parts of the report – which figured in the working group’s subsequent discussion of the replies we had received from contacted institutions – dealt with the concept of “invisible teaching load.” As described in the report, the term refers to

independent studies or supervised research projects that take up a good deal of time for many faculty and are not reflected (typically) in most departments’ calculation of load (there are some exceptions to this.) These courses represent invisible overloads.

Moreover, it was clear that this “invisible load” was “especially pronounced” in certain departments. In short, a sister Jesuit institution had pinpointed (and provided an expressive label for) the very kinds of activities that the working group found problematic and deserving of our initial attention. The Creighton report – and, for that matter, the responses from a variety of other schools – do not necessarily focus on the relatively broad concept of “faculty workload” as opposed to some more specific part of it (for instance, teaching load). Nevertheless, that material has inspired some of the recommendations to be found at the end of this report.

Baseline Elements of Faculty Work

Teaching

- Standard course preparation
- Maintaining currency in the content and pedagogy of one’s designated teaching fields
- Maintaining class protocol (e.g., syllabus, schedule)
- Carrying standard load of courses (3 or 4, depending)
- Grading of exams and assignments
- Holding regular office hours
- Advising students as required by department
- Following University procedures for tracking student enrollment and performance

Scholarship

- Maintaining an ongoing scholarly program in reading and research
- Participating in and presenting at scholarly conferences
- Publishing peer-reviewed scholarship (books, articles) on a regular basis
- Maintaining active membership in a professional society
- Conducting grant activity appropriate to the field

Service

- Attending department meetings and fulfilling other department obligations
- Serving on University committees

Other

- Practicing good citizenship toward the University:
 - Assisting with student recruitment by agreeing to classroom visits
 - Attending University meetings
 - Meeting students

These descriptions vary by category as to how universal they are and how uniformly they can be applied. The activities under “teaching” apply to all faculty across all semesters, but it is less clear how to measure and interpret the baseline description of scholarship, especially as it would vary depending on whether a faculty member was teaching a 3/3 or a 4/4 load. Moreover, how often any one person would be publishing and in what form would vary by discipline, as would the degree to which grant activity was possible or desired. Forms of participation in scholarly conferences would vary not only by field, but by the degree to which the University supported the cost of travel.

Recommendations

Based on the work of the last year-and-a-half – our discussions, interactions with the other working groups, data collection, and information solicited from other colleges and universities – the Working Group on Faculty Workload and Recognition offers the recommendations listed below. “Responsible parties” have been designated for each of them, but subsequently it may be decided that other or additional entities should play a role in their realization. Likewise, the working group acknowledges the possible need for the official approval of individual measures, e.g., by the Faculty Council.

1. Establish a consistent system for tracking the elements of workload for individual faculty performance. (The sources for accessing the relevant data already may exist – via Banner and the Registrar, for example – so it ought to be a matter of making intentional use of these sources rather than having to create them from scratch.) The system should make it possible to distinguish between baseline expectations and work that goes beyond the fulfillment of those expectations in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Efforts previously considered “invisible” should receive due recognition. Moreover, it is vital that this tracking take careful account of course load – whether 4-4, 4-3, 3-3, or some other combination – course-load reductions, and the rationale for these reductions, with maximum equitability the goal. (Indeed, the University’s official 4-4 course load and its implications warrant explicit reconsideration.) The tracking might entail a revision of the faculty self-evaluation, so that faculty themselves can help chairpersons and deans alike in evaluating their performance. Ultimately, it should lead to the dissemination of a rubric whereby deans clarify the value they attach to the discrete elements of faculty workload.
Responsible parties: Department Chairs, Deans, Provost/Academic Vice President’s Office
2. For selected elements of faculty workload, especially those particular to, or more common in, certain departments – e.g., independent studies, theses – develop a combined compensation system that allows a faculty member to choose whether to bank such work toward a course release or to receive a stipend for it in any given semester. The determination of compensation for these kinds of work may necessitate some preliminary decisions. For example, in the case of independent studies, the University might need to decide which kinds it wishes to offer and which kinds it wishes to discourage, following up with appropriate incentives and disincentives.
Responsible parties: Deans, Department Chairs

3. Continue and expand the benchmarking of John Carroll on the basis of benchmark information collected by appropriate University agencies and using consistent sets of comparator and aspirant institutions. The process could help the University keep abreast of developments and make progress in dealing with faculty workload and recognition. Benchmarks should be correlated with the merit system and thus play a role in the determination of faculty salaries, especially if the comparator group used in the CUPA special studies eventually is deemed too large.
Responsible parties: University Planning Group, University Budget Committee
4. Support the work of the Faculty Compensation Committee in securing equitable salary practices and a competitive compensation package at the University. The Committee and academic administration have striven to develop and maintain a productive working relationship built upon an open exchange of faculty concerns and salary information. That dialogue must continue, as the recognition of faculty work is most clearly reflected in faculty compensation.
Responsible parties: Faculty Compensation Committee, Provost/AVP, Deans
5. Raise the profile of faculty work at the University – teaching, scholarship, and service alike. Several awards – the Distinguished Faculty Award, Lucrezia Culicchia and Wasmer Awards for teaching, and Curtis W. Miles Award for Community Service – already honor faculty achievement, but an increase in the stipends attached to them is overdue. *Faculty Notes*, the scholarly luncheons, and the annual research reception spotlight faculty productivity; likewise, the annual recognition meetings recently instituted by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences are exemplary in calling attention to faculty accomplishment. More could be done, though, to communicate and celebrate faculty milestones such as retirements. The University webpage, too, should more frequently and regularly highlight the faculty’s individual and collective achievements. Likewise, greater efforts might be made at familiarizing the immediate community as well as the Greater Cleveland area about the activities of our faculty and the often untapped resources they represent. Also deserving of attention are faculty-student collaboration, the international ties of our faculty, and the role played by our part-time lecturers in enriching the University community. In short, faculty work must be recognized and reaffirmed more explicitly and on an ongoing basis.
Responsible parties: Integrated Marketing and Communication, Provost/AVP’s Office, Deans, Department Chairs
6. Maintain periodic contact among the working groups launched by the academic planning process – or their successors – so that the consideration of faculty workload and recognition remains current with other developments in the academic division.
Responsible parties: APTF Steering Committee
7. Review the recommendations in this report within a year of its submission to determine how and to what degree they have been realized. That would also be an appropriate opportunity to decide whether a standing committee on faculty workload and recognition should be appointed. Given the essential role of faculty in the academic enterprise overall and therefore in the specific aspects of academic planning, such a committee could be

similarly instrumental in coordinating and integrating the follow-up activities of the other working groups.

Responsible parties: APTF Steering Committee, Provost/AVP

Appendix 1

COMPENSATION FOR INDEPENDENT STUDIES & THESES AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS:

None	Credit in Evaluation	Courseload Reduction	Courseload Reduction banked	Courseload Reduction at Chair's Discretion	Stipend
Denison (when moved to 3/2 courseload); Kenyon (moving away); Oberlin OH Northern Mt Union UTexas Arlington Indiana State <i>Total: 7</i>	Ohio U; LeMoyne (moving away); Louisville CWRU Loyola Chicago Towson <i>Total: 6</i>	Kenyon (moving toward); Kent for MA thesis (1) dissertation (2) IS (1) <i>Total: 2</i>	Wooster (1/10 regular course); Cleveland State (12 for 1 course release) <i>Total: 2</i>	OH Northern Akron Bowling Green Miami <i>Total: 4</i>	Scranton \$110-175 per cr hr per student; Kent summer only; St Thomas \$450; LeMoyne (moving toward); Towson \$61 to \$100 per cr hr limit 3 students; Baldwin-Wallace \$225 limit 4 students per semester; Eastern Nazarene \$150-300 per 3 credits; Hiram stipend if exceed 24 cr per year (normal load is 22-24); 3 IS in 1 year is 1 teaching cr hr added to normal load; Xavier \$400; Canisius \$890 <i>Total: 10</i>

Akron, Ohio U, Xavier, Canisius all mention trying to avoid/ discourage Independent Studies

Appendix 2

COMMITTEE SERVICE:

	2000	2011
Number of faculty	236	197
Number of committee seats	167	240

COMMITTEE SEATS:

	2010-2011	2011-2012
Number of faculty on committees	101	94
Distribution of faculty serving on committees	46 serve on 1 committee 29 serve on 2 committees 14 serve on 3 committees 10 serve on 4 committees 2 serve on 5 committees	41 serve on 1 committee 26 serve on 2 committees 15 serve on 3 committees 8 serve on 4 committees 3 serve on 5 committees
Distribution of faculty by department on university-wide committees (not including on leave, reduced, administrators or visiting)	AC: 4 of 4 AH: 3 of 4 BL: 3 of 10 CH: 5 of 8 CMLC: 6 of 12 CO: 1 of 8 ECFN: 8 of 9 ED: 4 of 20 EN: 5 of 10 HS: 6 of 6 MML: 7 of 13 MT: 11 of 13 PL: 6 of 10 PH: 5 of 5 PO: 5 of 7 PS: 5 of 11 SC: 4 of 9	AC: 4 of 4 AH: 2 of 4 BL: 2 of 10 CH: 4 of 7 CMLC: 6 of 12 CO: 2 of 8 ECFN: 7 of 9 ED: 3 of 20 EN: 5 of 10 HS: 6 of 6 MML: 6 of 13 MT: 11 of 13 PL: 6 of 10 PH: 5 of 5 PO: 5 of 7 PS: 7 of 11 SC: 5 of 9

Steering Committee Report on Academic Program Prioritization Protocol

Members:

Lauren Bowen, Associate Academic Vice President
Lindsay Calkins, Associate Dean, Boler School of Business
Jeanne Colleran, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Gwen Compton-Engle, CMLC; Director of Core Curriculum
James Krukones, Associate Academic Vice President
Anne Kugler, History
Mike Martin, Biology
Dave Mascotti, Chemistry
Maryclaire Moroney, Associate Dean for Student Services and Academic Advising
Mindy Peden (past member), Political Science
Nick Santilli (co-chair), Associate Academic Vice President (past); Psychology
Tom Short, Mathematics and Computer Science
Tom Zlatoper (co-chair), Economics and Finance

1. Charge

John Day, Provost and Academic Vice President, charged the APTF Steering Committee with development of an academic program prioritization protocol. This is to involve identification of criteria for evaluating and prioritizing academic programs, which can inform resource allocation decisions.

2. Accomplishments

Since January 2011, the Steering Committee has:

- Read and discussed Robert C. Dickeson's *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services: Reallocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance*, Jossey-Bass, 2010. This book provides a framework and processes for determining academic priorities. Dickeson suggests ten criteria to serve as guidelines in the development of prioritization protocols as well as methods of rating programs and services common in academic affairs.
- Participated in "Academic Program Prioritization: Integrating Academic and Financial Planning," a webcast by Robert C. Dickeson and Larry Goldstein.
- Discussed the ten criteria for prioritization provided in the Dickeson book and weighted them to determine their relative importance in the John Carroll environment.
- Drafted a prioritization protocol, discussed the draft and suggested revisions.

3. Next Steps

The Steering Committee intends to:

- Review the revisions of the draft protocol and pilot a revised version during the 2012-13 academic year.
- Finalize the protocol by the end of the Spring 2013 Semester.