

Interim Recommendations from Academic Task Force Working Groups

Preliminary Recommendations to the Task Force

Co-op Experiences

Working Group Name: Instructional Efficiency

Specific Issue: How do we grow internships in programs that do not require these experiences?

Working Group Recommendation Number: #6 – Co-op Experience and Co-op Classroom Integration

- **Preliminary Recommendation: Option # 1.** Consider recommendations from Careers Across the Curriculum concept, which was explored in the Fenn Grant, and would be relevant to consider in an update to General Education requirements.

Benefits of Option #1

Potential savings associated with Option #1 None.

Potential negative consequences of Option #1 There may be a cost associated with managing the increased internships and working with employers.

Any particular facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of Option #1. We would need to see the impact on graduation. We may need to think about impact on current program requirements.

Any points of coordination or overlap of Option #1 with the recommendations of other Working Groups or Task Forces. Some coordination with the charge# 13 and Charge # 7

- **Preliminary Recommendation: Option #2 -** Take a look at community engagement general education proposal and connect to career across curriculum and internship/co-op

Benefits of Option #2: This would tie into existing general education requirements

Potential savings associated with Option #2: None

Potential negative consequences of Option #2 This may have an impact on a students' class or work schedule.

Any particular facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of Option #2. There can be valuable overlap between community engagement and internships. This can be a win win.

Any points of coordination or overlap of option #2 with the recommendations of other Working Groups or Task Forces. There is overlap with our work on Charge #7 and charge #13. This is a recommendation that would go to the Director of General Education for further discussion with the faculty.

Current Preferences of the Working Group among the listed options: Both options are viable.

Questions on which the Working Group seeks feedback:

Required internships - not only is it challenging for our students who are largely already working, but our employers don't suddenly have additional capacity or funding for more internships "just because" CSU students are required to do an internship.

Additional information needed by the Working Group with respect to this issue: None

Additional Relevant Considerations

- It's important to emphasize, in any recommendations around experiential learning or co-ops/internships, that specifics must be established at the programmatic level, as makes sense for pedagogical reasons and in relationship to the culture/professional expectations of the field.
- We should have the 0 credit and 3 credit options, as relevant to departments.

Course offerings and Curriculum

Working Group Name: Instructional Efficiency

Specific Issue: How can we evaluate/realign course offerings. What type of program and curriculum recommendations can be made to increase instructional efficiencies?

Working Group Recommendation Number: #7 Evaluate/realign course offerings and #13 Major program and curriculum recommendations.

- **Preliminary Recommendation: Option # 1.** Review the number of general-education courses offered on the schedule that meet the same general education requirement to see if the courses are enrolling efficiently.

Benefits of Option #1. It will avoid under enrollment of courses. It will more efficiently look at seat utilization. 78% of courses with the GE08 (Institutional Research code for Gen ED) attribute did not fill. On average, courses with the GE08 attribute fill 75% of the seats available.

Potential savings associated with Option #1: Likely to be savings. There were 2100 sections of General education classes offered in Fall 19, Spring 20 and Summer 20. A more thorough review on frequency of offering etc. needs to be completed at the departmental level.

Potential negative consequences of Option #1 It would reduce the options available for students, but it should not have an impact on retention or time to completion.

Any particular facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of Option #1. None.

Any points of coordination or overlap of Option #1 with the recommendations of other Working Groups or Task Forces. Yes. This can be easily included in the work and recommendations related to seat/utilization in charge# 8

Current Preferences of the Working Group among the listed options: This needs to be reviewed as part of a review of general education offerings.

Questions on which the Working Group seeks feedback: None

Additional information needed by the Working Group with respect to this issue: None

Additional Relevant Considerations: None

Class Size

Context:

Based on data comparing Fall 2014 to Fall 2019 data, in general, CSU is doing a better job in average class size at different levels.

Comparing data across multiple semesters, about 220 sections or 9% of our course offerings each semester (Fall and Spring) do not meet existing course minima.

30% of total faculty credits are allocated to courses with less than 10 students at Public Masters Universities nationally

The issue of seat utilization involves courses not meeting minima, under enrolled classes and course caps.

Based on EAB research publications CSU is already following some of the best practices of instructional efficiencies

Working Group Name: Instructional Efficiency

Specific Issue: Looking at how we can gain instructional efficiency by maximizing seat utilization.

Working Group Recommendation Number: #8 – Maximize Seat Utilization

- **Preliminary Recommendation: Option #1.** Have strict scrutiny on courses that do not meet course minima.

Benefits of Option #1

Potential savings associated with Option #1 Maximum Savings (430 courses in academic year. Assuming adjunct pay of \$3,000 per course) up to \$1.29 million.

Potential negative consequences of Option #1 The downside to this is that it could have an impact on student retention at least in the short term.

Any particular facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of Option #1. Scheduling needs to be viewed as a continuous activity by Chairs, Associate Deans and Deans.

Any points of coordination or overlap of Option #1 with the recommendations of other Working Groups or Task Forces: None

- **Preliminary Recommendation: Option #2** - Look to optimize the number of sections for multi-sectioned coursed. There is opportunity for increasing efficiency. In Fall 19, we

had 90 distinct courses that had more than 3 sections being offered. This accounted for 630 different sections.

Benefits of Option #2: Increase instructional efficiency.

Potential savings associated with Option #2: Eliminating 10% of these classes and moving the students into the other under-enrolled sections would save about \$360,000 per academic year (just Fall and Spring).

Potential negative consequences of Option #2 Sometimes this may have an impact on a students' class or work schedule.

Any particular facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of Option #2. We need to look deeper into the data to see the extent of under enrollment. We may need to look at the history of offerings. There may be unique reasons for underenrollment such as catering to the needs of evening students.

Any points of coordination or overlap of option #2 with the recommendations of other Working Groups or Task Forces: None

- **Preliminary Recommendation: Option #3** – Look at course caps. There are significant differences in the caps for so many courses. We understand caps are put in place for pedagogical reason, accreditation and physical space limitations. But in many instances, we don't fully understand the differences in caps for the same courses. This needs to be examined further.

Benefits of Option #3: Increased Instructional Efficiency

Potential savings associated with Option #3: It is a little harder to put a dollar figure on this key recommendation.

Potential negative consequences of Option #2: Sometimes this may have an impact on student retention and success.

Any particular facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of Option #2. Figuring out what is the ideal course cap in a data informed way.

Any points of coordination or overlap of option #2 with the recommendations of other Working Groups or Task Forces: None

- **Preliminary Recommendation: Option # 4.** Have course minima for lab courses

Benefits of Option #4. In Fall 19 and Spring 20, there were 92 sections that did not meet currently established course minima. Currently, lab courses do not fall under the review process.

Potential savings associated with Option #4: Maximum Savings for this option would be \$276,000.

Potential negative consequences of Option #4: The downside to this is that it could have an impact on student retention, if students don't get a preferred section or if there is only a single section. This should not have a major impact because multiple sections are typically offered for most courses.

Any particular facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of Option #4. Not clear, but we need to have deeper discussion with chairs on the impact of instituting minima for labs.

Any points of coordination or overlap of Option #4 with the recommendations of other Working Groups or Task Forces: There is overlap with charge #7 and #13.

Other Recommendations:

- Examine low enrolled programs for the number of core classes and how often they are offered, and the possibility of using courses in other departments as part of core or electives (i.e. statistics) offered, where pedagogically sound.
- Require all graduate and undergraduate programs to develop a cyclical schedule based on the size of their programs and their enrollment patterns.
- Support intrusive advising as a means to student success, cyclical scheduling, fewer enrolled classes etc. Advising can play an important role in guiding students into under enrolled classes when possible. For this class enrollment should be easily made available to faculty and academic advisors.
- As we reduce the frequency of course offerings we need to further support intrusive advising.
- Augmenting that cyclical scheduling recommendation, programs should have flexible advising plans for students who transfer or have interruptions to the Degree Map. (Again, emphasizing the need for Intrusive Faculty Advising, and some flexibility and autonomy for those advisors).
- Require all departments to review the prerequisite structure and core courses every 5 years.
- Suggest program heads, chairs, deans flag chronically under enrolled courses and programs, to look for efficiencies.
- Departments are encouraged to limit the number of electives or special topics to be offered in a single semester to funnel the students into fewer options that will increase the efficiency without compromising academic quality.
- We recommend regular reviews of low enrolled programs (majors) and, the following should be considered for each of them;
 - Implementation of the cyclical schedule
 - Review of frequency of course offerings
 - Number of electives being offered
 - Sharing of courses with other programs
- Program reviews need to be more structured to include instructional efficiencies

- Consider combining evening and day sections in an asynchronous or blended online environment
- Provide some training to all chairs and new Associate Deans on developing good scheduling practices in a data informed manner.

Current Preferences of the Working Group among the listed options: All four are viable options to consider. There are some of these issues, such as course caps, that may need to go to standing committee for review.

Questions on which the Working Group seeks feedback: None.

Additional information needed by the Working Group with respect to this issue: None

Additional Relevant Considerations: None

Workload Assignments

Working Group Name: Instructional Efficiencies

Specific Issue: Teaching Workload Assignments

As a general note, the working subgroup recommends that there be a clearer and more legible format for keeping track of workload across colleges. Information about research, service, and teaching varies in terms of detail and placement in workload columns. Reaching general agreement on the formatting could provide a more transparent accounting of workload allocation. However, there will always be outliers beyond those categories. Consequently, we recommend using a fourth column to account for special releases, buy-outs, credit for grants, and other assignments outside the norm.

The workload subgroup notes the following trends.

There are 340 TTFU, TTASO, and TFAST professors included on the College Workload Sheets we were provided. For that group of faculty the total credit hours allocation for a 6-2-16 load, the benchmark in the CBA for research- and service-active faculty, would be 2040 research credit hours, 680 service credit hours, and 5440 teaching credit hours. The actual total allocation on these spreadsheets was 2044 research credit hours, 1038 service credit hours, and 5078 teaching credit hours. The observed load, then, on average for these 340 faculty is 6.01-3.05-14.94.

Based on those averages, the workload subgroup notes that the workload assigned to these 340 tenure-track faculty, in aggregate, aligns quite closely with the benchmark workload assignment in the CBA for faculty of that class. Overall, there is a 1-credit variation with respect to service. We hypothesize that this variation may be attributable to the challenges of aligning a 16-credit teaching workload baseline with a 3-credit model, perhaps an unintended result of not realigning the benchmark tenure-track workload to a 3-credit standard after the 4-credit to 3-credit conversion of the curriculum. However, because workload benchmarks are a subject for contractual negotiation, we will not offer recommendations regarding those benchmarks.

Exclusive of lecturers in the School of Nursing, which uses a unique calculation basis for clinical instruction, there are 76 LEC included on the College Workload Sheets. For that group of faculty the total credit hours allocation for a 0-8-24 load, the norm in according to CBA for lecturers teaching 4 3-credit hour courses per semester, would be 0 research credit hours, 608 service credit hours, and 1824 teaching credit hours. The actual total allocation on these spreadsheets was 17 research credit hours, 559 service credit hours, and 1856 teaching credit hours. The observed load, then, on average for these 76 LEC faculty is 0.22-7.36-24.42.

Based on those averages, the workload subgroup notes that the workload assigned to these 76 LEC faculty, in aggregate, aligns quite closely with the benchmark workload assignment in the CBA for faculty of that class.

Having noted those general trends, we recommend that Chairs, Directors, and Deans pay careful attention to the Collective Bargaining Agreement's stipulations regarding teaching in assigning workload, which include the following:

“The normal instructional activity for a full-time faculty member shall range from 50% to 80% of the average workweek” (13.1.A)

For tenure-track faculty meeting college research/creative activity benchmarks, “The expected teaching load is 16 credit hours” for bargaining unit tenured/tenure track faculty’s annual workload assignment.” (13.1.F.1)

“Normally, all tenure-track and tenured bargaining unit faculty will be assigned at least 9 credit hours of teaching each academic year, though grants, credit banking, and other buyouts may reduce the instructional assignment below that level.” (13.1.F.1)

“Normally, all tenure-track and tenured bargaining unit faculty will be assigned at least 6 credit hours of teaching each academic year, regardless of grants, credit banking, and other buyouts.” (13.1.F.1)

The options detailed below are aimed to facilitate putting those principles into practice.

Preliminary Recommendation: Option #1/3

Implement a 7-credit ceiling on unfunded research credit in workload assignments.

Benefits of Option #1

For AY 2020-2021, the university assigned 179 credit hours for research above 7 credits. It is not clear how many of these extra hours are accounted for by grants, but it does appear that at least a portion of this body of credits is for unfunded research above college benchmarks. Recognizing unfunded research accomplishment up to 7 credits would preserve the existing contractual benchmark for research productivity (6 credits), while permitting an extra hour of research credit assignment to help assistant professors starting their career and to reward highly research-productive faculty. This ceiling would ensure that all faculty, exclusive of credit for grants and other funded opportunities, would maintain a core commitment of substantial teaching in line with the CBA. Applying this ceiling to unfunded research, rather than funded research, would permit discipline-appropriate exceptions for winners of substantial research grants that necessitate more workload allocation towards research.

Potential savings associated with Option #1

Because we do not know the specific sources of these 179 credit hours, the cost-savings are variable. At the maximum, if these additional hours were assigned to teaching by full-time faculty, it would result in a reduction of the adjunct budget by approximately \$214,800.

The calculation basis for this estimate is that, on average, CSU pays its adjuncts, \$1000 per credit hour, plus fringes of approximately 20%, for a net total compensation cost of \$1200/ adjunct credit hour.

Potential negative consequences of Option #1

This limit could discourage additional research productivity beyond the ceiling, though merit and promotion increments could still provide crucial incentives, as could grant opportunities. Faculty who view themselves as primarily researchers may dislike this realignment.

Any particular facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of Option #1

The Provosts’ office, along with Chairs, Directors, and Deans, would need to work with each college faculty to assess and align their workload policies with this ceiling.

Any points of coordination or overlap of option #1 with the recommendations of other Working Groups or Task Forces

No.

Preliminary Recommendation: Option #2/3

Assess the amount of credit assigned to faculty for departmental administrative service, and align it more carefully to program size and needs.

Benefits of Option #2

Separate from chair and school director positions, for AY 2020-2021, the university assigned 291 credit hours for faculty administrative service within departments and schools, typically under the headings of “Associate Chair,” “Director,” “Coordinator.” In an environment of contracting staff positions and fewer faculty, these incentives can provide an economical means to support a unit’s educational mission. At the same time, the administrative service release time does not always correlate to program size or responsibility. A careful assessment of the responsibilities associated with each release could yield savings if it is determined that the responsibilities can be part of a faculty member’s normal 2-credit service workload “commensurate with their rank” (13.1.F.3) or can be taken up by the unit’s chair or school director.

Potential savings associated with Option #2

Variable—difficult to assess until someone evaluates the releases.

Potential negative consequences of Option #2

With staff shortages and contraction of faculty, reducing these incentives could harm efficiency if critical work—especially student-facing work like advising—is neglected. As CSU’s operations become more complex, Chairs and School Directors rely upon faculty releases for critical parts of their units’ operations while they handle an increasing workload themselves.

Any particular facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of Option #2

As with Option #1, the Provosts’ office, along with Chairs, Directors, and Deans, would need to work with each college faculty to develop benchmarks for release time in terms of departmental and school service.

Any points of coordination or overlap of option #2 with the recommendations of other Working Groups or Task Forces

This service will almost certainly change in size and scope due to college and departmental reorganization (Task Force #1). The outcome of that process will provide a fresh opportunity to discuss what service release time is needed within the new units.

Preliminary Recommendation: Option #3/3

Assess the amount of credit assigned to faculty for university administrative service to determine which are most critical for the university's current mission.

Benefits of Option #3

For AY 2020-2021, the university assigned approximately 75 credit hours for administrative service to the university outside of departments and schools, including releases for Faculty Senate offices, committee chairs, and broader university initiatives like assessment, general education, and other “champions.” A careful assessment of these releases could help determine which are essential for faculty governance and smooth operation of the university, and which may be optional. One might use the test of “needs” vs. “wants” in terms of university initiatives here.

Potential savings associated with Option #3

Variable—difficult to assess until someone evaluates the releases.

Potential negative consequences of Option #3

A number of these releases are associated with highly mission-critical, labor intensive tasks. Removing those would provide a substantial disincentive for high-level university service, devalue that work, and slow down efficient governance.

Any particular facilitators or obstacles to the implementation of Option #3

These releases are distributed at the Provost's and President's discretion, so they can make this decision unilaterally, though doing so would be unwise.

Any points of coordination or overlap of option #3 with the recommendations of other Working Groups or Task Forces

No.

Current Preferences of the Working Group among the listed options

We have listed the recommendations in ranked order above, 1-2-3.

Questions on which the Working Group seeks feedback

None.

Additional information needed by the Working Group with respect to this issue

None.

Additional Relevant Considerations

None.