

Quarters to Semesters Transition Team Meeting
October 29, 2008
Baker 230

Present: Alfrey, Jessica (for Adeyanju), Benton, Calcamuggio, Carpenter, Cheripko, Conrath, Cornell, Day, Descutner, Downs, Elliott, Esmond-Kiger, Flaherty, Giesey, Leinbaugh, Lombardi, Lopez-Permouth, Miles, Neader, Noftz, Ruff, Scanlan, Smith, Thomas, Tuck, Watts, Webster, Willan

Introduction: Descutner called the meeting to order.

The College of Engineering has volunteered to serve as a test college for conversion.

Calendar: Carpenter

- A blueprint to submit to the colleges and departments/schools is needed soon so that the faculty know what parameters will be used to build the new curriculum.
- Intersession: Decision must be pedagogical.
 - Since 1.8 % of students take coursework during intersessions now, this issue is relatively small compared to the rest of the calendar and does not need to be decided immediately.
- **Process:** At the previous meeting there was discussion about surveying the students and faculty regarding their calendar preferences. After some deliberation it was determined that the data from such a survey would not yield the information we need and may be difficult to interpret.
 - The original document, “Quarters to Semesters Conversion: Assumptions, Constraints, and Principles,” was vetted by the deans prior to its adoption and reviewed by the Transition Team. Likewise, work on the calendar by the Transition Team should return to the deans for their review. Deans will be asked to discuss the proposed calendar models with their chairs and directors and to recommend their preferences to the Transition Team.
 - EPSA, UCC, and Faculty Senate will also be asked for their recommendations on workload and research time considerations.
 - Final calendar model recommendation rests with the Transition Team, and its recommendation will go to the EVP-Provost and President.
- A calendar for 2012-13 was provided as a default model to share with the deans.
 - Flaherty suggested assigning a dollar amount to intersession earnings to inform our decision-making. We do not want to lose a significant source of revenue.
 - Esmond-Kiger said that moving January start to the 21st ought to line up with other state schools and improve intersession design.
 - Without going into too much detail, the Transition Team was reminded that the calendar provides the broad framework within which a variety of flexibly scheduled short courses such as ½ semesters, intersessions, summer sessions, and 2 week

intensive courses can be developed. The calendar can permit overlaps of a variety of courses of varying lengths.

Note: Descutner reminded the Team that we should be prepared to make the calendar recommendation early in Winter Quarter.

- Other suggestions/considerations on possible calendar arrangements were:
 - Four-week summer sessions and two-week intensives have worked for us in the Quarter system.
 - Watts reported that other places have a wide range of session options. While the business end can be difficult to manage, the teaching/learning works fine.
 - Faculty prefer “chunks” of time for research.
 - As we think about various structural options, we should calculate value of each in terms of revenue and enrollment.
 - The deans have data available from Institutional Research to assist them in their decision.
 - The deans should also provide justifications for their recommendation.
 - The Transition Team will maintain a list of particular programmatic needs and flexibility issues to inform its decision-making.
 - Scanlan suggested 5 week summer terms (with the addition of two exam weeks), following the 2nd semester in May (adding two weeks to summer) to finish by July 26; he noted that we lose instructional time under our current exam structure.
 - Thomas suggested giving up the MayMester to gain the best possible summer session.
 - Deans are very interested in rethinking summer; this potential has not been tapped and they want to devise a thoughtful summer plan responsive to student needs.
 - Have we looked at USO? Can we create something to fill a need within the USO that would benefit summer/intersession enrollments?
 - Summer session discussions will include Regional Campuses, University Outreach, and Lifelong and Distance Learning so that their preferences and enrollment and revenue targets are taken into account.
- The calendar models, including Esmond-Kiger’s model, will be sent to chairs and directors prior to their meetings with respective deans to prepare them for discussions.

Budget: Day

Advising Pool:

- Day shared a budget document based on a \$1M estimate to support the Faculty Advising Pool.
 - Funds were allocated to colleges according to two criteria: degree completion and headcount. In the end, each college was given an allocation associated with which method maximized the funds it would get. This moved the total to

\$1,090,000. Day suggested that the deans think about what it takes to provide each student the same level of support and oversight that the graduation check currently requires and then use the funds to create capacity to accomplish this advising task effectively.

- Colleges can decide how to use their allocations to handle the advising process for conversion.

Faculty Release/Buyout:

- A \$200K budget estimate was the beginning point based on work units provided by each dean. Deans worked with chairs and directors to determine the number of units of work they would need to accomplish the conversion based on the mix of departments and program they had and the differences these created in the effort that would be involved in the conversion. Once college allocations were determined using these estimates, it was decided that the resulting allocations were too low. Deans felt that they needed at least \$3500 to buy out faculty time for the conversion
 - Each allocation would pay for a stipend or for hires to replace selected faculty assigned to work on the department/school curricular conversions. The figures do not include benefits.
 - An additional 10 units of work were also budgeted to create a pool of \$35,000 to provide a 10% contingency pool in case we run into problems and need additional conversion resources.
 - Flaherty has developed a parallel system to determine needs on the regional campuses.

Additional Estimated Costs:

- A point person must be identified, most likely through an internal search, to oversee the entire conversion process. That person will need staff and an office for approximately 2+ years. The 200,000 allocated for this area is only preliminary and will probably have to increase as we see what compensation is needed to attract someone for the position and the type of staff that will be necessary.
- For the registrar, the DARS-TA software is expected to streamline the process and save costs that were originally projected in this area by the calendar study group.
 - An encoding position in the Registrar's office, administrative pay grade 83, is another identified need.
- Flaherty mentioned that there is a significant amount of correspondence coursework to be reviewed and updated as well.
- It is recognized that these are simply the direct costs and that there will be substantial opportunity costs in the form of faculty and staff time both in the conversion and the work that will follow in designing the new courses. This opportunity to take our curriculum to the next level is a rare opportunity and can be a great benefit for future students, and so this

effort is viewed as strategically important for our future. It will require the investment in resources from faculty that are beyond the simple direct dollars allocated for the conversion.

Total funding estimate for the direct costs is currently \$2,324,000 for this process.

Additional comments/concerns/suggestions:

- Lopez-Permouth: The effort that faculty will expend to update and create courses once the conversion is specified will require the investment of time. If research is to remain where it is, the only area faculty where can reduce is teaching. He recommends adding course buyouts for the work of updating courses in addition to the buyouts for the point people doing the overall conversion. We need to alleviate the workload for faculty to address the curriculum.
 - Descutner said that, as a faculty member for 22 years, he does not view the added task of course conversion as a choice between doing research and the conversion process. Updating the content of courses is a process that continually occurs, although not simultaneously across the whole curriculum. Faculty have two years to work on their coursework, which can and ought to be incorporated into their work life.
 - Other universities doing semester conversions in the past have only compensated the overall conversion, not every faculty member that will have to alter the content of individual courses.
- Tuck added that Toledo offered stipends as well as buyouts for the conversion and that the majority of Toledo's faculty took stipends.
- Leinbaugh said that due to accreditation restrictions, the College of Education can not buy out any Group I faculty to do this work and meet required course contact hours.
- Scanlan suggested providing each faculty member a stipend of 1000 or perhaps 500 to use as needed.

Thomas: EPSA and UCC have developed concrete ideas on the review of the existing catalogue and General Education requirements. Descutner said we will discuss these ideas at our next meeting.

Adjourned 9:01

Next meeting: 8:00 a.m., Wednesday, November 5, Baker Center 230

Special meeting with Andy Jorgensen, Project Consultant: 8:00 a.m., Friday, November 7, Ellis Hall 113.