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PREFACE

In our approach, we have kept in the forefront of our thinking these guiding principles:
— That all our efforts must be to the benefit of educating our students; and
— That any system of shared governance must be based upon, and foster, mutual respect and trust in an academic community of professional designers, artists and scholars.

Looking back upon the roughly twenty weeks from the initial visioning workshop to this document, everyone feels that the topics are hugely important and that the time allotted for thorough investigations, expert knowledge, reflection and formulation was woefully short. Yet, seemingly scattershot, we feel that we must articulate our finding in greater depth than a few lines on a summary chart.

The emergent objectives center around shared governance; academic community; efficient, well-defined and sustainable structures and processes; assessment; and, diversity.

The structure of Art Center’s governance has evolved over the life of the college as it has increased in size and its programs have become more complex. In the beginning, there was just a president, the faculty members and a slim group of support services; then, a president delegated a set of program chairs who managed their faculty members. Art Center is a professional school. It hardly is a traditional academic model. We chose to investigate different modes of shared governance, at the same time that we looked for Art Center’s centers of decision-making, knowing that the college will continue to change as it flexes.

The positive impacts of shared governance are:
— improved, or enhanced morale;
— creative policy formation;
— grassroots support for decision-making and policy; and
— greater resilience for difficult situations because the community has the habit of mind to work together. (Evans, 1999)

Academic community is woven into shared governance. A strong academic community is one that protects inquiry, promotes scholarship, improves as a matter of process, and is centered on teaching and learning. With that, follows equity, respect, carefully considered policies, support for teaching, and cohesion. The goal is to create a community grounded on “trust, leadership, and responsibility.”

Related to governance and community is assessment. “Assessment is an ongoing process designed to monitor and improve...learning.” (Allen) It begins by setting learning goals,
aligned from institutional mission to program to course description to projects in the
learning environment. Assuring the quality of learning requires well defined, measurable
outcomes that will drive data-driven decisions about the colleges offerings, its relevance
and ability to make refinements. With that, faculty members, co-curricular programs,
resource managers and support staff can work together to provide the richest opportunities
for every student to learn, regardless of their particular needs or learning styles. The
college fulfills its purpose—to provide an education on the level of professional practice for
its designers and artists who become citizens in both local and global cultural contexts.
Meaningful assessment requires leaders who cultivate learner-centered pedagogies, and, if
needed, dedicate resources to train both faculty and staff. Their aims should be formative,
both giving and accepting performance reviews on all levels with the sincere and honest
intent to increase dialogue and to foster a mindset focused on continually improvement.

This visioning process started with a workshop attended by a cross-section of staff, faculty,
administrators, and even a trustee, attending the governance and community session. At
the end of the day, they had set a goal: create a model (or, many models from which to
choose) of a governance structure.

We looked at organizational charts and processes, both those that we have and those
of others. We began to look at resources and the allocation of spaces in our community.
We interviewed senior leadership. We read about governance, we interviewed others. We
had to research and read about the topic because governance is complex and nuanced.
In the end, we see value in the structure that we have. It is unique compared to traditional
academia. It is one that has evolved over the eighty years of the college.

Add the insights of our times: severe economic stress, turbulence and change. There
is a lesson: whatever operational structure that the college sets up, it must be efficient,
workable, and flexible in order to be sustained.

The topic of diversity touches upon the face our student’s experience, upon the academic
community of the college, upon the local places that we live and work, upon our culture
and how we choose to shape it into a context, and, by extension, to our world as
inhabitants of this little blue planet, ‘third from the sun.’

We take the position that diversity starts with rich exchanges from different perspectives,
assuring the same quality education for all our students, and accepting that opportunities
for success are inherent in every person. It is our task to accommodate them, each and
everyone.
To conclude, the group recognizes that this visioning process is likely yet another reflective moment — a re-visioning. What is it that Heraclitus, the philosopher from Ephesus in the 6th-century BCE, said: “On those who step in the same river, different and different waters flow.” Visions and revisions present different paths, possibilities, and opportunities. This work has only begun. As an exercise in collaboration, in shared governance, it has invigorated our campus and has brought both hope and trepidation.

Let us begin.
OVERVIEW

The Governance and Community Research Group of the 2010 ACCD Visioning Process started in January with an evening of conversations with noted people from the disciplines, followed by a workshop the next day.

Then, we mapped out an approach and gathered to begin our work: Rob Ball, ENV; Ann Field, Chair, ILLUS; Mary Matyseck, IS, Cochair, ACFC, facilitators; Michael Brubaker, IT; Beth Duffy, Development; Victor Emerson, IT; Maria Glover, Development; Rollin Homer, Architecture; Richard Houston, ILLUS; David Luce, ILLUS; Christine Nasser, ILLUS, ACFC; Richard Pietruska, TRANS; Dennis Phillips, HDS; and Ty Powe, Facilities, the team. It is of note, that few ‘governors’ themselves took part in this work and that, in itself, was impetus for careful, documented investigation. That a number of staff members thought this domain was relevant and worthy of their time is, we think, not only significant but attests to the broader definition of a community in which many contribute to the success of our students.

This document addresses our principle findings and attempts not to reshape a governance structure but to enhance and make more efficient what we have. The first three objectives are integrated but have been teased apart to look at specific concerns.

MAIN OBJECTIVES

I. Shared Governance;
II. Academic community;
III. Efficient, well-defined and sustainable structures and processes;
IV. Assessment; and,
V. Diversity.

ADDRESSING VALUES

The Visioning Steering Committee has identified a set of shared values and attributes: Diversity and Inclusion; Access and Affordability; Academic Excellence and Assessment; Professionalism and Research; Human-Centered Education and Citizenship. We have not separated these out from our discourse.

TERMS

As a matter of form, the working definitions are a parallel text, a reference, intended to illuminate more broadly. The terms are not listed alphabetically, but clustered in domains. A bibliography follows. We have accumulated a set of nearly a hundred digital files including the many reports, interviews, facility maps, and some of the references that our group has collected and reflected upon. We hope these will be useful as the work continues.
**MAIN OBJECTIVES**

I. **Shared Governance**

The governing board oversees the operations of the institution to assure that its policies and bylaws, its standards, and its learning objectives conform with the intended purpose, or mission, of the college.

The governing board delegates authority to the president of the college.

The president, in turn, sets up an administrative staff who manage the strategic and operational support of the college and the educational programs who attend to teaching and learning.

A general organizational chart for Art Center today looks like this:

Most colleges and universities have a similar hierarchical structure but with some striking differences.

One, is scale. Art Center is small, a community of a few thousand counting everyone. Does it have enough hands, or the will, to attend to the actual work of shared governance? Most faculty members have demanding professional lives and have only an interest to teach. There are 85 full-time faculty who have contractual obligations to service. Our adjunct faculty contracts are based on contact-teaching hours only.

Two, is function.

**THEM:** In traditional academia the status of faculty is different. All full-time faculty are hired as a result of a search to complete its contingent of disciplines (academic community) required by the to meet its mission. After a probationary period of about seven years, they are either granted tenure (a long-term contractual commitment) or not. If not, they may be able to continue to teach at that institution. Some suggest that sometimes the ‘tenure-track’ hire is less than sincere.
Statistically, tenured positions continue to decline. The ascension to administrative positions goes through participation in the faculty senate (shared governance) to deans and provosts and president, moving up through the ranks, so to speak, which can be a sorting-out process of teaching effectiveness (one-third of their academic portfolio) and leadership development (assets of the college). Some tenured positions only involve conducting research. The department chair is a faculty member, one who assumes operational leadership for a time (rotating chairs). The faculty senate is a set of committees that manages the academic concerns of the institution. Slow and resistant to change, they are more stable. The academy offers a protected place for open inquiry (academic freedom).

**US:** By contrast, our department chairs are specific hires. They are masters in their fields. They are regarded as staff.

They hire faculty. Both give Art Center rich expertise and intimate contacts to the outside workplaces for programming, sponsored projects and employment for our graduates. These “teaching professionals,” along with the chairs, know current trends and advances in design and art. The department chair also has obligations to cultivate outside partnerships and provide co-curricular opportunities and to help with fund raising.

Some disadvantage are: these expert faculty and staff are not trained educators, and, retention is may be difficult. They are easily drawn away to other ventures. Or, a chair my turn the direction of the program radically and faculty are summarily marginalized or dismissed. That affects morale and fosters discontent. The fluid nature of the programs makes it difficult for the institution to develop depth in teaching over time and nearly impossible to engage in research.

As part of their job description, a chair are expected to develop the curriculum for his/her program. Some chairs do that with more or less collaboration with their faculty. For some, shared governance inhibits their autonomy and flexibility or their ability to redirect program curricula at will. Beyond that, there is little overarching curricular oversight amongst them (“silos”). The college added a provost-like position c. 1997 and we have had three since then, mostly because the position was ill-defined and marked a division between “education” and “administration” that has proven disastrous.

The entire organization is “at will.” This makes everyone’s position tenuous. By definition, adjunct faculty members also serve at the will of their chair as do staff under their department supervisors. Of the 85 full-time faculty, perhaps 60% are core or foundation faculty. Another 15% are delegated as assistants or directors in their departments. Yet, a level of competitiveness keeps faculty fresh and improving and there is a marked difference between our motivated faculty and some of those who are protected in secure positions.

**Recommendation**

- As we looked at various governance structures and considered engendering a healthy academic
community, we focused on centers of decision-making. There are several levels at which we can be partners in governance (see above, the highlighted areas on organizational chart):

1. Standing Committees (● global coordination of resources and priorities)
2. Advocacy groups and managers (● process)
3. Departmental/program development (● local collaboration and planning)

It is fitting that those constituents closest to the mission objectives, should plan, should initiate proposals, and should assess effectiveness in teaching and learning and in the programs they have developed.

Those who manage the process of making things happen include advocacy groups and standing committees who advance proposals. On the administrative side, the managers take care of the exigencies pull together statistical or quantitative data.

The people who make the decisions weigh merit, feasibility, alignment to mission and attend to the strategical planning of the college.

To the right is a draft of a budget request process being proposed this Spring.

The Budget Committee members include representatives from each advocacy group (Chairs Council, Faculty Council, and Student Government) plus an additional faculty-at-large elected from the community. Ex-officio members include the CFO and other administrators who advise the committee. Proposals originate from within the community at the level where people are have direct contact and expertise in the workings of the college. For example, educational issues are attended by department chairs and their faculty who advance proposals to the Provost (or alternatively, through their advocacy groups, the faculty council or student government) who, in turn, takes them to the Budget Committee. The President then takes the proposal to the Finance Committee of the Board which adds it to the agenda of the next full board
meeting for approval. All defined avenues in the process are two-way negotiations, working out the details and refinements in sequence until the request it brought to the board for final approval. The process is transparent with appropriate balances and checks along the way. Other standing committees also send requests along to the budget committee if appropriate. Not every decision follows this path if the responsibility for making particular decisions has been delegated by the Board or by the President.

- The Board of Trustees has seven committees of its own that pool expertise in their oversight of the college’s operations (Governance, Academic Affairs, Audit, Finance, Facilities/Operations, Development, and Investment). It might be nice to mirror those functions within the community, but only if they are not redundant or functionally relevant. Efficiency and sustainableness must be the guiding principles along with assessments that assure that everyone is performing effectively. Short-term ad hoc task forces can direct focus at specific concerns. Time and effort is expended efficiently and the outcomes are concrete. Convening a grievance committee or the compensation task force are examples. - The intent is to keep the system “elegant.” Everyone wants to use their time purposefully; no one wants to go in loops; and we do not want to loose the advantage of being able to be responsive to opportunities as they arise, though, mindful of the impact of decisions made without careful consideration and consensus.

- All changes in structure are vetted and by the BOTs Academic Affairs Committee so the work of this visioning committee is to conduct research, note observations, and make recommendations about the following areas of shared governance.

**STANDING COMMITTEES:** Standing committees oversee the mission objectives of the college, negotiate priorities, and coordinate resource allocations. At present we have a Budget Committee and a Facilities and Technology Committee (FAT). An academic affairs committee might be appropriate, but its tasking may already be carried out internally by other entities. - A properly functioning Chairs Council under the Provost may be more appropriate and immediate for educational concerns.

The membership of the standing committees include one each representative from the chairs and faculty (and staff were appropriate) councils and the student government, and an elected faculty-at-large from the community.

Representatives from the advocacy groups—chairs, faculty, and staff councils and the student government—are selected from within each group. The terms of the two faculty members rotate alternatively for contiguity. Just how that synchronizes with the elections within the advocacy groups has yet to be thought through and the process for electing the faculty-at-large must be addressed. Perhaps that is managed by a senior staff person or HR since standing committees reside at the prioritizing level. Interested parties can express their interest and note their qualifications and the general community can vote.

A number of Senior Administrators and staff members sit *ex officio* on each committee as is
appropriate to the committee. Their role is advisory. They provide data and other support so that the committee can make data-driven decisions and prioritize proposals. The President is *ex officio* on all committees. The three Constituent Trustees, one each from the Chairs Council, the Faculty Council and the Student Government, make transparent the relationship of the BOT to the community, and, inversely give board members access to the college. All concerns can be heard and deliberations are reported back to the community through their advocacy groups, ‘closing-the-loop.’ In addition to attending and reporting at Trustee meetings, the constituent trustees also sit on two of the Board’s committees. All are on Academic Affairs, one each is on Finance, Facilities and Development.

**ADVOCACY GROUPS:** There are presently three advocacy groups that represent particular constituencies of the college: Chairs’ Council; Art Center Faculty Council (ACFC); and Art Center Student Government (ACSG). We propose a fourth, a Staff Council. Their purpose is to advocate directly for all members of the community.

**CHAIRS’ COUNCIL** — The Chairs Council was formed just after both the CAO resigned and the President moved on in the summer of 2008 and before an interim president was appointed in the Spring of 2009. The intent was to stabilize the leadership of the college. It persists. It is composed of the department chairs for both the undergraduate and graduate departments. It reports to the Provost. We recommend that the Chairs Council have its own charter with explicit duties and responsibilities. (see below, local governance). Presently, A member from the Chair’s Council sits on every committee with the community and it’s constituent trustee sits on the education and facilities committees of the board.

**ACFC** — The faculty council started as an advisory committee to the president in 1993 and in 1998, under the first “provost” (Sr. V.P., Education), bylaws were drafted and approved. In 2005, the bylaws were revised and in 2007, reporting directly to the CAO, the council was recognized as an independent representative body of the faculty. At that time, there were discussions to expand the role of the council to include community and faculty development. An Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) was established with a director who rotated off the council for a one year term. After two terms, the council proposed a Faculty Center and a faculty developer instead of the OFA, thinking it would be a greater force in prioritizing and assuring excellence in teaching and learning.

Faculty council representatives now sit on every committee of the college. This year, an ACFC Constituent Trustee was appointed by the BOT and sits on the education and finance committees. The role of the ACFC is advisory and presently works with the president. In process, the relationship is closer to the provost. We recommend that the ACFC continues and that it may have a more expanded role in community and faculty development be reconsidered. As such, in shared governance, it would be a value-added support for teaching and learning. Of course, this would increase its operating budget since adjunct faculty are compensated. Full-time faculty serve as part of their contractual service obligation.

Following is a sketch from the 2008 proposal to illustrate the relationship of proposed sub-
Over the past 17 years nearly every full-time faculty member has served on the council and as helped bring this form of shared governance to the college. Given an empathetic sigh, shunned by their own, regarded with suspicion by others, distanced by those who fear for their own job security, relegated to the far corner of the basement, and disappeared from either the academic or administrative organizational charts, the faculty council persists. Its unique feature as the advocate for faculty concerns has been its strength and a strong motivating force for change. The governance and community group looked at many organizational charts and read extensively on faculty senates. The question arose: senate or council? We are leaning toward keeping the council. Miller and other list a number of reasons that favor a council over a senate:

**COUNCIL**
- every division is represented on the council;
- increased effectiveness and leadership of the chair(s);
- engagement of the board and access to the academic community;
- stronger faculty voice
- eliminates voting-group system

**SENATE**
- many issues presented to only one group
- members sit through topics that may not be relevant to them – feels like wasted time
- faculty voice is disseminated, weaker
- priorities difficult to negotiate in large, diverse groups
- loss of individual flexibility, conformity
- assembling a group or finding consensus that will affect change can take many terms, even years

**ACSG** — The student government is a co-curricular program in which, by participating, students develop leadership skills, learn to negotiate and collaborate, and participate in shared governance.
Its bylaws are well developed and its traditions ardently supported by the Dean of Students. We believe that as a co-curricular program, participation in the student government — and, for that matter, any service to the community — should be documented on a student’s transcript and may even qualify for units earned. These value-added experiences are recognized by educators today as integral parts of a holistic approach to teaching, and some/any/lots of program development that blends together the CSE and the academic programs is needed, once again, easing the superficial divisive line between administration and education.

At Art Center, the student work load is very heavy. Participation and persistence is delicate. Student leadership development, community service and other co-curricular programs, from interest groups to entrepreneurial efforts, can be supported and modeled by faculty and staff to demonstrate the value of these educational opportunities in broadening students’ perspectives.

STAFF COUNCIL — Staff councils are not unheard of. The number of staff members who volunteered many hours on the governance committee was enlightening to faculty members. People who normally are invisible to each other were discussing common issues. For this reason, we recommend purposing a staff council.

Locally, Pitzer College has a staff council. It addresses employment and benefit concerns, provides a formal line of communications to all staff departments and groups, participates as a voting member on that campus’ College Council; and is represented on the academic planning, campus aesthetics, budget implementation, campus life, and diversity committees. (The aesthetic committee encourages art on campus and, besides staff, has four student representatives.)

Art Center has a remarkable team of patient and diligent people everywhere. Technicians in the “shops” pull students through deadlines and projects. Ty Powe and his team keep everything trim. IT is the glue to operations, efficiencies and endless issues of compatibility and never says no to helping others. Chris Mattia patiently walks faculty through acquiring the skills to use technology in the classroom. He and Carlos are collaborating with the community on InsideAC 2.0. The people in advancement and development tell our story and “ask.” Events happen. Finance. Enrollment Services. Financial Aid. Counselors. Food Services. Janitorial Services. We rely on them day to day.

LOCAL GOVERNANCE: The third hub that the governance and community committee identifies for shared governance, and probably the most important, is the local, that which is within each department where the fundamental collaborations on educational matters and assessments occur. This is where course offerings emerge and where programs meet their obligations to the students. [And, this is where the accreditation agencies (or mandated state and federal standards, if it comes to that) will rout about fervently.]

If we apply the principles of clearly defined processes, similar to those for the budget request process above, to the operations of the heart of teaching and learning, then tasks and responsibilities can be articulated for each constituency.
First, purpose and charter the Chairs Council.

Second, train faculty and chairs in learner-centered practices and assessment strategies.

Third, foster a habit of mind prioritizes continual improvement in teaching and learning.

Here is a thought experiment: if each program had an ongoing “strengths-weakness-opportunities-threats” analysis in which everyone participated honestly and openly, would there be a difference?

Shared governance at the local level includes collaboration, defining aligned course descriptions, peer support, reviews, research, drafting proposals and crafting actions plans. Faculty members actively take part in making decisions within their departments by helping with planning and assuring excellence through assessments not only in their classroom management but also in keeping relevant and improving the program. The department chair leads by advancing proposals and responding to needs.

This local model brings the department chair closer to the faculty. It unifies. It enhances morale. It empowers both faculty members and the program. The processes for proposing and developing programs and courses are clear and open. Staying relevant remains local and immediate. The negotiations about priorities and resource allocations is supported by evidence-based data provided by those who are nearest to learning environments. The chairs have more opportunity to manage their own programs with changes evolving from the grass roots.

**YOU:** There is only one question: *Does Art Center College of Design offer aspiring designers and artists the best possible education to achieve mastery in their practice?*

Is every resource we have directed toward that objective? Do we respect the limited time we have to give the best we have to offer? Are we the best teachers? What is it going to take to achieve a level of education that assures ALL of our students a productive, satisfying career and life? Are the students getting the best value for their $17,000+ per term?

Last summer, Dr. Ellsworth jolted the representatives on the faculty council:
“You have the power. Get over it!”

- Sharing the work, sharing the responsibility, is the only way.
- Let’s get to work!

**II. Academic Community**

Structurally, an academic community is a set of disciplines or domains of knowledge. A university has programs for every domain. It has a broad universe of offerings. Art Center is a professional school whose mission has a narrower focus: the education of designers and artists. Our program offerings compared to a university are nuanced and have great depth of the sort you cannot find elsewhere. Art Center’s domains are rarefied and rigorous and closely aligned to practices in industry and the arts.

Borden states:

“The purpose of an academic community is to create, share and apply knowledge.” She goes on to say that it’s primary activity is “learning.” It is committed to “intellectual inquiry, investigation, discovery, an open exchange of ideas, and ethical behavior.”

Structurally, how does Art Center support learning, it’s academic community, in terms of governance?

- **First, by clearly defining its expectations.** If we look at the employee handbook, does it attend to the college’s expectations of its educators. Beyond its mandated conditions of employment and compliance to state and federal regulations, does it include policies that are specific to the academic community—to learning? Does it defend its right to inquiry, to learning? Does it have an obligation to be ethical? And, what does that mean? Does it protect itself from conflicts of interest? Does it cultivate its teaching assets? Does it attend to matters of retention, best practices, and depth in its knowledge assets? Put together an ad hoc task force to make an effective document. It is long overdue.

Art Center does not yet have a policy protecting the academic freedom of its faculty members. Academic freedom does not give them the right to say or do anything. The are bound to the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. It gives them, their students, and the institution, for that matter, the right—and the attendant responsibility—to inquire freely, to provide an education that prepares its graduates to be citizens who define culture. What kind of world can we design?...can we create?...do we bring into form? Art Center has an incredibly resilient, adaptive and strong community. It’s not imaginable that it thinks it should allow constraints on its world view or the pursuit of truth.

Last year, Art Center adopted grievance procedures, which, incidentally, are up for review and continuance in January 2011. How can academic freedom be defended without recourse to conflict resolution? An academic community, with all its different domains of knowledge, inherently
looks at things from different perspectives. A business view is different from an artist's view. Collegiality is respecting those differences and mediating them. There are not the “wrists” and the (?) “heads.” Ten years ago the Grad ID program steeped its students in the paradigm-shifting reports from then current research in neuroscience, in cultivating each individual’s way of making, in constructing minds, in creating artifacts and cultures, and the symbiotic interaction between body and object. The mind is the body. A college of design and art attends to the performative and visual intelligences, *techne*, that characterizes the nature of its students and there is not lobotomy-like cleavage between *techne* and *psyche*, the ancient Greek ideas that has defined western cultural perspectives for millennia. It’s the one.

How does the college itself cultivate its own deep thinking if its procedural processes allow institutional amnesia. What defines depth when you think of its teachers—which includes those who support teaching on every level—as assets. Are retention and development values? How do you measure excellence if there are no standards to measure against or exceed or transgress? Define the specific terms of employment such as “at will” and contractual matters; course loads; course requirements; credit units; types of classes; details about full-time and part-time status; inherent obligations of service to the college; retention; advancement, and opportunities for development.

In addition, since Art Center relies heavily on adjunct “working professionals,” and since every educational endeavour is subject to re-forming, the college needs to support creating and managing situated experiences, active learning and a culture of assessment. Build. Move forward. Write the manifesto.

- **Second, attending to engaging faculty in governance.** Some faculty members have little interest in becoming involved in operations. We rely on many of them to be “out there,” to be doing what we profess and to bring rigor to the academic discourse of Art Center’s community. There are 85 full-time faculty members, and more if you add in the program chairs who are classified at Art Center as staff; and even more if you add in all those who offer value-added co-curricular programs (Designmatters, CSE, entrepreneurial programs, etc.) and other events and activities. This cadre of regular employees are the ‘capacity’ needed to carry out the ongoing work of college.

Full time faculty have a contractual commitment of 42 service hours per term (85 x 42 = 3570 hours/term). Just how are those hours are used is not documented on anyone’s employee file even though they are a consideration for advancement, performance reviews and titles. How does the institution manage that resource? What is its actual value?

Many faculty are tasked within their departments as advisors or conduct portfolio and program reviews. Some are delegated as directors. Some serve on committees, task forces, and the faculty council. What qualifications should be expected for particular types of service? Should advisors and mentors complete training, and if they do, how do they get it? Part-time faculty are not contractually obligated for service hours but prep time, attending department meetings, participating in portfolio reviews, college events, etc. seem an inherent part of their job. Sometimes
they may be pressured to “serve” as a condition for getting the teaching assignment? Some part-time faculty are compensated for duties. Is there a correlation between credits and hours? Many adjunct faculty members have taught specialized courses for years, courses that add great value to the college’s curricula. Perhaps there should be a new status, regular part-time, that has contractual obligations and adjusted compensation rates to reflect service hours and entitlement to a benefit package.

Third: communications. Since its inception, InsideAC has made a significant step toward pooling resources, managing calendars, streamlining operations, records keeping, and communications. Much work and collaboration has gone into InsideAC 2.0 that launches in the Fall.

The college web presence supports admissions and is its public face. This interface is undergoing refinements to function better. Moodle, a classroom management tool, is being deployed with nearly 30% of faculty using it. The institution makes a large commitment to these digital resources. Their impact of their usefulness is known immediately.

Fourth, faculty voice in governance. Legally, no committee can be held responsible for the decisions they make, so the strength of faculty voice is to make recommendation based on their mastery, on good research, on data-driven evidence and reflection. It behooves those who provide institutional support to make decisions and take actions on those recommendations if they are sound and they align to the college’s mission. Institutional research facilitates that process. But consensus is formed on the community level, especially where faculty interface with students.

Fifth, one organizational chart for all. The tension between educational and operational administrators is self-defeating. “Get over it.” The ACFC does not appear on any existing chart of governance. Good, it’s the independent representative body of the faculty. Hooray for independence; yikes, it doesn’t register. In the past six years, representatives from the council have come to sit on every committee. The should-have-been expected product of this diaspora has enhanced its advisory capacity. It has become a hub of shared experience. Last Fall, for the first time, both the faculty council and the chairs council met to discuss summer enrollment, its budgetary impact and suggestions for summer programming. There a many intersections where all advocacy groups can work together.

COMMUNITY

Other views of community complement the architecture of the academic community. Opportunities for integrated learning experiences crossover between disciplines should align with the mission of the college and be strategically planned to augment the direction of the college. Embedding broader knowledge-based deep thinking skills improves abilities to solve problems and act in accordance with assessment and reflection. How do our professional and educational practices impact the competencies we expect students to have when they graduate, especially in a world with rapidly changing technologies that not only disseminate information but also generate it as well. How can the democratization of information be an opportunity rather than a threat. These
are curricular concerns. Structurally, how does the college accommodate that change? Being nimble and flexible requires a completely engaged faculty and staff. The discourse between both education and administration, and the various educational constituencies must be as one. That the governance and community research group ended up with an equal number of self-appointed staff and faculty revealed the need to include many voices in the decision-making process. Adoption of a particular software application could have serious integration problems with the college’s data system. Planning programs and events puts real time and hard line demands on facilities and the staff’s ability to accommodate them. Development efforts can only be enhanced by working closely with education.

The obvious sense of community is providing opportunities for people to come together. Moving the graduation to Saturday afternoon increased the number of faculty and staff who attended to see their students “walk.” Shows, speakers, interest groups, publishing—all provide views from different perspectives. And, open the doors! The fire safety mandate that all door should remain closed sequestered and divided the learning inside the classroom from community. Before that, everyone could see what was going on inside and anyone could visit. Knowing how classes fit together helped scheduling and advising. Changing to the two-class per day schedule erased the lunch hours when both the student and faculty dining rooms were packed and abuzz. Students ended up with schedules concentrated in a few days instead across the week. Art Center at Night had started after four and was out by ten. The apparent efficiencies and multiplicity of some things changes others. Is that what we want?

Taking on more and more sponsored projects and calving off dedicated spaces for graduate programs greatly reduced the commons. The use of space relative to the value-of-benefits-derived can only reflect the efficient and proper use of resources.

Another sense of community centers on morale and its impact on the ability of the college to

Suskie writes:

- “Attitudinal goals include appreciation, integrity, character, enjoying and valuing learning, and becoming more aware of one’s values, attitudes, and opinions and their evolution.”

**III. Efficient, well-defined and sustainable structures and processes—affecting change**

When the governance and community group began to meet, everyone had expectations, some were adamant about certain views and notions and remain so, others looked and questioned.

We didn’t end where we thought we would when we started. First, the scope is overwhelming. Second, appearances do not reveal the way things are especially in a human-centered enterprise like learning. Three, exploring scenarios and modeling structures of governance and community requires expert knowledge and the learning curve was a dart straight up for the group. In our discussions, a reference was made to a digital expert system that generates outcomes for various models and maybe this would be helpful.

That the president plans to carry forth this discourse in a re-configured governance and community group is a relief to what we have started and all that we wanted to document. Change will manifest itself as an evolving one, made with care and deliberation and regard for the community. Everyone thinks that change rests on assessment. But, how do people change to a different way of doing things?

What incentives are there for change?

The United Nations UNDP has a governance assessment portal website (www.gaportal.org) that offers frameworks for policy making: stages; multiple-streams; institutional incentives; major policy change; and advocacy coalition.

- The first approach, stages, is straightforward: identify the issues and set the agenda, formulate a policy, get approval, implement and evaluate. But, they say, things are often jumbled and it may be better to consider things across the arch of governance, through cycles, or as opportunities arise rather than expecting to be so systematic. And, the stages approach does not address causes: the people involved, the interests, the institutions or the incentives behind issues.

- The multiple-streams approach views policy as three streams involving both people and processes: PROBLEM—the evidence of the problem and the way people define it; POLICY—the recommendations and the people offering solutions; POLITICS—elections and those who are the decision-makers. Here, they advise linking definitions with known issues and possible solutions, making everyone aware of the depth and magnitude of the problem, and taking in to account the general mood in regard to issues and potential solutions. There may be something useful here for Art Center because its community is divided ideologically and operationally and its general mood, though hopeful, is skeptical given past experiences. And there may be something cautionary in that the visioning task forces were self-selecting and therefore may not reflect the community.

- The incentives frame starts with individuals’ self-interests. What seems right for one person may not be viewed the same as the group. What seems like the best thing to do has attentive factors—short term relief or long term benefits to the whole; costs and feasibility (who bears the responsibility?); and building momentum toward objectives. We all say our interests center on the students, but somehow, we don’t act accordingly.

- The major change frame can happen with disruption, circumstance, political receptivity,
economic pressures or change in leadership. Well, Art Center certainly fits this! They advise: “For governance assessments it is important to seize these windows of opportunity.”

- The advocacy coalition frame puts groups of people from different institutions together who have similar experiences or concerns. The groups learn from each other. They are likely to bring out contesting viewpoints that can be analyzed and interpreted. This approach is more successful if the issues can be approached objectively, without infringing on core values of one group or another. Start where people can agree, they say, and stay focused on the long-term objectives.

Suskie looks at a culture of assessment and offers some advice:

- “Change is rarely rapid,” she says, “and there are invariably pockets of stubborn resistance.” Some may never change. You may start with those who are skeptical yet curious. The second piece of advice is to value assessment efforts in tangible ways:
  1. Use the results to inform decisions on important goals. Show that the effort was worth it and that evidence-based planning works, that is has the desired goal of improving things.
  2. Support the process with appropriate resources and infrastructure. Respect people’s time and have on hand what is needed to make the effort successful. If you need expert advice, have someone on hand to facilitate. Teach people why assessment is important to them.
  3. Celebrate what assessment accomplishes and recognize the efforts it took to make it successful. Consider incentives to become engaged in the work: ‘what is in it for me?’

As our group looked around the table at each other—frustration: so little time, so much to do, and how do we deal with the magnitude of what we care so much about. And the realization set in that many of us who want this to happen, don’t have the time. What are the implications of time?

At Art Center under the current system without any faculty representation on academic policy beyond an advisory level, major changes can be made very fast. However, to quote:

... any process that makes it possible to make good decisions more quickly also makes it possible to make bad decisions more quickly.”

“Faculty involvement in shared governance may slow down the decision making process, but it also assures more thorough discussion and provides the institution with a sense of order and stability. (Restructuring Shared Governance in Higher Education, p. 7, 43).

Another reports, that all of the research emphasizes that governance reflects strategy, that

- “structure follows strategy” (A Challenge to the Governance of Higher Education p. 69). And strategy is determined by the ideals and mission of a college—which in a vocational school are closely related to the external professional market—the opportunities for our graduates.

- “Institutions must be responsive to their environments to survive, and the responses
Art Center’s governance structure has evolved over time, eighty years, to be precise. It has its efficiencies and strengths. We do not see that it is in the interests of the college to apply a traditional academic structure over what enviably works. What doesn’t work is not in the structure, but in the college’s contentious factions caused by its undefined processes that inadvertently set all factions of the community against each other. Now, the entrepreneurial among us might respond: “and...?”

Here are more notes.

Miller, in *Improving Faculty Governance*, suggests that:

(a) respect and authority given to the governance process starts with the President;
(b) subsequent offices and administrators will follow the President to respect the faculty, student, and staff roles in governance;
(c) units of governance are seen as positive bodies that are high performing, valuable asset in charting the course of the institution; and,
(d) develop a cooperative attitude in which policy is not based on concession, but rather, compromise.

In 2003, the AAUP Conference provided the following statistical definitions of shared governance:

47% say faculty and administration make decisions jointly and consensus is the goal;
27% admit that it is only information sharing and that authority remains with senior administrators and the board; and
26% say that decision are made by discrete groups responsible for specific issues (faculty, administration, board).

And, lastly, King’s College and Drake University indicate that department heads and committee chairs attend appropriate Board meetings (voting and non-voting). There the Faculty Council Chair is a voting member for the BOT Academic Affairs Committee because faculty have the greatest interaction with students and experience the impact of policy decisions more than any other group in the college.

We return to improving. The governance committee recommends that whatever we might add or change be thought about for its impact or implications in all directions:

- Where are the decision-making centers? —on standing committees? —with strong leaders whom we have chosen from outside for their expertise? — top-down?
- Who sits on committees? Do we have enough people with enough time to sustain them longer than the first two years after the original expectations wane and it comes time for rotations?

An activity report from the “faculty advisory committee” in 1993 lists activities undertaken:
salary study and summary, salary chart/grid, contracts, titles and reference grid, new faculty “buddy” program, faculty/employee handbook, and a position letter on [faculty] priorities. Things have changed but clearly, some remain the same. (Note: Enrollment for 1993: 3611; students on scholarship: 311, up from about 75 in 1985. Total revenues: $30.1 million.) In 1999, the bylaws of the “Faculty Council” were written, the “grid” was put in place along with criteria for initial placement. There were a number of committees on which faculty could serve: a curriculum/education committee, a budget committee, and an intellectual property committee. None of them survived.

But, without structural representation at either the departmental or institutional level the faculty has only advisory input.

- “It is particularly difficult to obtain participation when past participation has not been successful… Faculty apathy turns out to be rational!” (How Colleges Work, p149)

**IV. Assessment**

The governance and community group recognizes that any functional structure of governance is only as good as its intent to operate efficiently and ethically, and, that it aims to continually improve.

**A little background:** Learner-centered education has its origins in a constructivist approach to knowledge acquisition (epistemology) — we actively construct our own mind out of experiences. We learn and find meaning naturally. As children we do this through play. In this view, the learner is responsible for their own learning. This approach inverts the traditional ideas that knowledge is transferred from one person to another—the teacher (expert) teaches the student. In learner-centered teaching, the teacher provides an opportunity for students to learn and guides them through discovery. The teacher facilitates learning. Providing learning environments that reflect real life experiences is better (situated experiences).

In 1978, Vygotsky advanced the earlier work by Piaget and others. He said that learning happens in a social context (social constructivism). People share their individual perspectives (collaborative elaboration). Meaning, then, is constructed through interaction with others (culturally derived) or with the world they live in (environment).

Duffy and Jonassen (1992) add collaboration to the model. People of different skills and backgrounds who collaborate on tasks and discussions arrive at a shared understanding of the truth in a specific field (socially negotiated). Others add learning-through-teaching; and applying learning through authentic practices (apprenticeships).

Pedagogies (teaching methods) have shifted. A constructivist approach to curriculum design developed by Biggs and Tang, 2007, embeds the intended outcomes into the teaching methods
Teaching and learning are continually assessed in a four-step cycle to determine the effectiveness—or, value—of what a student is learning. The process begins by setting criteria. Within a class, the teacher defines the expected learning outcomes for each project on the syllabus. All the projects align with a college's course description, which is one of the set of courses required for students to complete their education within a program of study. Each program also must align with the mission of the college. Programs are assessed every three to five years to be sure they continue do so and do not drift from the institutional learning objects. If the college's mission is adjusted, so too must all the programs and all their courses, on down to the sum of projects within each class. In this way, the college provides the most relevant, efficient and thorough educational experiences for the students and assures the value of their degrees. A culture of assessment is a commitment to ongoing self-evaluation and reflection for the purpose of continually refining and improving teaching and learning.

**Assessment:** A process of gathering information or data or evidence of learning. The process begins with the articulation of learning outcomes in order to determine what kind of evidence to gather. (Driscoll)

**Alignment:** A process of connecting significant elements of a program or course—originating from mission and goals; translated into learning outcomes, pedagogy, and curriculum; and ensured through assessment—with the ultimate intent of maximizing learning. (Driscoll, 2007)

The depth and extent of the practice of assessment at Art Center is a concern to WASC, our accrediting agency that assures the quality of the college's education product. A WASC review is a peer review. Fellow administrators and teachers from other institutions make the assessment, looking carefully at the standards that the accrediting agency has set. Art Center has an advantage compared to a liberal arts college. Almost everything that we do as designers and artists is active...
learning. We make things. We simulate studio practices. We have internships and interdisciplinary classes. If anything, we have the opposite problem of the traditional lecture class, we are trying to embed the liberal arts and sciences into the studio practices. The issues behind WASC’s concerns are those in assessment that they call “closing the loop.” Art Center has manifest evidence of the quality of the student’s education in terms of portfolios and projects, but it does not quantify that data, gather it together, and use it to refine and change and improve. The college has been adopting learner-centered pedagogies and assessment practices but some programs have better assessments than others. Many faculty understand the value of learner-centered education but feel that the aims of assessment are subjective and punitive.

So, how does Art Center meet the standards for accreditation?

1. Leaders must value and model a culture, a habit of mind, of continually improving
2. Institutional research gathers together all the evidence, analyzes and interprets that evidence, and uses it to make data-driven decisions as a matter of best practice
3. Orientation of new faculty (and experienced faculty) to learner-centered teaching
4. Articulating the college’s expectations of educational excellence and manage that expectation
5. Identify or create a variety of instruments, not only summative, but formative, to measure the performance of every aspect of teaching and learning and administrative support services from multiple perspectives
6. Identify and provide opportunities for improving
7. Assure that the community appreciates the intent and value of assessment.
8. Get professional support, if needed, to help the community adopt and use assessment strategies at all levels.

V. Diversity

Diversity has long been a central component in any discussion of academic policy or planning and there is now little, if any question, as to the crucial role it plays in preparing students for their future roles in society. And yet, even within the context of this acceptance, the concept of diversity is quite slippery to define much less creating and promoting organizational structures to ensure its positive influences.

Traditionally, diversity has been equated with the recruitment of a more diverse student body to campus coupled with a curricular expansion of multicultural offerings. Academic institutions now recognize that diversity involves much more specialized and complex issues than simply adding topical classes or luring minorities to school. We suggest, due to the uniqueness of Art Center, that
diversity should be carefully examined and addressed as a primary design parameter to help us evaluate:

- What we need to teach
- How we need to teach and interact
- How we need to planning for the future of the institution

It is essential that Art Center clearly define what diversity means for the institution and specifically, which aspects of these differences need be recognized and addressed.

What does diversity mean for Art Center?

Not only does diversity encompass the recognition of different cultural backgrounds and experiences it can also be defined as:

- The recognition of contrasting points of view or approaches existing within a specific discipline or department (this understanding brings with it the responsibility of how to most effectively coordinate these differences given limited and competing resources).
- The recognition and respect for the different manifestations of intelligence (visual intelligence, analytical intelligence, verbal intelligence, etc.) and how best to nurture these within the context of our curriculum.

How will Art Center respond to an ever more diverse society, globalized world, and globalized professional marketplace? Our future mandate will be to effectively address the differences between professional diversity both inside and outside the United States.

Our ongoing responsibility is to prepare students for their future role in society including skills to address societal problems, such as: poverty, intolerance, sexism, adaptation to technological change, and competition for dwindling resources.

If we approach diversity first with the recognition of inherent diversity that already exists at our institution, how most effectively might we capitalize on what we already have? What would be our “diversity profile” at Art Center? How have we benefited from this in the past? Where have we failed? These are important questions that must be investigated thoroughly before we develop a strategy to move forward.

The benefits of diversity are:

- A broader range of student exposure and an enriched educational experience
- Preparation for a dynamic interconnected world with the ability to interact constructively within various cultures and contexts
- Increased challenges for students within a dynamic environment that promotes problem-solving ability and effective adaptation to change
- Increased demands and challenges to faculty and administration to provide an enriching educational experience for our students

Recommendations
1. Clearly define and investigate diversity as it pertains to Art Center specifically.

2. Establish a workable Mission statement and Departmental Learning Objectives with respect to diversity in order to clarify the direction of Art Center’s vast efforts in this area and monitor our progress and relevance. Our effectiveness should be monitored though formalized oversight and assessment procedures (at all levels) to ensure these goals are addressed uniformly.

3. Establish a culture of trust, respect and fairness... It is essential to any model of shared governance that multiple/divergent points of view are recognized and freely considered. Decision making and problem solving has traditionally been top down at Art Center and does not promote this culture of trust. How well an institution can allow for and assimilate a minority point of view is a measure of its success.

4. Promote a sense of community between all factions of Art Center, which embraces our diversity and coordinates our efforts to the benefit of the school as a total. This would include developing the means and desire for broader faculty and staff involvement within all aspects of the institution. The various talents and experience of our faculty and staff should be viewed as a unique resource with respect to diversity.

5. Review all educational departments and readdress how school resources are shared to ensure fairness and transparency. Every enrolled student at Art Center is entitled to the same quality of education.

6. If we are serious about issues of diversity Art Center will need to devote more of its resources and energies to formally address this area. This should include looking inside and outside our institution for more help and greater expertise.
WORKING DEFINITIONS

Governance
[derives from the Greek verb [kubernáo] which means to steer]
The persons (or committees or departments) who make up a body for the purpose of administering something (Webster)
Participants in decision-making processes. (Gappa)
The activity of governing…the kinetic exercise of management power and policy…decisions that define expectations, grant power or verify performance…consists either of a separate process or of a specific part of management or leadership processes…consistent management, cohesive policies, processes and decision-rights for a given area of responsibility (Wikipedia)
“The exercise of political authority and the use of institutional resources to manage society’s problems and affairs.” (World Bank)
The governing authority
— adopts policies that are consistent with the school purpose and support the achievement of the expected school-wide learning results for the school,
— delegates implementation of these policies to the professional staff and
— monitors results.
The governing board
— has policies and bylaws that are aligned with the school’s purpose and support the achievement of the expected school-wide learning results and academic standards based on data-driven instructional decisions for the school;
— delegates implementation of these policies to the professional staff; and
— monitors results regularly

Shared Governance
Shared governance is…complex; it is a delicate balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and decision-making processes, on the one hand, and administrative accountability on the other.
“…the legal right and obligation to exercise authority over an institution is vested in and flows from its board…[that] formally delegates authority…to the president, who, in turn, may delegate authority over certain parts of university management to other university officials…
…‘shared’ governance has come to connote two complementary and some-
times overlapping concepts:
— giving various groups of people a share in key decision-making processes, often through elected representation; and
— allowing certain groups to exercise primary responsibility for specific areas of decision making.

...faculty members traditionally exercise primary responsibility over the curriculum. Because professors are the experts in their disciplines, they...determine degree requirements and all the intricacies of a complex university curriculum. That is fitting and proper.

But even in the second sense of shared governance...a committee vote is not final...in most universities, even curricular changes must be approved by an accountable officer...in still other[s], the final authority rests with the board....

Chronicle of Higher Education, July 23, 2009)

WASC Standard 4.1: The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies in institutional reflection and planning processes that assess its strategic position; articulate priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions and resources; and define the future direction of the institution. The institution monitors the effectiveness of the implementation of its plans and revises them as appropriate.

- Educators and managers of the college working together to make informed decisions.
- Reciprocal relationship between the institution and its faculty
- Joint or shared responsibility in the decision-making
- Identify and prioritize workplace and contributions
- Develop plans
- Take responsibility for making changes (WASC)

Faculty are responsible for establishing goals for student learning, for designing and implementing programs of general education and specialized study that intentionally cultivates the intended learning and for assessing students’ achievement. In these matters, faculty must work collaboratively with their colleagues in their departments, schools and institutions as well as with relevant administrators. (AACU)

**Administrative support**

Administrative support is party to governance:

- represented on strategic governance efforts in an advisory capacity, concerns long range vision and various unknowns—both present and future; and,
- operational governance implements strategic efforts; relatively procedural; supports
departments of widely varying function which must work together; and, adapts to changes in scholarly direction. Typical improvements or issues that require operational governance are: adding/supporting a new program; responding to changing needs; billing not conflicting with academic calendar, student work study programs management, admissions, IT, secure data, security, regulations, building programs, operations, etc.

Governance at the board and academic levels address the direction and character of the school while governance from an administrative support perspective addresses daily operations outside the classroom.

**institution mission**

Describes what is unique about the institution. Expresses the core values of the college or university. Focuses on the clients and stakeholders who are being served. (Academic Leadership, Diamond, 501)

A mission statement tells who it is, the purpose (mission) of the organization, and inspires and motivates all constituents. It is immediately understood, able to be readily repeated, relevant, honest and consistent with values. (ACFC)

The institutional mission is the cornerstone of the strategic foundation and serves to focus the organizational resources and cultural commitment to a single vision, providing a coherent structure, to support the objectives and purpose of the institution. The Mission is set by the senior leadership of the institution and the degree to which that mission is fully integrated and executed throughout the university will drive the success or failure of the organizational purpose. (Point Loma Nazarene University: reflective essay)

Learning outcomes are often organized into a hierarchical system. The highest level is the mission statement, a description of the overall vision or purpose of education within the institution. Associated with the mission are a set of goals, broad statements about the types of learning that are fostered within the program, such as communication or problem-solving skills.

Learning outcomes (objectives) are associated with each of these goals, and they describe, in behavioral terms, how students can demonstrate that each goal has been met. (Assessing General Education Programs, Allen, 35)

**institutional drift**

The second aspect of the institutional fit examination is to consider those anchors in place that protect the institution from drifting away from its core mission…possibly measured by:

- faculty, staff, and student commitment to mission, goals
- support services
- institutional resources committed to the success of these growing programs.
- monitoring for under capitalization of programs that would have a detrimental impact on the long-term reputation of the institution
**community**

A group of people living/working together as a smaller social unit within a larger one, and having interests, work, etc. in common [a college community] (Webster's)

“...opportunities for faculty to identify colleagues in other departments that have similar (teaching) interests.” (PODlistserve)

**academic community**

A set of established disciplines (branches of knowledge or learning) that fulfill the mission of the institution

**school**

A place or institution for teaching or learning; a place for training and in some special field, skill, etc.

**college**

An institute of higher education that grants degrees; a school offering specialized instruction in some profession or occupation; sometimes a division of the university.

**university**

An educational institution of the highest level, typically, in the U.S.A, with one or more undergraduate colleges, together with a program of graduate studies and a number of professional schools, and authorized to confer various degrees, as bachelor's, master's and doctor's. (Webster's)

The purpose of an academic community is to create, share and apply knowledge. The primary activity in an academic community is learning... “intellectual inquiry, investigation, discovery, an open exchange of ideas, and ethical behavior....The hallmarks of this community are intellectual inquiry, investigation, discovery, an open exchange of ideas, and ethical behavior....by [being in this academic community], you are also taking on these commitments.” ( “Learning in an Academic Community,” Borden)

Faculty members are an institutions intellectual and creative capital—an appreciable capital. The competence and commitment of faculty can increase steadily over time to meet the institutions changing circumstances and goals. (“Rethinking Academic Traditions in the 21st Century,” Austin and Gappa, AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom, 2010)

**disciplines**

A set of established disciplines that fulfill the mission of the institution.

For example, at Art Center—graphics, illustration, trans, product, humanities and science, art, etc.; in a university—liberal arts, sciences, business, technology, etc.)

**liberal arts**

Early disciplines were based on the study of the trivium (trivia-the three lower liberal arts), grammar, rhetoric and dialectic/logic; preparatory for higher education, the quadrivium (the four ways/roads), arithmetic (number/quantities), geometry (magnitudes at rest), music (relations between quantities), and astronomy (magnitude inherently moving). These preceded more serious studies in philosophy and theology, or, later, going to the university (community of scholars and learners).
"liberal education"

"Liberal education is an educational philosophy rather than a body of knowledge, specific courses, or type of institution. By drawing on a broad range of knowledge, it asks students to grapple with complicated, important issues, and usually expects them to learn at least one subject in great depth and at an advanced level. Intellectual growth occurs as both broad and deep learning...depends less on particular subject matter than on an approach to teaching and learning.

...to achieve these goals...first, it must define itself as the best and most practical form of learning or a changing world and then strive to meet that standard. Second, it needs to become available to all students, not simply the self-selected (and comparatively privileged)."


scholarship

... integrating teaching, research, and community engagement

(Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship)

WASC Standard 2.8 The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation, as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution's purposes and character.

WASC Standard 2.9 The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service. (WASC Standards)

The definition of scholarship has been broadened to include significant activities that strategically impact student learning. These activities include: classical research (including the creative work of faculty in the literary, visual, and performing arts), integration (of scholarly work across disciplines), applied scholarship or outreach, teaching (which has been broadened to include curriculum development, advising, as well as instructional and classroom research), and service to the institution or to the profession (citizenship).

(Point Loma Nazarene University: reflective essay)

academic freedom

This is the essential characteristic of an institution of higher education. It encompasses the right of faculty to full freedom in research and in the publication of results, freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, and the right of faculty to be free from institutional censorship or discipline when they speak or write as citizens. (AAUP)

"The right of faculty to full freedom in research and in the publication of results, freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, and the right of faculty to be free from institutional censorship or discipline when they speak or write as citizens."

"Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth....in its teaching aspect...the protections of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights." (AAUP)
Academic freedom to explore significant and controversial questions is an essential precondition to fulfill the academy’s mission of educating students and advancing knowledge. Academic responsibility requires professors to submit their knowledge and claims to rigorous and public review by peers who are experts in the subject matter under consideration; to ground their arguments in the best available evidence; and to work together to foster the education of students. (AACU)

A college or university is a marketplace of ideas, and it cannot fulfill its purposes of transmitting, evaluating, and extending knowledge if it requires conformity with any orthodoxy of content and method. In the words of the United States Supreme Court, “Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die.”

(The earliest attribution of academic freedom is traced to the first independent (not monastic or state) university in Bologna, 1080, when it adopted an academic charter, the Constitutio Habita, c. 1155, which guaranteed the right of a traveling scholar to unhindered passage in the interests of education. (Wikipedia))

**academic responsibility**

Academic responsibility requires professors to submit their knowledge and claims to rigorous and public review by peers who are experts in the subject matter under consideration; to ground their arguments in the best available evidence; and to work together to foster the education of students.

…There is, however, an additional dimension of academic freedom that was not well developed in the original principles [AAUP, see above] had to do with responsibilities of faculty members for educational programs.* Faculty are responsible for establishing goals for student learning, for designing and implementing programs of general education and specialized study that intentionally cultivate the intended learning, and for assessing students’ achievement. In these matters, faculty must work collaboratively with their departments, schools, and institutions as well as with relevant administrators. (*“Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility,” AAC&U Board of Directors’ Statement, Jan. 6, 2006)

*Note: In a traditional academic structure, a department chair is one of the faculty members in that department who takes on the operational duties of the department, usually given relief time from one of their teaching obligations…”rotating chairs.”

The department chairs at Art Center are staff, not faculty.

**academic integrity**

…academic integrity involves a commitment to such fundamental values as honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility within all academic endeavors (Curtin)

**honesty**

…honesty is fundamental to creating, sharing and applying knowledge responsibly…have to be able to trust that everyone is trying to be truthful (Borden)
**rigor**

Teachers must also ensure that the program is intellectually rigorous, or academically challenging for each student at his or her individual level. An academic program is rigorous when there is:

- depth and integrity of inquiry—sufficient time be devoted to a topic or unit of study and that students would have an opportunity to explore it in depth, developing questions as they go along.
- sustained focus—assistance and training to persevere on a given subject so that there would be the opportunity to study a topic in depth.
- suspension of premature conclusions—to continue to search
- continuous testing of hypotheses (US Dept. State)

**respect**

... [recognition of] the dignity of each person in our academic community and acknowledging the part that each of us plays in our different role.

Valuing of each faculty member as a human being (core value of which everything else rests) (Gappa)

- Respect comes from meeting high and honorable expectations.
- Society has respect for an academic institution that is seen to uphold high standards of conduct in learning, teaching and research.
- Respect among those in an academic community means interacting with civility and justice. Teaching and learning rely on active engagement and mutual respect - among teachers and learners.
- Respect for others means that we value their worth and their work.
- Respect for oneself comes from active and honest involvement in the academic or learning process.

**collegiality**

...how effectively a faculty member works in his or her department and with others based on clear criteria, standards, and documentation...good departmental or institutional citizens with individuals’ rights... (Academic Leadership, Diamond, 278)

**assessment**

Assessment is an ongoing process designed to monitor and improve student learning. Faculty explicitly define what they want students to learn, verify that the curriculum is design to foster that learning, collect empirical data that indicate the extent of the learning, and use these data to improve the program. (Allen, Assessing General Education Programs).

Any process primarily intended to gather and use information for purposes of improvement or change, without necessarily having the attending goal of making final decision about merit or worth. An external review designed to provide other perspectives to the activity, not to pronounce judgment. (Academic Leadership, Diamond, p497)

- Establishing clear measurable expected outcomes of student learning.
- Ensuring students have sufficient opportunities to achieve those outcomes.
— Systematic gathering analyzing and interpreting evidence to determine how well student learning matches our expectation.

— Using the resulting information to improve student learning

WASC Standard 4.4: The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, using comparative data from external sources, and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.

WASC Standard 4.6: Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the inquiry, evaluation and assessment that is used throughout the institution. The faculty takes responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and uses the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.

WASC Standard 4.7: The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.

**summative evaluation/assessment**

... providing information for making terminal decisions about the merit or worth of individuals, groups, programs, or units; occurs at the completion of a process to determine success or impact. (Diamond, 502)

**formative evaluation/assessment**

... providing information for ongoing revision and improvement; based on evidence of quality, collected during an educational process and used for program improvement. (Diamond, 500)

**direct assessment/evidence**

...tangible, visible, self explanatory, and compelling evidence of exactly what students have and have not learned...the kind of evidence that a skeptic would accept. (ratings of field experience; scores for passing licenses, capstone experiences, work scored using a rubric, portfolios, multiple choice or essay test scores, score gains (value added), observations, summaries of discussion threads, think-alouds, classroom feedback clickers, simulation feedback, reflections on experiences)
Assessing Student Learning, Suskie, 20-21

Both qualitative and quantitative…
("Approaches, Reproaches; Joy of Method," Wright, ppt)

Indirect assessment/evidence
…proxy signs that students are probably learning….less clear and less convincing.

course grades, assignment grades if no rubric, admission rates to grad programs or from 2 to 4-year programs, test scores required for further study, quality and reputation, placement rates, alumni perceptions, student ratings, student evaluations at end of course, satisfaction surveys, voluntary gifts, participation rates, honors and award rates)
(Suskie, 21)

Kirkpatricks’ Four Levels of Learning Experience Outcomes:
1. Reaction – satisfaction with learning experience
2. Learning – what was learned as a result of the learning experience
3. Transfer – using what was learned in other pursuits or situations
4. Results – how what was learned helps achieve goals
(Evaluating Training Programs, Donald and James Kirkpatrick, (Suskie, 22))

Policy content
…promulgated through official written documents…often…with the endorsement or signature of the executive powers within an organization to legitimize the policy and demonstrate that it is considered in force.
…often have standard including:
• purpose statement, why and what its desired effect should be;
• applicability and scope statement, describing who the policy affects and which actions are impacted by the policy;
• effective date when the policy comes into force;
• responsibilities section, indicating which parties and organizations are responsible for carrying out the policy,…may require the establishment of some ongoing function or action,…any relevant oversight and/or governance structures;
• additional sections…indicating reasons, history, and intent that led to the creation of the policy, which may be listed as motivating factors; and,
• definitions for terms and concepts.
(En.wikipedia.org  Policy and action, sec. 6)

Faculty Appointments/Hiring
Types of Contractual arrangement
Tenure / tenure track
Contract renewal
Fixed Term
tenure

Since its founding in 1915, the Association has seen tenure as necessary to protect academic freedom.

Tenure, briefly stated, is an arrangement whereby faculty members, after successful completion of a period of probationary service [six to seven years], can be dismissed only for adequate cause or other possible circumstances and only after a hearing before a faculty committee. (AAUP)

At most smaller colleges, a faculty member’s eligibility for tenure is determined by:

— first by teaching ability,
— second by publication record (academic or creative, depending on what the candidate was hired to teach), and
— third by a combination of departmental service (participation in various faculty committees) and student advising.
— research is often considered as or more important than teaching at some larger universities

(http://jerz.setonhill.edu/resources/FAQ/tenure.htm)

employment “at will”

An at-will employee can be fired at any time, for any reason (except for a few illegal reasons, spelled out below).…[you] have very limited legal rights to fight your termination. In every state but Montana (which protects employees who have completed an initial “probationary period” from being fired without cause), employers are free to adopt at-will employment policies, and many of them have. The law generally presumes that you are employed at will unless you can prove otherwise, usually through written documents relating to your employment or oral statements your employer has made. Theoretically, you don’t have to sign an at-will agreement-- but most courts have held that your employer can fire (or refuse to hire) you for failing to do so. Be wary of signing an at-will agreement if you relied on your employer’s promises of continued employment when you decided to accept the job. Some employers have written policies that require good cause to fire, provide an exclusive list of reasons for which employees can be fired, or otherwise provide employees some job protections. If your employer has adopted these kinds of policies, you are entitled to rely on them.

…You still cannot be fired for reasons that are illegal under state and federal law:

— job discrimination [due to] certain characteristics, such as your race, religion, or gender.
— because you have complained about illegal activity, about discrimination or harassment, or about health and safety violations in the workplace.
— for exercising a variety of legal rights, including the right to take family and medical leave, to take leave to serve in the military, or to take time off work to vote or serve on a jury.
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