Strategic Plan – Initiative Work Plan FY2016

Initiative Name  Enhancing the Quality of Life of Faculty and Staff  Date 6/8/201

Goal # 6  Goal Chair(s)  President Bradley

Initiative # 1  Initiative Chair(s)  Linda Maule, Susan Powers, Lisa Spence, Beth Whitaker

Thesis Statement: We aim to continue successful programming, support grant initiatives aligned with our goal, and further institutionalize the Quality of Life initiative, with a special focus on instituting a permanent, by appointment committee to support the initiative.

1. Introduction/Background – What?

We have shifted our focus, this funding cycle, to institutionalizing the Quality of Life initiative by formalizing and making official the Quality of Life committee and developing from the COACHE analysis policies, protocols, procedures and programming focused on improving the quality of life of our faculty and staff.

2. Proposal/Purpose/Justification – Why?

a. Continue support of successful programs – The Work Life Integration Conference has provided a forum for student, faculty, and staff enrichment. The conference has grown to include external attendees, drawing recognition to Indiana State as an institution that encourages work-life balance, a principle component of quality of life. This year, the facilitators of this conference will organize a series of Work Life Integration workshops in lieu of the conference.

b. Comprehensive Assessment of Workplace Satisfaction – In FY 2014, we used the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), to provide us with a comprehensive assessment and consultation. This three year membership includes assessment, data analysis, consultation, and follow-up. We also conducted an assessment of staff satisfaction using a survey developed by the Society of Human Resource Management.

1. This AY, we will develop policies, protocols, procedures and programming founded on recommendations derived from the COACHE analysis.

3. Discussion of Past Years Results – Benchmark Successes?

Attendance at the Work Life Integration Conference – this activity is an avenue for faculty, staff, and students to learn more about the current climate and national trends of work-life integration, but does not necessarily help the campus with its issues. We propose continuing supporting the conference through the initiative for one more year and then institutionalizing its cost through Interdisciplinary Programs.
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Faculty (regular) retention from year one to year two – this is a clear measure of faculty retention and one that we should continue using; however, we are unable to report this outcome until the Fall of each year (making a spring report out difficult). Furthermore, the data from the COACHE survey suggests, it is in fact tenured faculty who seem most dissatisfied with the institution (on 10 of the 16 benchmarks). We could argue that the reason for the loss of pre-tenure faculty, particularly in the first two years may be due to the climate created by tenured faculty. Programs aimed at mentorship in the mid-career may help to resolve some of these deficits.

Staff (EAP and SS) retention from year one to year two – again, this is a clear measure of staff retention and one that we should continue to use (although we face the same report-out issues). The staff satisfaction survey yielded a 53.8% response rate and demonstrated moderate to high satisfaction in many of the areas we asked about. A more in depth analysis has suggested certain employment areas may need to implement more career advancement opportunities and demonstration of administrative support.

Please see the new configuration of benchmarks in the benchmark template.


Our action steps include maintaining or supporting some programs for another year until they can be institutionalized. These include:

Work-Life Integration Workshops –Debra Israel has planned and implemented the Work life Integration Conference the past. The programming and attendance have improved dramatically over the years). This year, we will move from a conference format to a workshop format.

New programming or action steps, based on the findings of our comprehensive assessment plan include:

5. Reporting and Deliverable Schedule – When?

Work-Life Integration Workshops – Fall 2015 and Spring 2016

6. Budget – How Much, a General Discussion of Funds Use?

The total request for funds is

7. Stakeholders and Management Plan – Who?

1. Work-Life Integration Workshops – Deb Israel

8. Outcome Assessment & Future Testing

For the Work Life workshops, we will continue to measure attendance

To measure overall initiative success, we should use the viable benchmarks:

- Faculty (regular) retention from year one to year two (percentage or ratio of retained/employed)
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- Staff (EAP and SS) retention from year one to year two (percentage or ratio of retained/employed)
- Institution of a permanent Quality of Life committee to which faculty and staff are appointed.

9. Line Item Budget Discussion that tracks Budget Templates …

1. COACHE payment – $2330

Programming:

1. Work-Life Integration Workshops – $5000 (Operational: $500.00, Travel: $3000.00, Honorarium: $1500.00)
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Initiative Name____Enhance the Development of Faculty_________________ Date_May 28, 2015_

Goal # _____6___________________ Goal Chair(s)         __Diann McKee, Dan Bradley______
Initiative #   __2_________________ Initiative Chair(s)  _____Lisa Spence___________________

Thesis Statement __The Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence (FCTE) requires appropriate staffing by a faculty member who can augment the efforts of the director to engage faculty, conduct training sessions, and help to assess the results of the Center’s activities.

1. Introduction/Background – What?

The FCTE has only one permanent staff member – the Executive Director. The FCTE provides a robust curriculum of sessions and support to promote excellence in teaching among all faculty at Indiana State. These activities require research, preparation, delivery, and after-activity assessment. The environment for pedagogy changes almost daily, with new technologies and techniques offered to engage students in a great variety of ways. In order to serve the over 650 faculty members, and groups such as teaching assistants, who are so important to the success of students in this complex and changing environment, it is necessary to augment the FCTE permanent staff with a faculty fellow. Technology forms a major part of the instructional environment, and it is essential to have a close connection between technology support and the unit that is responsible for the success of faculty and students.

2. Proposal/Purpose/Justification – Why?

Activity 1: Overall Activities of the FCTE

In academic year 2014/15, the FCTE offered over 100 sessions/consultations to approximately 500 faculty. The curriculum included large group meetings, small group sessions, and a full schedule of offerings during Mornings in May. In addition to sessions/classes for groups of faculty, the FCTE also provided 85 hours of individualized consultation to faculty. The FCTE also offers “push out” services which takes the director to other locations on campus, such as classrooms for observation, department meetings, university committee events, etc. In addition, the FCTE location has become a preferred location for formal and informal gatherings of faculty for collaboration and learning. Our faculty numbers have increased in the last several years, and the faculty remain very dynamic, with 20 – 30 new regular faculty and a large number of adjuncts each year, many of whom are new. Faculty retention is a strategic goal, and the development activities offered by the FCTE are a critical part of ensuring that faculty are mentored and supported throughout their careers. All of the FCTE’s activities are optional. The attendance and activity numbers above demonstrate the importance of these efforts to faculty. The changing and growing nature of our environment at Indiana State is the justification for continuing to operate at this level.

Summary: The activities of the FCTE must continue to be supported, and to provide this level of activity takes manpower. We are proposing that a faculty fellow be funded for 2015/16 to lead and participate in the basic efforts of the FCTE.

Activity 2: Support for Instructional Technologies

Blackboard usage is increasing, and in 2015/16 all faculty are required to use Blackboard to enter grades so that students can better understand and react to their status in their classes. As faculty continue to transition through and/or experience an environment of increasing and ever-changing technology, we must connect faculty to technologies and support them in their use of technologies. A necessary condition for success here is a rich understanding of teaching activities and the class environment, both face-to-face and online. The most effective liaison for faculty, in order to identify and engage their areas of interest or need, is a person who is a faculty member himself, experienced with and passionate about the use of technologies for teaching.

Summary: We are proposing a second faculty fellow, to be housed in the FCTE but to work closely with the instructional tools support area within OIT. This fellow will design and lead technology training sessions, coordinate and facilitate our instructional tools advisory committee and focus group, provide support for testing of new releases, and act as the general faculty advocate in our ongoing efforts to ensure our instructional tools environment is robust and meets the needs of faculty, and that faculty support needs are well understood and responded to.

3. Discussion of Past Years Results – Benchmark Successes?

Activity 1: Overall Activities of the FCTE

See justification above. In the year 2015/16, the FCTE plans to continue to offer a schedule similar to the schedule offered in 2014/15, with an increased emphasis on supporting faculty during their adjustment to the new Blackboard requirements.

Activity 2: Support for Instructional Technologies

OIT estimates over 800 hours are currently devoted by various staff to the activities anticipated to be fulfilled by a faculty fellow. These activities will expand this year with the grading initiative, so this is easily a half-time commitment.


Activity 1: Overall Activities of the FCTE

The faculty fellow is in place for the remainder of a two-year commitment. Once funding is secured, her activities will continue throughout summer 2015 and in preparation for the 2015/16 academic year.

Activity 2: Support for Instructional Technologies

1. Identify a faculty member with exception skills and a passion for teaching (summer 2015).

2. Offer that faculty member a release, to be supported by Goal 6/Initiative 2 funding (summer 2015).
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3. Work with department chair and identified faculty member to transition responsibilities (summer 2015).

4. Transition activities from Kristie Bigler and others to faculty fellow, as defined above (fall 2015)

5. Execute on role, including training, coordination of advisory committees, and faculty, in partnership with FCTE Executive Director and faculty fellow, and OIT instructional tools team (AY 2015/16)

6. Assess activities and success of approach and role (spring 2015)

5. Reporting and Deliverable Schedule – When?

Activity 1: Overall Activities of the FCTE

In the spring 2016 report-out for Goal 6, the FCTE Executive Director will report on the activities of the faculty fellow as a part of the report on the FCTE’s activities and results. Additional reporting will be made on a regular basis through the Office of Student Success (where the FCTE is administratively housed).

Activity 2: Support for Instructional Technologies

In the spring 2016 report-out for Goal 6, the CIO will report on the activities and success of the faculty fellow for instructional technologies.

6. Budget – How Much, a General Discussion of Funds Use?

2 stipends at $6000: $12,000

2 2-course releases at $3000 each: $12,000

7. Stakeholders and Management Plan – Who?

The primary and direct stakeholders for both of these fellows are the faculty of Indiana State University. The indirect but very critical stakeholders are the students of Indiana State University. Other indirect stakeholders include department chairs and other members of Academic Affairs leadership who benefit from having an engaged faculty who are well-served in their efforts to develop their skills.

8. Outcome Assessment & Future Testing

1. Faculty satisfaction survey results
2. Summary of sessions offered (individual support sessions and classes)
3. Visits to the FCTE
4. Comments recorded about individual sessions
9. Line Item Budget Discussion that tracks Budget Templates ...

Activity 1: 1 Faculty Fellow at $6000; 1 set of course releases at $6000
Activity 2: 1 Faculty Fellow at $6000; 1 set of course releases at $6000