Academic Portfolio and Workload Review
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Outline of Project Update

• Reminder of Project Scope and Goals
• Engagements, Communication, and Timeline
• Approach and Methodology
• Metrics and Variables
• Questions & Answers
• Next Steps
Reminder of Project Scope and Goals
Project Scope and Goals

• Provide a framework that allows KBOR to ensure the six KBOR bachelors-degree granting institutions are offering academic programs that students are interested in pursuing, successfully complete, and that lead to employment

• Assess academic resource utilization across all institutions and recommend an ideal workload evaluation process that leads to continuous improvement
Engagement, Communication, and Timeline
Engagement and Communication

• Project Leaders and KBOR staff
  • Regular meetings and communication

• Steering Team
  • Monthly meetings through December

• Data Team
  • Bi-weekly meetings through September; reconvening in December

• Ad-hoc Faculty Advisory Group
  • Met in May, August, scheduled to meet on November 10

• Universities
  • Regular communication and specific meetings to review data

• Open feedback form
Call for Communication

• Project website has form for all constituents to ask questions/submit comments. Please share the form widely.

• Recent questions/comments:
  
  • How many post-secondary institutions have been evaluated in the past by rpk, or is the project with KBOR the first of its kind?
  
  • Faculty do not seem to be directly involved in the collection of data to be used to inform critical decisions, and yet faculty will be directly impacted by those decisions, so how does this process demonstrate or support shared governance, a crucial foundation for institutional success?
  
  • When will information about your study be shared with faculty members at the KBOR institutions?
  
  • At ---University, faculty doing academic advising is part of the "Teaching" responsibility. Will that be considered in the workload review?
October 2022
KBOR staff and Universities received Workload Review data; 5 universities have met with rpk/KBOR staff to review

November 1, 2022
Universities will receive Academic Program Review data for review

December 14, 2022
rpk presents findings and recommendations to Regents

October 2022
KBOR staff received Academic Portfolio Review Data

December 1, 2022
Joint Steering and Data Team meeting

January 2023
rpk provides narrative summary of project and recommendations to Regents
Context for Analyses
KBOR’s Landscape

- Doctoral Universities with very high research activity (2)
- Doctoral University with high research activity (1)
- Master's Colleges and Universities (3)
- Medical College (1)

Institutional Mission
Programmatic Offerings
Teaching Expectations
Workload Review: Teaching Activity - National Higher Education Landscape

• 15 states and systems were identified as having Governing Board similar in structure and authority to KBOR.

• 5 boards have defined teaching activity.
  • 3 of those instances use Carnegie classifications and/or institutional type to differentiate teaching expectations.

• 6 boards have deferred responsibility of defining teaching activity to institutions.
  • 3 of those require regular monitoring and reporting.

• 4 boards have not engaged in defining teaching activity or requiring reporting by institutions.
## Established Workload Policies by Governing Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/System</th>
<th>Policy Status</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada System of Higher Education</td>
<td>Board implemented</td>
<td>Universities: 18 instructional units per year; Colleges: 24 instructional units per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii System</td>
<td>Board implemented</td>
<td>24 semester credit hours per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| University of North Carolina System| Board implemented    | Semester standards set by Carnegie type: Research Universities - Very High Research Activity: 2 courses  
                               | Research Universities - High Research Activity & Doctoral Granting: 2.5 courses  
                               | Master’s Colleges & Universities - Large & Medium: 3 courses  
                               | Baccalaureate Colleges - Arts & Sciences: 4 courses  
                               | Baccalaureate Colleges - Diverse Fields: 4 courses                                                                                       |
| Utah System of Higher Education    | Board implemented    | Stipulates averages based on institutions function: Research/Teaching (18 credit hours per year); Metro/regional (24 credit hours per year); CC 30 per year. Defers to presidents to be 'innovative' to increase faculty productivity |
| Vermont State College System       | Negotiated labor contract | 24 credit hours or its equivalent per year; 18 credit per for technical colleges                                                             |
### Deferred Workload Policies by Governing Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/System</th>
<th>Policy Status</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents, State of Iowa</td>
<td>Deferred to institutions; reporting</td>
<td>Biannual faculty analysis must be submitted to the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Board of Regents</td>
<td>Deferred to institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana University System</td>
<td>Deferred to institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota Board of Regents</td>
<td>Deferred to institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin System</td>
<td>Deferred to institutions; reporting</td>
<td>Each institution is responsible for monitoring, allocating, and reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>required</td>
<td>data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
<td>Deferred to unit heads</td>
<td>Sets baseline teaching load of 15 credit hours per semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## No Workload Policies from Governing Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota University System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workload Review: Teaching Activity
Workload Review: Teaching Activity

Course Data (demand)

Faculty Data (supply)

Metrics
- Student credit hours
- Faculty by type (full-time, part-time)
- Student credit hours per total faculty FTE

Lenses
- KBOR
- Doctoral Universities; very high research activity
- Doctoral University; high research activity
- Master’s Colleges and Universities
- Medical School
Workload Review: Student Credit Hours

**Methodology**
- Student credit hours for course sections are generated from enrolled count and earned credits of all students.
- Student credit hours are grouped by level: developmental, undergraduate, or graduate.
- Student credit hours are mapped to the course subject’s home department.

**Insights**
- Provides a tracking of demand from students.
- Grouping by level serves as a reminder of institutional mission (some institutions have more graduate activity than others).
Workload Review: Faculty Type

Methodology

• Full-Time Faculty
  • All full-time faculty who are teaching in a term year are considered 1 FTE in rpk’s analysis

• Part-Time Faculty
  • All non-full-time faculty FTE calculated by rpk using a formula of 1 FTE = 24 credit hours
  • Part-Time faculty FTE is assigned to course subject’s home department

Insights

• Clear definitions provide transparency into calculations.

• Awareness of the faculty labor mix offers insights into what levers can be pulled in response to student demand.
Workload Review: Student Credit Hours per Total Faculty FTE

**Methodology**

- The sum of student credit hours in a defined period divided by the total faculty FTE in the same defined period.

**Insights**

- Student credit hours per total faculty FTE allows for a transparent and on-going understanding of teaching activity with more nuance than load or number of courses taught.

- Student credit hours per total faculty FTE should be reflective of institutional mission and program offerings.
Academic Portfolio Review
Program Awareness

• What programs are the most and least in demand for students?
• To what extent is there program repetition or duplication across the system, and what trends are evident for those programs?
• How are trends presenting at award levels (bachelors, masters, and doctoral)?
• Are graduates who stay in KS/MO employed and earning living wages?

Program Indicators

• Headcount
• Degree Production
• Retention Rate
• Years to Degree
• Graduation Rate
• Employment and Earned Wages in KS/MO
• Aligned resource allocations (Workload Review: Teaching Activity)

Program Recommendations

• rpk will recommend a framework for the continuous evaluation of KBOR’s academic portfolio that is transparent, creates accountability, and ensures the ability to demonstrate the proper stewardship of resources.
Next Steps:

• Steering and Data Team meeting on December 1, 2022
  • Joint meeting to receive draft presentation of what rpk will share with Regents
• rpk presentation to Regents on December 14, 2022
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