



Data Strategies Workgroup Report

May 6, 2010 – **FINAL DRAFT**



Prepared by:

Dr. Karla Hughes, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dr. Gerald DeMoss, Dean of the College of Science and Technology

Dr. Dayna Seelig, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Academic Programs

Ms. Beth Patrick, Chief of Staff and Vice President for Planning and Budgets

Ms. Jill Ratliff, Director of Institutional Effectiveness

Ms. Teresa Lindgren, Director of Budgets

I. Purpose, Goals and Anticipated Impact and Outcomes

The ad-hoc workgroup was established to review existing institutional data resources and current processes in place to support the assessment of academic programs and identify areas for improvement necessary to facilitate:

- Implementation of the recommendations identified in the Academic Curriculum Review;
- Benchmarking of program productivity and cost information using normative data;
- Development of a sustained accountability system that creates stronger ties between program planning and budget allocation at the academic program level; and,
- Creation of a model process which can be adopted across the institution for planning, budget development and continuous improvement.

The workgroup identified the following goals:

- Develop a standard model for collecting and reporting data at the academic program level that will facilitate annual comprehensive review of productivity, resource allocations (personnel, operating and capital) and cost assessment;
- Identify processes, responsibility, and timeline for the annual productivity and resource review cycle;
- Research and collect “best practice” examples among peer institutions to inform and facilitate Academic Affairs in a restructuring of MSU’s faculty productivity and assessment measurement tools (i.e. workload formulas, FEP, PBSI); and,
- Develop incentive models and budget policy revisions that will further motivate units to improve efficiency, increase academic unit productivity as well as enhance the quality of academic programs through rewards and opportunities.

Anticipated impact and outcomes resulting from the implementation of report recommendations include:

- Increase overall efficiency and quality
 - Increase enrollment and retention rates
 - Reduce number of low-enrolled courses
 - Reduce reliance on adjuncts
 - Improve course planning/course scheduling

- Strengthen academic advising
- Reduce average time to degree
- Improve faculty morale and faculty retention
- More effective distribution of available budget resources (e.g., ability to reallocate resources to program identified in the academic program review process as programs to “enhance”)
- Empower department chairs with opportunities to impact program development and resource allocation at the academic unit level
- Strengthen and grow summer school programs

II. Summary of Research Sources

Comprehensive research was conducted of various models, policies and practices in the areas of academic program review and assessment. The workgroup made campus visits to Western Kentucky University and East Tennessee State University because both institutions were found to have strong processes in place for academic program assessment and benchmarking. Both visits were made in the fall 2009 semester and included two days of meetings with staff and administrators at each institution. The following resources had the most significant impact in the development of the recommendations in this report.

- Delaware Cost Study
- East Tennessee State University – site visit and program documents
- Western Kentucky University – site visit and program documents
- University of North Carolina – funding model review
- Middle Tennessee State University Staffing Framework
- Council on Postsecondary Education – program review standards
- Hanover Research Council Database – summaries of best practices
- Reviews of policies and processes at other peer institutions as identified through extensive web research and phone interviews
- CPE Academic Productivity Guidelines

III. Summary of Findings

Significant weaknesses and challenges with related current processes and policies in place at MSU included the following:

- Academic program cost data -- The most significant issue that was identified initially was the lack of budget and cost data being tracked at the academic program level. For example, personnel and operating budgets are tracked at the academic department level and used to support multiple academic programs thus making it difficult to determine the actual cost of the program.
- Inconsistency in data standards used for evaluation and assessment – Various sources for collection of academic program productivity data are currently used across campus by departments, colleges and administration to support program review and reporting needs. While the source of the data is consistently enrollment data maintained on the Datatel Colleague system, the timing of the data reported impacts consistency because the Colleague system is dynamic. This means that the system changes daily as students add and drop course sections. Data items such as headcount enrollment and student credit hours vary significantly as the semester progresses because of continuous system updating. Also, the complexity of the comprehensive data base maintained on Colleague can impact data consistency because the knowledge base of the individual creating the query statements can vary across campus.
- Institutional performance goals are not “owned” at the unit level – Although the University establishes clear performance goals each year for each of the key performance indicators that assess institutional progress toward the ASPIRE Strategic Plan, the responsibility and ownership of the goals is not clear at the individual unit level. Current planning, assessment and budget prioritization processes do not provide clear objectives and incentives that would facilitate individual units in identifying and owning relevant and appropriate aspects of the overall goals set for the institution.
- Inconsistent linkage between planning and budget decisions at the academic program level – For many years, academic department budgets have eroded from multiple across-the-board cuts and programs have grown or declined based on the available operating budget resources. There is a critical need for program-level “business planning” that would provide the opportunity for an academic department to request funding for initiatives with the greatest potential to impact meeting departmental key performance goals.
- Current planning, assessment and budget processes do not empower department chairs to utilize incentives to direct change in behavior or processes that improve productivity and/or reduce costs.
- Workload measures are not consistent across academic programs. This was also found to be the case at peer institutions. Program differentiation makes a

“one-size-fits-all” approach to workload lacking in its ability to produce comparable data across the institution.

- Multiple reporting and assessment processes conducted across the University to address mandatory reporting, accreditation review, budget development and institutional research are not aligned effectively and often burden departments during peak instructional periods. This approach is counter to continuous improvement and wastes both time and personnel resources which could otherwise be redirected to support academic programs.

IV. Recommendations

The following recommendations address the issues identified in Section III of this report and will facilitate the establishment of processes and policies that will enable faculty and staff in achieving institutional goals:ⁱ

1. Implement an Annual Program Review (APR) process. Through the APR process, academic units will have an opportunity to outline a justification for additional operating resources that would fund high priority initiatives identified to drive departmental key performance goals. Academic departments consistently meeting productivity goals, exceeding peer productivity measures, and/or dealing with unique program opportunities/challenges should be considered as a higher priority for additional funding. Likewise, academic departments with consistent declines in productivity, above peer average program costs or unclear plans for program development may risk a reallocation of operating resources to another academic program. Details about the APR process are included as Appendix A. Implementation of this recommendation would be led by the Provost and start with a pilot/training APR process in spring 2010 with full implementation starting in fall 2010 to provide input into the FY11 operating budget development process
2. Implement an academic program productivity model that follows broad guidelines at the institutional level for measuring credit hour production per faculty FTE but provides flexibility within the academic department for chairs to assign workload across the faculty to balance teaching, scholarship and service/engagement activities.ⁱⁱ A draft faculty workload productivity model is provided in Appendix B. Implementation of this recommendation would be led by the Provost Office and implemented in the academic year 2010-11.
3. Develop a strategy for the review and revise the current PBSI and FEP policies. This is especially important to provide a distinct process for annual review directed toward performance expectations. The

implementation of this recommendation would be led by the Provost Office working closely with Faculty Senate leadership in spring 2010 with a target to have revised policies ready for approval in fall 2010.

4. Implement an incentive program that would allocate resources (as available) to units who meet or exceed performance and quality enhancement goals negotiated during the APR process the prior year. The goals should be data-driven based on prior performance, peer benchmark data, and potential impact from on-going efforts and initiatives as well as potential environmental or market changes. Details for a draft incentive model are included in Appendix C. Implementation of this recommendation would be led by the Provost Office with support from the Office of Institutional Research and the Office of Budgets prior to the first official APR in fall 2010.
5. Develop an award program to recognize and reward units with the best unit planning and assessment processes as documented in the WEAVE system. This award would be focused on the process and the ability of the unit to show how results were used to implement changes and not on performance of a given assessment. Development of the award program would be drafted in spring 2010 led by the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and the Executive Director of Academic Assessment and Professional Development for implementation with the 2011-12 academic year.
6. Develop an expanded incentive program focused on departmental productivity goals as resources are available. A draft “Quality in Planning” award program is included in Appendix E.
7. Revise current budget policy to allow departments to “carry forward” a portion of their remaining operating resources into the next fiscal period. A draft policy for carry-forward is included as Appendix D. Implementation of this recommendation would be led by the Director of Budgets prior to the start of the 2010-11 fiscal year.
8. Develop a self-funding model for summer school programs that allows an academic program to share in net tuition revenue generated. Development of an alternative summer school model should be developed for implementation with the 2010-2011 budget process.

V. Report Summary

Through extensive research and evaluation, the ad-hoc work group has developed a comprehensive process to address academic program productivity,

academic program development, budget allocation, and assessment for continuous improvement. In addition, modifications and/or development of processes and policies have been identified with timelines for completion. Based on the Academic Audit Process and the work of the SACS committees, it is the conclusion of this ad-hoc work group that implementation of these recommendations in Academic Affairs is critical if we are to contribute to the strategic goals of the institution.

ⁱ This ultimately allows the institution to benefit from the outcomes identified in Section I of this report.

ⁱⁱ This is the basis of the differentiated workload and is based on the collective priorities of the institution, college, department, program, and faculty member.

Appendix A

Annual Program Productivity Review (APPR) Process Academic Units

Definition:

The Annual Program Productivity Review (APPR) process will include collection and review of data to support assessment of unit productivity and resource usage as well as to provide information for setting goals for individual unit productivity and quality improvement goals for the upcoming academic year. APPRs will be conducted for each budget unit on an annual basis to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the unit as well as guide the allocation of operating, personnel and capital resources. Data and assessment processes will be consistent across instructional units. A parallel process will be implemented for non-instructional units but will utilize different data and assessment processes appropriate for measuring productivity and progress.

Principles:

- Institutional budgetary resources are never sufficient to meet all budget requests identified within the University creating a need to prioritize all instructional and non-instructional investments based on the strategic value and potential return on investment of each request.
- All measures used for assessment of academic program productivity must be consistent and comparable across all colleges and programs.
- The work required to support the APPR shall also support the three- and five-year academic program review process and eliminate duplication of reporting effort.
- All budgetary units must be provided equal opportunity to request and share in resources available to fund initiatives that will improve quality of programs and services and/or increase productivity of programs and services.
- Budgetary units responsible for programs and services that consistently fall short of meeting annual goals identified for measuring productivity and quality must be required to justify the continued investment into the program or service.
- To facilitate the breakdown of personnel expenditures by academic program, each individual faculty member will be assigned by the Department Chair to a

primary CIP Code.¹ While it is recognized that in some cases a faculty member's actual teaching load in a given semester may support more than a single program, the assignment of a CIP code should be made based on the faculty's *primary* academic program.

- For the purposes of calculating academic program operational expenses, the total budget and operating costs for a given academic department will be initially divided proportionate to the breakdown of faculty FTE among the multiple academic programs supported by the total departmental budget. This calculation will be completed by the Office of Budgets and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Department chairs will have the opportunity to review and recommend adjustments to this standard distribution where appropriate, based on program exceptions and actual program costs within the department.
- To ensure that all reports and analysis are based on consistent, accurate, and comparable data, only data provided by the Office of Institutional Research from the University's official database, as defined by the Council on Postsecondary Education Comprehensive Database Guidelines will be used for academic program productivity and resource assessment purposes. The current official census date based on CPE guidelines for fall term is October 15 and for spring term is March 15.
- Results of the APPR process will serve as input for the President and the cabinet in developing the annual operating budget recommendation to the Board of Regents.
- Appropriate transparency of process and review must be applied throughout the program review process.

Personnel:

The APPR process will include the Provost, the Dean, Department Chair and the Director of Budgets. Associate Vice Presidents, Assistant Vice Presidents, Associate Deans, Executive Directors, the Director of Information Technology and the Chief Diversity Officer will be included when appropriate and as needed.

¹ CIP Code refers to the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) that provides a taxonomic scheme supporting the accurate tracking, assessment, and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. CIP was originally developed by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 1980, with revisions occurring in 1985 and 1990. The 2000 edition (CIP-2000) is the third revision of the taxonomy and presents an updated taxonomy of instructional program classifications and descriptions. (information from the CIP Official Website)

Purpose of Review:

The APPR will facilitate the following objectives:

- Review of prior year productivity goals including but not limited to:
 - Total majors by classification
 - Student credit hours generated per faculty FTE
 - Number of graduates²
 - Student retention
- Review of individual course analysis reports that detail indicators such as success rate, grade distribution, enrollment caps, etc.³
- Analysis of non-tuition revenues generated by the program⁴
- Analysis of actual program costs
 - Cost per student credit hour generated by program
 - Costs per major expenditure category
- Comparison of productivity and cost information with national normative benchmark data and productivity goals set for the program based on assigned tier in the Academic Program Productivity Framework. A draft of the Academic Program Productivity Framework is included in Appendix C of this document and includes productivity ranges by program for each tier.
- Evaluation of staffing capacity
- Review of non-instructional activities including community engagement initiatives and partnerships
 - Number of students participating in Community Engagement initiatives and/or capstone opportunities
 - Number of faculty integrating community engagement principles and practices into instruction, research, and outreach activities including service learning
- Review of grant activity , both submitted and awarded
- Review use of F&A resources from grant awards
- Review of quantity and purpose of contract activity
- Review of efficiency initiatives implemented to increase productivity or reduce operating resources
- Review of continuous improvement as documented in WEAVE report

² Data set will track students who have been admitted to professional programs without completing the undergraduate degree at Morehead State University.

³ These data will be developed for benchmarking purposes initially. The review will be implemented and/or continued for programs that are not meeting productivity goals.

⁴ All non-tuition revenue sources must be approved through the appropriate University process according to policy.

- Review of program needs assessment and resource requests based on program “business plan”
 - Staffing plan based on enrollment trends and program growth strategies
 - New position requests
 - Anticipated retirements
 - Other changes in personnel resources
 - Equipment replacement plans and/or needs
 - Requests for additional operating budget
 - Other objectives identified as necessary

Annual Program Productivity Review Cycle:

The APPR is on a five-year review cycle beginning with the 2010-2011 Academic Year. The full cycle identified in this report covers the following timeframe:

- ❖ Year One=2010-2011
- ❖ Year Two=2011-2012
- ❖ Year Three=2012-2013
- ❖ Year Four=2013-2014
- ❖ Year Five=2014-2015

Anticipated Outcome:

Data and discussion from the APPR will provide the Deans and Provost with information needed to prioritize budget requests and recommend budget reallocations for the upcoming academic year. This will facilitate a stronger link between planning and budgeting at the program level. In addition, it allows for an increased focus on strategic allocation of limited resources.

NOTE: Each academic unit head will be provided with examples of reports, detailed guidelines on how to prepare for the APPR, and key questions/issues to address in the APPR discussions.

Appendix B

OVERVIEW OF FACULTY WORKLOAD PRODUCTIVITY MODEL

Preface:

As defined in PAc-29 – Faculty Workload, the workload for ST-I faculty shall include a standard teaching load, professional achievement (scholarly productivity and/or creative productions), and service activities consistent with the expectations for faculty productivity as outlined in PAc-2 – Promotion Review and PAc-27 – Tenure Review. Regional engagement, a new component to workload, also reflects faculty productivity and contributes to workload. In general, the instructional load for ST-I faculty represents approximately 80% of the overall workload with professional achievement, regional engagement, and service providing the remaining 20%. However, these percentages may vary for those faculty provided released time from teaching to concentrate their efforts on activities from the non-instructional components of workload. Based on the financial constraints impacting the University's overall budget, student credit hour production (SCH) will provide an added measure of instructional productivity within the standard teaching load model. Employing this productivity index (SCH/FTE faculty) will provide each academic discipline a standard by which instructional load can be measured. While the SCH expectation will vary by discipline, academic units meeting the expected level of SCH/FTE will have the flexibility to provide ST-I faculty released time to pursue scholarly inquiry, creative productions, regional engagement, and/or service endeavors.

I. Introduction

The workload for ST-I (tenured and tenure-track) faculty shall be defined by work units as established within each academic department with the distribution of effort to include (1) the teaching load, (2) scholarly productivity/creative productions, (3) regional engagement, and/or (4) institutional/professional service¹. This workload model shall be based on a standard productivity index where classroom/laboratory instruction represents the primary investment of faculty time and effort. The normal faculty workload will be based on the standard of 12 workload hours per semester or 24 workload hours per academic year with the teaching load component of the workload representing 50 to 80% of the

¹ Institutional Service includes but is not limited to committee work, advising, serving on editorial boards of professional organizations, leadership roles within professional organizations, and/or institutional administrative assignments.

overall workload for each ST-I faculty member. Institutional/professional service should represent the smallest portion of the overall workload. Scholarly productivity/creative productions as well as regional engagement are included in the basic workload model. However, released time from teaching to provide faculty the opportunity to increase their time and effort for professional achievement (scholarly productivity/creative productions), regional engagement, and/or institutional service may be negotiated by faculty with their department chair/associate dean provided the overall SCH/FTE faculty meets or exceeds the SCH productivity index for the discipline/academic unit.

II. Teaching Load

The standard teaching load for tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be based on the traditional four courses per semester or eight courses per academic year model where a course is defined as a typical 3-hour lecture class. This model represents the standard instructional component of faculty workload at most comprehensive institutions across higher education. Alternate forms of instruction, such as laboratory, clinical teaching, etc., shall have defined work units as appropriate to the time and effort provided by faculty.

As a factor of teaching load, student credit hour production (SCH) established for each academic discipline shall be used to establish a productivity index for all faculty within the discipline. The productivity index for each discipline will be based on a SCH model per Full-Time Equivalent faculty (FTE) as adapted from practices of peer institutions as well as other state higher education systems, including the CPE program productivity expectation. The SCH/FTE faculty expectation will vary by academic unit or disciplines within academic units. The targeted threshold for SCH/FTE faculty within a discipline shall be based on the average SCH for all faculty (ST-I, FT, and lecturers) teaching in the discipline. Department chairs/associate deans will have the flexibility to negotiate teaching loads with faculty within their respective units based on the SCH/FTE threshold identified for their discipline.

For faculty in disciplines where the average SCH/FTE exceeds the targeted threshold, faculty may request course releases to reduce the instructional component of their workload and increase their percentage of time and effort as related to professional achievement, regional engagement, and/or service. Such releases from instruction shall be approved by the appropriate department chair or associate dean during the annual performance review. Measurable goals and objectives, including targeted outcomes/products, will be identified for faculty requesting the release and included on the workload plan next academic year.

In academic departments or disciplines where the SCH/FTE are below the threshold targeted for that discipline, faculty may not request releases from

instruction to pursue scholarly/creative productions, regional engagement, or institutional service activities appropriate to their duties and responsibilities within the academic unit. Department chairs/associate deans will be expected to develop a long term staffing strategy to assist faculty within these units in meeting the SCH/FTE targeted threshold for their unit. Faculty released time provided via buyout resulting from competitive grants and/or contracts are not subject to the SCH/FTE productivity index model.

Faculty seeking an Educational Leave of Absence (PAC-28) or a Sabbatical Leave of Absence (PAC- 17) will not be negatively impacted by a low SCH/FTE within their department or discipline. An Educational Leave or a Sabbatical Leave may be an option to assist disciplines/units in developing a long term staffing strategy to meet their SCH/FTE target.

Faculty effort contributing to **Teaching Load** may include:

1. **Standard lecture/laboratory courses** taught by individual faculty with course credit tied to each section; for large classes (80+ students), teaching load may be adjusted up as appropriate. Example, a lecture class with fewer than 80 students that meets an average 2.5 hours/week shall carry a 3 hour teaching load credit.
2. **Applied courses** (Music, Art, etc.) taught by individual faculty with course credit tied to each section may carry teaching load credit based on enrollment (head count).
3. **Non-credit bearing laboratory/clinical** sections assigned to faculty. For these sections, the SCH are tied to the lecture component of the class and instructional load assigned to faculty is determined by contact hours for each section of the class.
4. **Team taught** courses where the teaching load credit is divided among several different faculty. In these situations, the SCHs will be credited to the instructor of record. Teaching load for each faculty member should be based on their individual contribution to class instruction; overall teaching load for team taught courses should be the same as similar courses taught by individual faculty.
5. **Special Classes** taught outside the discipline (Honors, FYS, etc.) will carry teaching load as determined by the class and SCHs generated shall be credited to the faculty within their academic unit.
6. **Supervising Student Research/Creative Productions**, such as undergraduate research fellows and graduate student research projects, may contribute to teaching load based on the number of students engaged in these activities. Such activities contribute to teaching load only once per academic year for each student.
7. **Curriculum Development** that includes new course development or program revisions may contribute to teaching load as determined

appropriate within each academic unit. Revisions of existing courses will not qualify for course releases. Exceptions may be made for the development of web-based courses that facilitate program availability to extended campus locations.

III. Scholarly Productivity/Creative Productions

Faculty effort in Scholarly Productivity/Creative Production contributing to **Workload** may include:

1. **Internally Funded Research/Creative Productions** funded through the ORSP may provide released time from teaching for tenure-track faculty to facilitate the establishment of a scholarly agenda for junior faculty. Released time requests will not be automatically assigned to the workload but such requests will be negotiated with the department chair/associate dean based on product outcomes for the research/creative production protocol.
2. **Externally Funded Research/Creative Productions** managed through ORSP should include resources to provide released time as supported by the funding agency or through institutional grants match funds. Faculty releases for research/creative productions will provide resource support to hire adjunct faculty to cover course releases within the academic unit.
3. **Grantsmanship** efforts that target funding from external agencies may contribute to the productivity index for faculty provided the development of the proposal is endorsed through ORSP. Released time from teaching may be granted if the proposal has sufficient potential to provide resources to the investigator(s)/institution to merit time away from teaching.
4. **Publications/productions** (peer reviewed manuscripts, books, creative performances/products) may contribute to the productivity index for faculty. Releases from teaching may be approved by the department chair/associate dean as appropriate.
5. **Contracts with appropriate local, state, federal, or professional groups** will be considered within the context of program/department goals as well as guidelines from ORSP. Released time from teaching may be granted if the contract has sufficient potential to provide resources to the investigator(s)/institution to merit time away from teaching.

IV. Regional Engagement

The scholarship of engagement is considered applied research and encompasses the identification of a problem, issue or opportunity in the community that requires

the expertise of faculty and/or staff at the University. In general, there is a theoretical framework that is utilized in identifying the issue(s) and the underlying cause(s). Using the theoretical framework, a process or program can be designed for use in the community with the appropriate education and intervention as well as data collection. As in "research and creative production," regional engagement projects are identified via a proposal which includes (1) literature supporting the need to address the issue as well as programs/initiatives that have already been done and reported; (2) methods or procedures for developing and implementing educational programs and/or interventions; (3) a process for data collection; (4) analysis of the program and the data; and (5) a written report and/or publication that can be shared with the professional community.

In addition to pure scholarship, regional engagement can be integrated into course content via service learning activities which should be documented by the student as well as the faculty member. In mentoring students for regional engagement, faculty can utilize the principles used in mentoring the undergraduate research fellows.

Efforts in regional engagement are part of the basic workload model and should be integrated into the individual faculty plan negotiated with the unit administrator (chair or associate dean).

V. Institutional and Professional Service

All faculty are expected to participate in appropriate institutional and professional service. However, the amount of service activity should be monitored carefully during the probationary period.

Annual Program Review Cycle – Instruction Units

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Spring Term		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University Surveys of Current Students and Alumni Conducted 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University Surveys of Current Students and Alumni Conducted
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department submits APR Portfolio which includes Departmental Dash Board and WEAVE Summary Assessment Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department submits APR Portfolio which includes Departmental Dash Board and WEAVE Summary Assessment Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department submits APR Portfolio which includes Departmental Dash Board and WEAVE Summary Assessment Report Short Review Summary Report to be filed in APR Portfolio and on WEAVE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department submits APR Portfolio which includes Departmental Dash Board and WEAVE Summary Assessment Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department submits APR Portfolio which includes Departmental Dash Board and WEAVE Summary Assessment Report Comprehensive Program Review Report to be placed in APR Portfolio and on WEAVE
September - October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Program Review led by Provost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Program Review led by Provost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Program Review led by Provost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Program Review led by Provost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Program Review led by Provost
November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean submits prioritized budget requests and reallocation recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean submits prioritized budget requests and reallocation recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean submits prioritized budget requests and reallocation recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean submits prioritized budget requests and reallocation recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean submits prioritized budget requests and reallocation recommendations
December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provost submits prioritized budget requests and reallocation recommendations to the Director of Budgets – both personnel and operating needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provost submits prioritized budget requests and reallocation recommendations to the Director of Budgets – both personnel and operating needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provost submits prioritized budget requests and reallocation recommendations to the Director of Budgets – both personnel and operating needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provost submits prioritized budget requests and reallocation recommendations to the Director of Budgets – both personnel and operating needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provost submits prioritized budget requests and reallocation recommendations to the Director of Budgets – both personnel and operating needs
January – March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet develops operating budget recommendation for the Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet develops operating budget recommendation for the Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet develops operating budget recommendation for the Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet develops operating budget recommendation for the Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cabinet develops operating budget recommendation for the Board

Departmental Dash Board – This report is to provide a snapshot of program productivity and cost information for use in the annual review. ALL data required to complete the IR Data Sheet will be provided to the academic department directly by the Office of Institutional Research or available to the department in the MSU Profile document. The development of the IR Data Sheet will be led by the Director of Institutional Research.

WEAVE Assessment Report – This is a standard report that is created by the WEAVE system.

Short Review Report – This report is required to be placed in the Program Portfolio and on WEAVE in Year 3 only. It should be a 2-3 page summary document that reflects on and summarizes the trend data for academic program productivity and identifies continuous improvement strategies for Year 4 and 5 prior to the fall Academic Program Review required in Year 5. A template will be provided for the development of this report.

Comprehensive Program Review Report – Required in Year 5 only and should be placed in both the Program Portfolio and on WEAVE. Development of the detailed guidelines for this report will be led the Provost Office and a template will be provided for this report.

University Surveys – To be conducted in Years 2 and 5 by the Office of Institutional Research.

- **Current Student Survey** – This survey consists of standard questions for all students with a specified number of program specific questions which may be submitted by the academic department
- **Alumni and Employer Survey** – This survey will collect opinions from graduates regarding their experience at MSU as well as preparation for employment. The Office of University Relations will provide support for distribution of the survey from the Alumni database and from Career Services. Academic Units that are already collecting this information will assist in the development of a comprehensive instrument that will become the approved survey for this data.

Appendix C

Annual Program Productivity Review (APPR) Process Guidelines for Preparation and Implementation

Goals:

- Create a uniform process for the review of programs and the allocation of resources;
 - Provide the opportunity for the unit administrator to evaluate the data and inform the Academic Affairs administrative team about program issues, challenges and opportunities annually;
 - Link the evaluation of academic units/programs to the allocation of resources;
 - Design a mechanism for the reallocation of resources based on productivity measures; and,
 - Assist academic units in setting appropriate productivity goals.
1. In preparation for the Annual Program Productivity Review (hereafter referred to as the APPR), department chairs, associate deans, and deans will receive a data summary package for their respective unit(s) and programs.¹ This data is the only information² that is to be used in the APPR presentation and discussion because it is institutional data as of the census date for reporting to the Council on Postsecondary Education. This data will be collected and compiled based on the previous academic year³.
 2. Scheduling of the APPR will be done through the Provost's Office and will take place in late September and go through October. The dean for the respective College will be in attendance at each APPR in their College. All materials prepared at the unit level will be due to the Provost's Office two weeks prior to the APPR meeting.
 3. Each chair/associate dean may design the presentation of their department/program consistent with their presentation style. The use of a PowerPoint presentation with/without handouts is optional. Approximately 90 minutes will be set aside for the presentation and discussion.
 4. Regardless of how the presentation is done, a written document responding to the APPR questions, discussion of the unit data, plans for future development,

¹ An example is in the College of Business and Public Affairs where the Associate Deans would receive data summary packages for the programs within their unit or school.

² Other information requested by or approved by the Provost may be included if approval is obtained prior to September 1 of the current year and will not become part of the standard APPR process.

³ Encompasses Fall and Spring Semesters of the previous academic year.

and supplementary documents must be provided for each individual in attendance.

5. Guiding questions for the APPR:

- What are the proposed long-term and short-term goals for the unit?
Please note that the Unit Weave Document should be a guiding document in this response. However, the discussion will guide development of Weave and not vice versa. In subsequent years, progress toward these goals must be addressed.
- Evaluate the changes in headcount majors and degrees conferred based on the 5 year trend as well as the 4-year and 1-year change presented in the document. What accounts for those changes? What actions, if needed, will be taken to change or maintain the trend?
- Evaluate the student credit hours generated by program faculty. How does this compare with the target SCH production for the unit? Please explain any variation and actions that need to be taken to stay on course, if any.
- How many faculty have been released to do other things? Summarize released time (RT) in the unit, including the faculty granted RT, their job assignment, and outcomes/status of the assignment.
- What is the scholarly productivity for the unit? Document a summary of the scholarly productivity of the unit, including the scholarship of teaching, inquiry, and engagement. Service productivity will be documented in each faculty member's portfolio. Use Faculty 180 as a tool for this discussion item.
- What efficiencies are possible in the unit to increase productivity and/or reduce expenditures?
- What innovative ideas do you have for increasing summer school productivity, on-line program development, delivery of programs to the Regional Campuses, Distance Learning, and/or new programs?
- Identify the challenges that exist which will impact the status of the Program? What suggestions do you have for addressing those challenges?

6. Supplementary Documents should include:

- Comprehensive Communications and Marketing Plan;
- Graduate Assistant Requests (if applicable);
- Status of Map Computer needs;
- Request for additional financial resources, personnel, and/or new programs. A business plan outlining the financial and personnel requirements must be included for the request to be considered; and,
- Recruitment and Retention Plans.

7. For Units that have been designated as “Enhance” in the Program Review Process, please respond to the following:
 - What are immediate actions that can be taken to enhance the program without a significant outlay of financial resources? Please list three to five, in priority order.
 - Define “enhancement” with respect to the program and outline the top five priority items that will contribute to enhancing the program. Please be specific with respect to the timeline for implementation and the expected result.
 - What will be achieved by enhancing the program? What are the goals in terms of programs offered, increase in majors, increase in SCH production, increase in scholarship, etc? In other words, what proposed goals and associated strategies will help you achieve the “enhanced” program status?
8. For Units that have been designated as “Continue with Conditions” in the Program Review Process, please respond to the following:
 - What are immediate actions that can be taken to improve the program without a significant outlay of financial resources? Please list three to five, in priority order.
 - What curricular changes are needed (or are in process) to make the programs relevant for the 21st Century?
 - What internal organizational changes would improve collaboration internally and/or externally to the unit as well as improve the quality of the program?
 - What measures (in addition to changes in number of majors, student credit hours produced, and degrees conferred) will inform the program that it has met the goals for continuation of the program. In subsequent years, progress on these benchmarks must be documented as part of this process.
9. Summarize the participation of unit faculty in the following institutional priorities:
 - Honors Program;
 - International Studies;
 - Interdisciplinary Programs;
 - General Education;
 - First Year Seminar;
 - Involvement in Teacher Education; and,
 - Diversity Initiatives.
 - Delivery of programs at Regional Campuses and online
10. Prepare a two-year schedule of the courses that will be offered in your unit. This process can be facilitated through the use of the e-advising system.

11. Summarize in Executive Summary format the take-away items from this APPR.

Please note that the yearly APPR is the framework for the three-year review as well as the five-year review outlined in Appendix A. The three-year review process is especially critical for the programs designated as “Enhance” and “Conditional Continuation.”

Academic Program Productivity Framework: Provides a tiered approach to evaluating the production of student credit hours by program faculty per academic year. The target SCH production is for each FTE faculty assigned to a program area by CIP Code and is based on national normative data as well as best practice

Tier 1 Programs 750 Student Credit Hours	Tier 2 Programs 600 Student Credit Hours	Tier 3 Programs 450 Student Credit Hours	Tier 4 Program 300 Student Credit Hours
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology • Mathematics • Psychology • Sociology • History • Communications • Political Science and Government • Geography 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English • Paralegal Studies • Philosophy • Social Work • Accounting • Economics • Finance Management • Marketing • Public Administration • Real Estate • Sport and Fitness Administration • Chemistry • Computer Science • Industrial and Engineering Technology • Earth Systems • Health and Exercise Science • Physics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theatre Arts • Fine Arts Music • Foreign Languages • Education (including Business and Health Education and CTE) • Agriculture • Space Science 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Veterinary Technology • Nursing • Imaging Sciences

Program tiers based on national normative averages and program requirements such as No/low General Education

- Lab intensive / restricted instructional facilities
- Accreditation requirements for low enrollment courses
- Cohorts / Competitive Admission Standards

Appendix D

Budget Carry-forward Policy (To Be Developed)

A Budget Carry-forward policy would provide incentive to all academic and support units of the University to implement cost-saving and efficiency initiatives that would build end-of-year budget reserves and also empower them to have the ability to do multi-year budget planning for funding of larger item purchases and programs. The intent of the policy is to provide additional fiscal flexibility and reward good fiscal management by allocating year-end budget surpluses and also to dissuade units from over spending expenditure budgets. The policy does not include auxiliary enterprises or restricted educational and general units. It is the recommendation that this policy be developed in the spring 2010 and proposed as part of the 2010-2011 Operating Budget.

The policy would include parameters that would allow a department to carry forward a percentage of their end-of-year budget balances under conditions such as...

- The amount carried forward will reflect a 5% reduction which will be allocated to a central fund for minor renovations and 2% reduction which will go to the Provost for funding of strategic priorities within the division
- The carry forward for a given division or college excluding the allocation to the minor renovations and Provost strategic priority fund may not exceed 10% of the current fiscal year discretionary operating base budget. Discretionary operating base is exclusive of personnel and fixed cost expenditures as defined by the Office of Budgets.
- Carry forward funds may not be used to create roster positions or hire permanent personnel.
- The proposed use of the carry forward funds must be approved by the Provost or division VP and will be set up in a special account for the approved purpose so they can be monitored.
- Selected general purpose programs which are university-wide in nature will be excluded in the calculation of budget surpluses and distribution of carry forward funds. These are:
 - Institutional Financial Aid
 - Personnel
 - Debt Service

- Utilities
 - General Institutional Expenses (i.e. insurance, rent, legal expenses)
 - Non-Discretionary Fixed Cost Allocations
 - Central Budget Reserves
- Units are expected not to incur operating budget deficits. Units that overspend their operating budget and end the year with an overall deficit will be required to cover 100% of the deficit from reductions in next year's budget. This deficit recovery normally will be done in the first quarter of the new fiscal year.
 - Each year, the carry forward funds will be held until the President is confident that the financial environment is not unusually adverse. The Office of the President, assisted by the VP for Planning and Budgets staff, shall determine whether the amount of budget reserves is sufficient to meet current year funding requirements. If not sufficient, appropriate additional reduction may be required.

The parameters above are EXAMPLE ONLY... Additional analysis and specific parameters will need to be set based on prior year budget data analysis if concept is approved for further assessment.

Appendix E

Excellence in Planning and Assessment Awards

The purpose of the Excellence in Planning and Assessment Awards is to create an incentive to improve the quality of planning and assessment at the unit level which will facilitate stronger continuous improvement efforts.

1. **Program Enhancement Awards:** Programs may submit a proposal for enhancement that supports the mission of the University in addition to addressing specific outcomes identified during the Annual Program Review discussions beginning in the fall of 2010. Programs must demonstrate a commitment to the proposal and be prepared to fund the initial implementation. Proposals will need to include specific measurable outcomes and be included in the WEAVE unit assessment plan for tracking purposes. This will be a competitive process and funds will not be awarded until completion of the plan or following the first stage of the plan if implemented over multiple years.
2. **Targeted Improvement Grants:** As a result of the APR hearings and a review of program assessment plans, common areas of greatest need across programs will be identified each year. Programs can apply for grants (\$x,xxx TBD) that will allow them to improve in the identified areas of need.
3. **Excellence in Assessment Awards:** Following completion of the six year program review process, academic programs (1/3 eligible each year) would be considered for a one-time award (\$x,xxx TBD) for exemplary assessments (must have completed an assessment of all student learning outcomes). Administrative units would be considered for an award upon completion of a cycle of assessment of all outcomes. The criteria would not be based on the unit meeting targets set for assessment but the broader approach to how results (positive or negative as compared to the target) were used to facilitate improvement within the unit and the documentation of the process in WEAVE.
4. **MSU Student Engagement Survey (MSUSES) Award:** A program can apply for an award based upon an improvement in survey scores resulting from implementation of an improvement plan. The program would need to provide MSUSES scores for the base year, the improvement plan, and MSUSES scores for the following year documenting the improvements made. This award would be competitive (\$x,xxx TBD).
5. **QEP Implementation Award:** the criteria for this award would need to be developed following finalization of QEP topic, assessments, etc.

While we will try to maintain consistency in annual award amounts, the amount available for each award will be set annually based on resource availability. Programs will be notified at the start of a program year of the amount available for the upcoming year.

21st Century College

Baking and Pastry Arts (12.3456)

Faculty Classification	2008FA						2009SP					
	Student Credit Hours				FTE	SCH/FTE	Student Credit Hours				FTE	SCH/FTE
UG - Lower	UG - Upper	GR	Total	UG - Lower			UG - Upper	GR	Total			
Full-Time	2553	726	165	3444	12.00	287	1761	771	342	2874	11.00	261
<i>Tenured</i>	1065	651	165	1881	8.00	235	579	675	342	1596	7.00	228
<i>Non-Tenure Track</i>	1488	75		1563	4.00	391	1182	96		1278	4.00	320
Part-Time	300	78	90	468	1.75	267	525	72	66	663	2.75	241
<i>Tenured</i>			90	90	0.50	180			66	66	0.50	132
<i>No Tenure Status</i>	300	78		378	1.25	302	525	72		597	2.25	265
Total	2853	804	255	3912	13.75	285	2286	843	408	3537	13.75	257

Baking and Pastry Arts (12.3456)

TERM*COURSE	COURSE.LEVEL	DL MODE	FTE	ENROLLED	STUD.CR.HRS	ID	FIRST	LAST	CIP	TENURE	STATUS	NOTES
2008FA*CAC*100*096	UG-Lower division		0.25	18	54	1235670	Betty	Blue	12.3456		0 PRT	
			0.25		54							
2008FA*CAC*100*099	UG-Lower division		0.25	25	75	2131220	Cindy	Salmon	12.3456		0 PRT	
2008FA*CAC*100*097	UG-Lower division		0.25	28	84	2131220	Cindy	Salmon	12.3456		0 PRT	
			0.5		159							
2008FA*BPA*310*302	UG-Upper division	B	0.25	26	78	1236780	Gary	Green	12.3456		0	0
			0.25		78							
2008FA*CAC*100*303	UG-Lower division	B	0.25	29	87	1238900	Tony	Tan	12.3456		0	0
			0.25		87							
		<i>O TOTAL</i>	1.25		378							
2008FA*CAC*650*001	GR			2	6	4131220	Jay	Leno	12.3456	TEND	FTS	DC, 0.5 FTE
2008FA*CAC*625*301	GR	B		27	81	4131220	Jay	Leno	12.3456	TEND	FTS	
2008FA*BPA*650*001	GR			1	3	4131220	Jay	Leno	12.3456	TEND	FTS	
			0.5		90							
		<i>TEND TOTAL</i>	0.5		90							
		PART-TIME TOTAL	1.75		468							
2008FA*CAC*100*020	UG-Lower division			21	63	337450	Joe	Tan	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*CAC*100*006	UG-Lower division			45	135	337450	Joe	Tan	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*CAC*100*003	UG-Lower division			45	135	337450	Joe	Tan	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*CAC*100*002	UG-Lower division			45	135	337450	Joe	Tan	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*CAC*100*001	UG-Lower division			45	135	337450	Joe	Tan	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
			1		603							
2008FA*CAC*100*302	UG-Lower division	B		29	87	104342	Sally	White	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*CAC*100*095	UG-Lower division			19	57	104342	Sally	White	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*CAC*100*012	UG-Lower division			44	132	104342	Sally	White	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
			1		276							
2008FA*CAC*222*302	UG-Lower division	B		22	66	493476	Mary	Plum	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*CAC*222*301	UG-Lower division	B		25	75	493476	Mary	Plum	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*CAC*100*301	UG-Lower division	B		26	78	493476	Mary	Plum	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*CAC*100*004	UG-Lower division			46	138	493476	Mary	Plum	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
			1		357							
2008FA*CAC*100*009	UG-Lower division			43	129	666253	Emma	Blue	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*CAC*100*007	UG-Lower division			41	123	666253	Emma	Blue	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*BPA*434*002	UG-Upper division			11	33	666253	Emma	Blue	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2008FA*BPA*434*001	UG-Upper division			14	42	666253	Emma	Blue	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
			1		327							
		<i>NTEN TOTAL</i>	4		1563							
2008FA*CAC*222*301	UG-Lower division	B		15	45	605936	Fred	Green	12.3456	TEND	FTS	
2008FA*CAC*434*001	UG-Upper division			8	24	605936	Fred	Green	12.3456	TEND	FTS	
2008FA*CAC*640*301	GR	B		23	69	605936	Fred	Green	12.3456	TEND	FTS	

			1		138				
2008FA*CAC*100*015	UG-Lower division			44	132	35499 Barney	Brown	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*322*301	UG-Upper division	B		35	105	35499 Barney	Brown	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*322*001	UG-Upper division			14	42	35499 Barney	Brown	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*310*001	UG-Upper division			3	9	35499 Barney	Brown	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*650*001	GR			1	3	35499 Barney	Brown	12.3456	TEND FTS
			1		291				
2008FA*CAC*100*010	UG-Lower division			45	135	207914 John	Black	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*100*008	UG-Lower division			45	135	207914 John	Black	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*334*301	UG-Upper division	B		26	78	207914 John	Black	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*334*001	UG-Upper division			25	75	207914 John	Black	12.3456	TEND FTS
			1		423				
2008FA*CAC*322*002	UG-Upper division			15	45	675893 Wilma	Gold	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*310*001	UG-Upper division			16	48	675893 Wilma	Gold	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*644*301	GR	B		10	30	675893 Wilma	Gold	12.3456	TEND FTS
			1		123				
2008FA*CAC*100*011	UG-Lower division			43	129	574144 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*450*003	UG-Upper division			14	42	574144 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*344*207	UG-Upper division	C		7	21	574144 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*344*205	UG-Upper division	C		7	21	574144 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*344*202	UG-Upper division	C		8	24	574144 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*344*200	UG-Upper division	C		12	36	574144 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*688*301	GR	B		2	6	574144 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND FTS
			1		279				
2008FA*CAC*100*093	UG-Lower division			20	60	135366 Peggy	Pink	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*100*017	UG-Lower division			33	99	135366 Peggy	Pink	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*355*001	UG-Upper division			12	36	135366 Peggy	Pink	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*BPA*350*001	UG-Upper division			10	30	135366 Peggy	Pink	12.3456	TEND FTS
			1		225				
2008FA*CAC*199*001	UG-Lower division			8	24	744763 Cindy	Copper	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*100*016	UG-Lower division			44	132	744763 Cindy	Copper	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*205*001	UG-Lower division			18	54	744763 Cindy	Copper	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*654*301	GR	B		13	39	744763 Cindy	Copper	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*650*001	GR	B		3	9	744763 Cindy	Copper	12.3456	TEND FTS
			1		258				
2008FA*CAC*100*005	UG-Lower division			40	120	551633 Sandy	Shores	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*425*001	UG-Upper division			5	15	551633 Sandy	Shores	12.3456	TEND FTS
2008FA*CAC*699*001	GR	B		3	9	551633 Sandy	Shores	12.3456	TEND FTS
			1		144				
	TEND TOTAL		8		1881				
	FULL-TIME TOTAL		12		3444				
	GRAND TOTAL		13.75		3912				

Baking and Pastry Arts (12.3456)

TERM*COURSE	COURSE.LEVEL	DL MODE	FTE	ENROLLED	STUD.CR.HRS	ID	FIRST	LAST	CIP	TENURE	STATUS	NOTES
2009SP*CAC*100*093	UG-Lower division		0.25	21		63	1235670 Betty	Blue	12.3456		0 FTS	FT Staff, treat as adjunct
			0.25			63						
2009SP*BPA*126*301	UG-Lower division	B	0.25	33		99	2131220 Sam	Salmon	12.3456		0 PRT	
			0.25			99						
2009SP*BPA*430*001	UG-Upper division		0.25	7		21	1236780 Gary	Green	12.3456		0 FTS	FT Staff, treat as adjunct
			0.25			21						
2009SP*CAC*100*096	UG-Lower division		0.25	27		81	1238900 Tony	Tan	12.3456		0 PRT	
2009SP*CAC*100*014	UG-Lower division		0.25	24		72	1238900 Tony	Tan	12.3456		0 PRT	
			0.5			153						
2009SP*CAC*310*207	UG-Upper division	C	0	9		27	12345 Wayne	White	12.3456		0	0 *ITV
2009SP*CAC*310*204	UG-Upper division	C	0	1		3	12345 Wayne	White	12.3456		0	0 *ITV
2009SP*CAC*310*200	UG-Upper division	C	0.25	7		21	12345 Wayne	White	12.3456		0	0 *ITV
			0.25			51						
2009SP*CAC*100*110	UG-Lower division		0.25	22		66	2131200 David	Letterman	12.3456		0 FTS	FT Staff, treat as adjunct
			0.25			66						
2009SP*CAC*100*095	UG-Lower division		0.25	23		69	2131230 Olivia	Smith	12.3456		0 PRT	
			0.25			69						
2009SP*CAC*100*303	UG-Lower division	B	0.25	25		75	3131220 Paul	Pearl	12.3456		0	0
			0.25			75						
		<i>0 TOTAL</i>	2.25			597						
2009SP*BART*650*301	GR	B		9		27	4131220 Jay	Leno	12.3456	TEND	FTS	DC, 0.5 FTE
2009SP*CAC*650*301	GR	B		13		39	4131220 Jay	Leno	12.3456	TEND	FTS	
			0.5			66						
		<i>TEND TOTAL</i>	0.5			66						
		PART-TIME TOTAL	2.75			663						
2009SP*CAC*100*020	UG-Lower division			45		135	2233445 Joe	Tan	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*CAC*100*007	UG-Lower division			47		141	2233445 Joe	Tan	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*CAC*100*003	UG-Lower division			47		141	2233445 Joe	Tan	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*CAC*100*001	UG-Lower division			21		63	2233445 Joe	Tan	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
			1			480						
2009SP*CAC*100*302	UG-Lower division	B		24		72	3344556 Sally	White	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*CAC*100*097	UG-Lower division			17		51	3344556 Sally	White	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*CAC*100*012	UG-Lower division			42		126	3344556 Sally	White	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
			1			249						
2009SP*CAC*222*302	UG-Lower division	B		26		78	4455667 Mary	Plum	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*CAC*222*301	UG-Lower division	B		26		78	4455667 Mary	Plum	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*CAC*222*001	UG-Lower division	B		15		45	4455667 Mary	Plum	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*CAC*100*301	UG-Lower division	B		22		66	4455667 Mary	Plum	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
			1			267						
2009SP*CAC*100*011	UG-Lower division			22		66	5566778 Emma	Blue	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*CAC*100*009	UG-Lower division			40		120	5566778 Emma	Blue	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*BPA*434*204	UG-Upper division	C		2		6	5566778 Emma	Blue	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*BPA*434*203	UG-Upper division	C		1		3	5566778 Emma	Blue	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	
2009SP*BPA*434*200	UG-Upper division	C		12		36	5566778 Emma	Blue	12.3456	NTEN	FTF	

2009SP*BPA*434*001	UG-Upper division		17	51	5566778 Emma	Blue	12.3456	NTEN	FTF
			1	282					
		<i>NTEN TOTAL</i>	4	1278					
2009SP*CAC*310*301	UG-Upper division	B	31	93	6677889 Fred	Green	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*310*001	UG-Upper division		16	48	6677889 Fred	Green	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BPA*345*001	UG-Upper division		3	9	6677889 Fred	Green	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*430*001	UG-Upper division		7	21	6677889 Fred	Green	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*617*301	GR	B	27	81	6677889 Fred	Green	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*678*301	GR	B	3	9	6677889 Fred	Green	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*678*001	GR		4	12	6677889 Fred	Green	12.3456	TEND	FTS
			1	273					
2009SP*CAC*100*008	UG-Lower division		37	111	7788990 Barney	Brown	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*100*006	UG-Lower division		38	114	7788990 Barney	Brown	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BPA*319*301	UG-Upper division	B	29	87	7788990 Barney	Brown	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BPA*319*002	UG-Upper division		22	66	7788990 Barney	Brown	12.3456	TEND	FTS
			1	378					
2009SP*CAC*100*005	UG-Lower division		38	114	8899001 John	Black	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*307*001	UG-Upper division		16	48	8899001 John	Black	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*643*301	GR	B	20	60	8899001 John	Black	12.3456	TEND	FTS
			1	222					
2009SP*CAC*651*302	GR	B	23	69	9900112 Wilma	Gold	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BPA*678*001	GR		3	9	9900112 Wilma	Gold	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BPA*635*001	GR	B	4	12	9900112 Wilma	Gold	12.3456	TEND	FTS
			1	90					
2009SP*CAC*100*004	UG-Lower division		43	129	1212123 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*424*301	UG-Upper division	B	3	9	1212123 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*424*001	UG-Upper division		7	21	1212123 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BPA*302*095	UG-Upper division		10	30	1212123 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*304*095	UG-Upper division		9	27	1212123 Mark	Melon	12.3456	TEND	FTS
			1	216					
2009SP*CAC*210*001	UG-Lower division		24	72	2323234 Peggy	Pink	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BPA*333*301	UG-Upper division	B	31	93	2323234 Peggy	Pink	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*352*001	UG-Upper division		11	33	2323234 Peggy	Pink	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*624*301	GR	B	17	51	2323234 Peggy	Pink	12.3456	TEND	FTS
			1	249					
2009SP*CAC*200*001	UG-Lower division		13	39	3434345 Cindy	Copper	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BPA*302*301	UG-Upper division	B	25	75	3434345 Cindy	Copper	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*399*001	UG-Upper division		5	15	3434345 Cindy	Copper	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*652*301	GR	B	11	33	3434345 Cindy	Copper	12.3456	TEND	FTS
2009SP*CAC*689*001	GR		2	6	3434345 Cindy	Copper	12.3456	TEND	FTS
			1	168					
		<i>TEND TOTAL</i>	7	1596					
		FULL-TIME TOTAL	11	2874					
		GRAND TOTAL	13.75	3537					

21st Century College

Wine Steward/Sommelier (78.9012)

Faculty Classification	2008FA						2009SP					
	Student Credit Hours				FTE	SCH/FTE	Student Credit Hours				FTE	SCH/FTE
UG - Lower	UG - Upper	GR	Total	UG - Lower			UG - Upper	GR	Total			
Full-Time	147	106	78	331	1.00	331	168	201	81	450	1.00	450
<i>Tenured</i>	147	106	78	331	1.00	331	168	201	81	450	1.00	450
Total	147	106	78	331	1.00	331	168	201	81	450	1.00	450

Wine Steward/Sommelier (78.9012)

TERM* COURSE	COURSE.LEVEL	DL MODE	FTE	ENROLLED	STUD.CR.HRS	ID	FIRST	LAST	CIP	TENURE	STATUS
2009SP*MIX*199*002	UG-Lower division			56	168	911911	Joe	Merlot	78.9012	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BREW*410*301	UG-Upper division	B		32	96	911911	Joe	Merlot	78.9012	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BREW*410*209	UG-Upper division	C		1	3	911911	Joe	Merlot	78.9012	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BREW*410*207	UG-Upper division	C		5	15	911911	Joe	Merlot	78.9012	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BREW*410*205	UG-Upper division	C		8	24	911911	Joe	Merlot	78.9012	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BREW*410*204	UG-Upper division	C		1	3	911911	Joe	Merlot	78.9012	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BREW*410*200	UG-Upper division	C		17	51	911911	Joe	Merlot	78.9012	TEND	FTS
2009SP*MSU*399*002	UG-Upper division			9	9	911911	Joe	Merlot	78.9012	TEND	FTS
2009SP*BREW*650*301	GR	B		27	81	911911	Joe	Merlot	78.9012	TEND	FTS
<i>TEND TOTAL</i>			<i>1</i>		<i>450</i>						
FULL-TIME TOTAL			1		450						
GRAND TOTAL			1		450						

**SUMMARY OF EXTERNAL GRANT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED AND FUNDED
BY ACADEMIC OR ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT
July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009**

	<i>Proposals Submitted</i>	<i>Amount Submitted</i>	<i>Proposals Funded</i>	<i>Amount Funded</i>
<u>21st Century College</u>				
Department One	6	\$212,999	4	\$192,555
Department Two	2	\$52,850	1	\$43,000
Department 3	2	\$35,568	0	\$0
Department 4	4	1605333	3	\$72,642
Total	14	\$1,906,750	8	\$308,197

Source: Office of Research and Sponsored Programs

2008-09 REASSIGNED TIME

21st Century College

Department One	39	2.17
Gold, Wilma	6	0.33
Shores, Sandy	3	0.17
Leno, Jay	18	1.00

* Source: Colleague Workload Reports

21st Century College
SCH by Department and Location
 Fall 2008 and Spring 2009

Department One	8312	100.00%
Mt. Sterling	258	3.10%
West Liberty	12	0.14%
Main Campus	5735	69.00%
Online	2307	27.76%
Department Two	10,050	100.00%
Ashland	15	0.15%
Jackson	3	0.03%
Mt. Sterling	438	4.36%
Prestonsburg	78	0.78%
West Liberty	270	2.69%
Main Campus	6808	67.74%
Online	2435	24.23%
Other	3	0.03%

Source: Official Data reported to CPE