

Effects of Growth on Academics

At

Idaho State University

**Faculty Senate
June 2000**

Jennifer Eastman Attebery, Chair
Ayme Allison, Graduate Assistant

Introduction

In fall semester, 1999, the Faculty Senate set as one of its goals, initiating an investigation of the effects of growth on academics at Idaho State University (ISU). To begin this effort Faculty Senate received an additional graduate assistantship for spring semester, 2000. Graduate assistant Ayme Allison completed two phases of the study: (1) compilation of statistical data from Institutional Research and other administrative offices, and (2) interviews with department chairs. Because the recent growth spurt began in earnest in 1989, the Faculty Senate study used 1989 as a basis for comparison. In some cases data were not available from that year, and an interim year was used for comparison with data from the past two academic years.

The information from interviews contained within this report was gleaned from thirty-eight (38) department chairs over the second half of the semester. A four-page survey was used to interview each department chair. The information reflects the perceptions of the department chairs based on their administrative experiences. In the interviews several themes emerged that cut across the colleges. Once these themes were determined, each survey was used to tally the number of departments that experienced the same trends. A content analysis was used to compile and interpret data. That analysis is available within each section of this report in charts and summaries.

To launch the study the Faculty Senate Executive Board and Deans' Council framed a series of questions regarding the impact of growth on faculty workload and pedagogical issues such as class size and classroom methods. In this report the information collected about those issues is organized around several key concerns: faculty workload, class size, pedagogical changes/changes in nature of students, advising, non-tenure-track hiring, tenure-track positions, classroom and other space needs, library resources, and distance learning and outreach.

This study should be regarded as a preliminary one. Gaps exist in our data, and many follow-up questions could be generated based on what has been accumulated here in just one semester's inquiry. In particular, the School of Applied Technology chairs were left out of this semester's work, and it would be of interest to determine whether trends as perceived by the chairs in SAT are similar to those elsewhere in the university. The study also excludes the issue of whether support staff has grown sufficiently. The study also did not seek to determine whether and where ISU departments may have been undersubscribed in 1989, before rapid growth began.

However many gaps may exist, the data do provide us with a sense of where and how growth has had the most dramatic effects on academics at ISU, how the colleges and departments have adjusted to growth, and how each department is positioned to react to the changes in demographics that may occur over the next few years.

Summary of Findings

Between 1989 and 1994 Idaho State University experienced a period of rapid growth averaging 10% per year. After 1994 growth slowed to average slightly less than 1% per year. In spite of this deceleration in the growth rate, many departments are still adjusting to the rapid growth of the early 1990s. The positive effects of growth are balanced by a number of concerns about the institution's ability to maintain academic quality.

1. Current record-keeping regarding our faculty and their work is insufficient to answer important questions about academics. Our data about faculty and faculty life at ISU are limited. Reports generated annually for state and federal reporting requirements do not always answer questions of interest from a professional and/or academic point of view. For example, records are ordinarily kept for full-time versus part-time faculty, but the former category includes both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, making it difficult to calculate differences in growth in those two categories. Ratios of students to faculty are skewed by using faculty FTEs rather than tenure-track FTEs. Similarly, records of class size are usually reported using average enrollment, but those figures are skewed by small classes and by the use of the 70s and 80s section numbers for place-holders and distance learning segments of other sections. Using median class size would be more meaningful. Separating general education from majors courses would also provide better information about class size.

2. The number of tenure-track positions has not kept up with growth in the student body. To compensate for this trend, departments have tended to use two strategies:
 - (1) Some departments have increased their reliance on non-tenure-track faculty, especially to absorb increases in general education teaching load. This strategy has allowed those departments to keep class size down, but it has the negative effect of increasing the advising and graduate teaching loads in departments where the number of majors is growing. It also concentrates service load among those faculty who are tenure-track.
 - (2) Some departments have increased class size. This strategy has the negative effect of increasing teaching load and affecting teaching practices. In departments where the number of majors is growing, the advising load also increases.

3. Library funding has not kept up with growth in the student body. Per capita spending has increased only modestly. When adjusted for inflation, per capita library spending has dropped by nearly one-half.

4. Growth has had disparate effects on academic quality across campus. When we combine several key indicators related to academic quality (increased student/faculty ratios, increased major/tenure-track faculty ratios, increased faculty workload, and increased class sizes), pressure from growth is most apparent in particular areas:
 - Arts and Sciences: especially in Biological Sciences and the Social Science departments
 - Kasiska College of Health Professions

5. Space needs are universal. Growth has created a need for classroom, office, and other space even in academic units otherwise feeling little effect from growth.

Overview of Growth at ISU

Between fall semester 1989 and fall semester 1998 the student population at Idaho State University grew by 4,232 and the faculty population grew by 155, excluding the vocational/technical students and faculty. During that period, growth was concentrated during 1989-1994, averaging 10% per year. After 1994 growth slowed to average 1% per year. The university's growth has outstripped that of the immediate area in which it is located: during 1990-98 Bannock County population grew by 13% and Pocatello grew by 15%, while ISU's growth in student body during that same period was 34%.

The year of greatest increase in student population was between 1989 and 1990. The smallest growth year was between 1996 and 1997, when enrollment dipped. The highest growth year for faculty was also between 1989 and 1990.

Since 1989 the student population in all categories has grown by 53%, whereas the faculty population has grown by 34%. The full-time student population has grown by 73%, whereas the full-time faculty population has grown by 41%. These figures for faculty include both tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty.

Growth by College

While all colleges have experienced some growth, the colleges that have added the most students over the past ten years are Arts and Sciences and Health Professions. In the category of undergraduate FTEs, Arts and Sciences grew by 130% while Health Professions grew by 117%. In graduate FTEs, Health Professions grew by 193%. In new freshmen FTEs Arts and Sciences grew by 165% and Health Professions grew by 200%.

Student and Faculty Headcounts

(See pages 6-10 for a breakdown by category; see page 16 for student/faculty ratios.)

YEAR (FALL)	10TH DAY STUDENT HEADCOUNT	FACULTY HEADCOUNT
1989	8,025	458
1990	9,139	504
1991	10,048	540
1992	10,755	570
1993	10,779	604
1994	11,877	603
1995	12,041	633
1996	12,155	657
1997	11,886	624*
1998	12,257	613*

*decreases represent, in part, a shift from part- to full-time status in non-tenure-track faculty hirings

Student and Faculty Headcounts by Category

Source: Figures from Institutional Research

1989

Student Headcount

Full Time Undergraduate	3,824
Part Time Undergraduate	1,924
Total Undergraduate	5,748
Full Time Graduate	369
Part Time Graduate	829
Total Graduate	1,198
Total Undergraduate & Graduate	7,107
Total Full Time Students	4,193

Faculty Headcount

Professor	97
Associate Professor	86
Assistant Professor	93
Instructor (Academic)	12
Instructor (SAT)	80
Total	368
Full Time Faculty	378
Part Time Faculty	80
Total	458

1990

Student Headcount

Full Time Undergraduate	4,120
Part Time Undergraduate	1,904
Total Undergraduate	6,418
Full Time Graduate	435
Part Time Graduate	1,032
Total Graduate	1,467
Total Undergraduate & Graduate	8,079
Total Full Time Students	4,555

Faculty Headcount

Professor	103
Associate Professor	87
Assistant Professor	100
Instructor (Academic)	18
Instructor (SAT)	82
Total	390
Full Time Faculty	402
Part Time Faculty	102
Total	504

1991

Student Headcount

Full Time Undergraduate	5,091
Part Time Undergraduate	2,033
Total Undergraduate	7,124
Full Time Graduate	479
Part Time Graduate	1,134
Total Graduate	1,613
Total Undergraduate & Graduate	8,971
Total Full Time Students	5,570

Faculty Headcount

Professor	114
Associate Professor	83
Assistant Professor	114
Instructor (Academic)	28
Instructor (SAT)	82
Total	421
Full Time Faculty	439
Part Time Faculty	101
Total	540

1992

Student Headcount

Full Time Undergraduate	5,461
Part Time Undergraduate	2,223
Total Undergraduate	7,684
Full Time Graduate	564
Part Time Graduate	1,164
Total Graduate	1,728
Total Undergraduate & Graduate	9,671
Total Full Time Students	6,025

Faculty Headcount

Professor	119
Associate Professor	95
Assistant Professor	111
Instructor (Academic)	32
Instructor (SAT)	82
Total	439
Full Time Faculty	468
Part Time Faculty	102
Total	570

1993

Student Headcount

Full Time Undergraduate	5,805
Part Time Undergraduate	2,264
Total Undergraduate	8,069
Full Time Graduate	608
Part Time Graduate	1,049
Total Graduate	1,657
Total Undergraduate & Graduate	9,726
Total Full Time Students	6,413

Faculty Headcount

Professor	128
Associate Professor	99
Assistant Professor	113
Instructor (Academic)	39
Instructor (SAT)	81
Total	460
Full Time Faculty	487
Part Time Faculty	117
Total	604

1994

Student Headcount

Full Time Undergraduate	6,238
Part Time Undergraduate	2,343
Total Undergraduate	8,581
Full Time Graduate	663
Part Time Graduate	1,451
Total Graduate	2,114
Total Undergraduate & Graduate	10,695
Total Full Time Students	6,901

Faculty Headcount

Professor	134
Associate Professor	92
Assistant Professor	108
Instructor (Academic)	40
Instructor (SAT)	80
Total	454
Full Time Faculty	489
Part Time Faculty	114
Total	603

1995

Student Headcount

Full Time Undergraduate	6,390
Part Time Undergraduate	2,446
Total Undergraduate	8,836
Full Time Graduate	713
Part Time Graduate	1,261
Total Graduate	1,974
Total Undergraduate & Graduate	10,810
Total Full Time Students	7,103

Faculty Headcount

Professor	133
Associate Professor	96
Assistant Professor	119
Instructor (Academic)	58
Instructor (SAT)	81
Total	487
Full Time Faculty	504
Part Time Faculty	129
Total	633

1996

Student Headcount

Full Time Undergraduate	6,465
Part Time Undergraduate	2,409
Total Undergraduate	8,874
Full Time Graduate	764
Part Time Graduate	1,265
Total Graduate	2,029
Total Undergraduate & Graduate	10,903
Total Full Time Students	7,229

Faculty Headcount

Professor	130
Associate Professor	107
Assistant Professor	108
Instructor (Academic)	56
Instructor (SAT)	83
Total	484
Full Time Faculty	510
Part Time Faculty	147
Total	657

1997

Student Headcount

Full Time Undergraduate	6,436
Part Time Undergraduate	2,270
Total Undergraduate	8,706
Full Time Graduate	753
Part Time Graduate	1,156
Total Graduate	1,909
Total Undergraduate & Graduate	10,615
Total Full Time Students	7,189

Faculty Headcount

Professor	139
Associate Professor	112
Assistant Professor	120
Instructor (Academic)	44
Instructor (SAT)	81
Total	496
Full Time Faculty	514
Part Time Faculty	110
Total	624

1998

Student Headcount

Full Time Undergraduate	6,560
Part Time Undergraduate	2,482
Total Undergraduate	9,042
Full Time Graduate	694
Part Time Graduate	1,236
Total Graduate	1,930
Total Undergraduate & Graduate	10,972
Total Full Time Students	7,254

Faculty Headcount

Professor	138
Associate Professor	118
Assistant Professor	108
Instructor (Academic)	59
Instructor (SAT)	86
Total	509
Full Time Faculty	532
Part Time Faculty	81
Total	613

Growth by College

Source: Institutional Research; numbers are student FTEs

ACADEMIC UNDERGRADUATE

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Education	Engineering	Health Professions	Pharmacy
1989	1,255	815	857	252	520	278
1990	1,543	952	989	261	642	272
1991	1,757	927	1,217	309	740	297
1992	1,866	968	1,311	314	844	332
1993	2,094	894	1,206	305	1,026	344
1994	2,419	892	1,198	273	1,152	367
1995	2,677	861	1,178	233	1,172	345
1996	2,776	839	1,223	222	1,178	311
1997	2,774	870	1,219	235	1,143	297
1998	2,897	896	1,164	266	1,130	287
% of growth since 1989	130%	10%	36%	6%	117%	3%

ACADEMIC GRADUATE

1989	161	25	98	13	73	6
1990	171	28	99	16	120	8
1991	185	30	117	12	114	10
1992	199	38	149	14	127	12
1993	191	31	101	22	143	12
1994	232	27	181	24	154	16
1995	212	40	140	25	175	11
1996	217	38	105	29	242	12
1997	230	42	91	19	240	15
1998	215	27	82	18	214	18
% of growth since 1989	34%	8%	---	38%	193%	200%

NEW ACADEMIC FRESHMEN

1989	228	152	74	43	81	41
1990	263	167	99	48	115	27
1991	308	148	120	74	147	32
1992	295	156	139	66	182	54
1993	410	123	105	62	175	35
1994	478	153	103	64	245	36
1995	531	121	124	43	230	22
1996	543	131	119	49	265	21
1997	552	167	135	52	231	24
1998	604	126	122	49	244	32
% of change since 1989	165%	---	65%	14%	200%	---

Positive Effects of Growth

In interviews the department chairs raised a number of concerns about the effects of growth on academics. Those concerns are discussed throughout the rest of this report. The chairs also identified a number of positive effects.

- 21% report that their departments have better or more diverse students
- 21% report that the faculty has improved through new tenure-track positions, more diverse faculty, or better faculty recruits
- 21% see the university as having a more lively atmosphere and more breadth
- 18% see the university as having developed a clearer and more prominent image
- 18% see growth as having no positive effects

Other positive comments made less frequently include:

- having classes fill
- having a more varied academic program
- attracting more funding, including funding for research
- having a stronger research program, including an increase in numbers of faculty engaged in research
- having better technological equipment, both computers and classroom technology
- having better teaching opportunities
- having better grant opportunities

Faculty Workload

Pressure on faculty workload as a result of growth has occurred most acutely in the College of Arts and Sciences, especially in biological sciences and the social science departments, and in the Colleges of Education and Health Professions.

Concerns about Workload

In interviews, the quality of faculty life and the level of morale among faculty at Idaho State University emerged as a concern among many of the department chairs. Forty-two percent (42%) of department chairs reported that they perceive faculty workload to have increased in general. Forty-two percent (42%) mentioned increases in time required for teaching, including overloads being taught in six departments. Chairs also mentioned increased service load (21%), and less time available for research and professional development activities (13%). Increased service load for tenured/tenure-track faculty was attributed, in part, to increased reliance on non-tenure-track faculty and to increases in reporting requirements, such as assessment.

As a result, twenty-six percent (26%) of department chairs report that faculty experience stress and/or low morale. Eight (8%) percent report major issues with the salary inequities both within the university and in comparison to sister institutions.

Advising

A recurrent theme across campus is increased advising load for the tenured/tenure-track faculty due to growth. Even departments that admit a set number of students report that the faculty advising load has increased. Forty-five percent (45%) of departments report a significant increase in their advising load. Some mention that increased reliance on non-tenure-track faculty for teaching has the effect of concentrating the advising load on tenured/tenure-track faculty. (Non-tenure-track faculty do not ordinarily advise majors.) However, thirteen percent (13%) said that the burden had not had an inordinate impact on faculty workload because of telephone registration. Telephone registration has made it possible for students to complete a course of study without ever consulting their advisors. Twenty-six percent (26%) of departments reported that if every student taught wanted contact with faculty there would be no way to grant that. A few departments are shifting advising solely to the chair or a single faculty member or to a professional staff person hired specifically for advising.

Student/Faculty Ratios

For academic students the student/faculty ratio at ISU has increased by 8% between 1989 and 1998, from 15.8 to 17.1. These ratios are calculated based upon FTEs, which include non-tenure-track faculty. Faculty credit load, reported in faculty workload reports discontinued in 1997, increased 9% between 1987 and 1996.

Growth in student/faculty ratio has been disparate, however. In some areas the student/faculty ratio has decreased slightly over the past ten years, while in other areas it jumped quite radically. For example, in Sociology and Social Work the student/faculty ratio grew by 64%; in Radiographic Science, by 43%; in Physical Therapy, by 42%. In most areas the ratios grew between 21 and 25%.

The distribution of ratios throughout the institution is also skewed. Within the College of Arts and Sciences many departments exceed both the ISU and the college ratios: for example, the History Department had a student/faculty ratio of 33 as of 1998, Sociology had a student/faculty ratio of 32, and Economics and Psychology had student/faculty ratios of about 27. Clearly, departments such as Engineering (student/faculty ratio of 9) and Dental Hygiene (student/faculty ratio of 6) bring down the ISU ratio overall.

Comparisons with Other Institutions

Since 1989, Idaho State University's student/faculty ratio has risen by 8% , while Boise State University's student/faculty ratio has fallen by 8%, University of Idaho's has risen by 1% and Lewis and Clark State College's has risen by .6%. Although BSU has shown a decrease in its student/faculty ratio, BSU still has the highest student/faculty ratio in the state.

As of 1998, Idaho State's student/faculty ratio was 7.6% lower than Boise State but 3% higher than University of Idaho and 9% higher than Lewis and Clark State College.

Concerns Regarding Faculty Workload

Source: Interviews with chairs. Ratios indicate number of chairs reporting a concern to number of chairs in the college.

College	Greater workload generally	More time required for teaching	More time required for service	Less time available for research/prof dev	Salaries have not improved to match increased workload	Poor faculty morale due to work conditions	Increased faculty stress
Arts/Sciences	7/16	9/16*	4/16	2/16	5/16	3/16	3/16
Business	1/5	1/5		1/5			
Education	1/4	2/4*			1/4	1/4	
Engineering		1/1					
Health Prof	5/10	2/10*	3/10	1/10	2/10	1/10	2/10
Pharmacy	2/2	1/2*	1/2	1/2			1/2
Total	16/38	16/38	8/38	5/38	8/38	5/38	6/38

*Chairs report a concern about regular teaching of overloads.

Other concerns reported from Arts and Sciences:

- less tenure-track control of curricula
- more faculty doing administrative work
- decreased faculty-student communication
- decreased faculty-faculty communication
- travel to remote sites robs time from other duties
- research growth creates less time for teaching/service

Other concerns reported from College of Business:

- decrease in student motivation
- less time available for service

Other concerns reported from College of Education:

- increased time required for dissertation supervision
- increased research expectations

Other concerns reported from Kasiska College of Health Professions:

- less time available for service

Student/Faculty Ratios

Source: Institutional Research; ratios calculated based on student FTE to faculty FTE during fall semester of each year
= ratio exceeds ISU ratio; @ = ratio exceeds college ratio

Area	1989	1998	% Increase
Anthropology	0	16.3	
Art and Architecture	17.1	17.0	----
Biological Sciences	17.5	21.2 #@	21%
Chemistry	16.1	18.0 #	12%
Communication and Theatre	14.0	14.7	5%
Economics	27.8	26.9 #@	----
English and Philosophy	15.7	19.1 #	22%
Foreign Languages	20.0	20.4 #@	2%
Geology	10.7	13.2	23%
History	26.7	32.9 #@	23%
Mathematics	22.7	21.6 #@	----
Music	10.0	12.5	25%
Physics	15.1	12.9	----
Political Science	25.7	22 #@	----
Psychology	24.7	26.7 #@	8%
Sociology and Social Work	19.4	31.8 #@	64%
ARTS AND SCIENCES	18.1	20.1 #	11%
BUSINESS	17.6	16.9	----
Counselor Education & Special Education	17.6		*
Teacher Education	19.4	23.7 #@	22%*
Occupational Education (HRTD)	18.9	20.1 #@	6%
Physical Education and Dance	19.7	21.1 #@	7%
Special Education & School Psychology		13.9	*
EDUCATION	19.0	13.9	----
ENGINEERING	7.7	8.9	16%
Counseling		8.6 @	*
Dental Hygiene	7.3	6.4	----
Health and Nutrition Sciences	0	4.4	
Health Care Administration	15.8	14.8 @	----
Idaho Dental Education	2.5	2.7	8%
Nursing	6.3	6.6	5%
Physical Therapy	4.8	6.8	42%
Radiographic Science	6.9	9.6 @	43%
Speech Pathology and Audiology	11.1	6.9	----
HEALTH PROFESSIONS	7.6	8.3	9%
PHARMACY	7.6	10.5	38%
ACADEMIC	15.8	17.1	8%
APPLIED TECHNOLOGY	10.9	11.9	11%

*Counselor Education was originally in the College of Education. That portion of the department moved to the College of Health Professions in 1995, and Special Education became part of the Teacher Education division.

Student/Faculty Ratios: Comparison by Institution and Year
Source: State Board of Education

	ISU	BSU	UOI	LCSC
1989	15.8	19.9	16.4	15.5
1990	16.4	19.7	16.8	16.0
1991	17.2	19.9	17.2	16.1
1992	17.8	19.7	17.5	14.8
1993	16.7	19.1	17.6	15.7
1994	17.0	17.8	17.0	15.2
1995	17.5	18.3	16.4	14.9
1996	17.5	18.1	16.5	15.7
1997	17.1	18.4	15.9	16.1
1998	17.1	18.4	16.6	15.6

Tenure-track Faculty Positions and Hiring of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Record-keeping Problems

Accurate figures for the change in number of tenure-track positions are difficult to obtain because regular institutional reporting formats have used the terms "full-time faculty" and "part-time faculty" as if those categories corresponded to the tenure-track and adjunct categories. In fact, they do not: During ISU's period of growth the full-time category has come to include a number of non-tenure-track full-time faculty, and the part-time category has come to include a few tenured/tenure-track faculty.

To assemble data about growth in the tenured/tenure-track faculty, we obtained information from Institutional Research that had previously been compiled for comparison of the years 1993 and 1998, and figures for 1997 comparing number of majors to number of tenured/tenure-track faculty. Those figures record faculty who were teaching, but do not record tenure-track positions that might have been unfilled at the time. We also asked the department chairs to estimate growth in the tenured/tenure-track faculty of their departments between the years 1993 and 2000. While both sets of data have to be regarded as soft, they do serve as indicators of the degree of change in the tenure-track and where change has or has not occurred.

Tenure-track Growth

Between 1993 and 1998 growth in tenure-track positions was less than growth in non-tenure-track hirings and less than growth in the student body. In 1993 there were 334 tenured/tenure track faculty and in 1998 there were 349. This represents a 4% growth in the tenure track. This can be compared to growth in non-tenure-track positions of 54% between 1993 and 1998. It can also be compared to growth in the student body: In 1993 there were 9,726 academic students and in 1998 there were 10,974 academic students. This represents a 13% growth.

Increased reliance on non-tenure-track hirings is most apparent in Arts and Sciences (23% non-tenure-track faculty) and Health Professions (27%). It should be noted that for some of the Health Professions a reliance on non-tenure-track faculty is not related to growth so much as to regular practices within particular fields.

Within those two colleges, the following departments reflect high (30% or greater) percentages of non-tenure-track hirings as of 1998:

Arts and Sciences

- English and Philosophy
- Foreign Languages
- History
- Mathematics
- Communication and Theater

Health Professions

- Family Medicine
- Nursing
- Physician Assistant
- Speech Pathology

Outside of those two colleges, the Physical Education and Computer Information Systems programs also had more than 30% of their faculty as non-tenure-track hires in 1998.

Student/Tenure-track Faculty Ratios

In interviews with the department chairs, many reported concerns about the growth of tenure-track faculty's not being adequate:

45% of department chairs reported that they did not have adequate numbers of tenure track faculty for the number of undergraduate students they serve

42% of department chairs reported that they do not have adequate numbers of tenure-track faculty for the number of graduate students they serve

The 1997 figures for majors to tenured/tenure-track faculty ratios indicate that ratios are least favorable for Education (56/1) and Business (51/1) majors and most favorable for Pharmacy students (15/1). Ratios in the following departments exceed those for their colleges as a whole:

Arts and Sciences:

- Biological Sciences
- Communications and Theater
- Political Science
- Psychology
- Sociology and Social Work

Health Professions:

- Health and Nutritional Science
- Nursing
- Radiographic Science

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty by College

<u>COLLEGE</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>CHANGE</u>
Arts and Sciences	163	178	+ 9%
Business	29	28	- 3%
Education	41	36	-12%
Engineering	16	10	-38%
Health Professions	48	60	+25%
Pharmacy	26	27	+ 4%
Library	11	10	- 9%
TOTAL	334	349	+ 4%

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty by College

<u>COLLEGE</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>CHANGE</u>
Arts and Sciences	38	54	+ 42%
Business	6	7	+ 17%
Education	2	5	+250%
Engineering	2	1	- 50%
Health Professions	11	22	+100%
Pharmacy	7	3	- 57%
Library	0	2	+200%
TOTAL	66	102	+ 54%

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty by Department

<u>DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Change</u>
Anthropology	4	5	
Art	7	7	
Biology	25	31	
Chemistry	9	9	
Economics	6	6	
English & Philosophy	23	23	
Geology	5	6	
History	8	7	
Language	6	8	
Mathematics	17	18	
Music	8	9	
Physics	8	8	
Political Science	7	8	
Psychology	9	11	
Sociology	8	9	
Speech Communication	13	13	
TOTAL ARTS AND SCIENCES	163	178	+ 9%
Accounting	8	7	
Computer Information Systems	4	4	
Finance	3	4	
Management	10	9	
Marketing	4	4	
TOTAL BUSINESS	29	28	- 3%
Education	15	19	
Occupational Education	9	8	
Physical Education	7	4	
Secondary/Special Ed	10	5	
TOTAL EDUCATION	41	36	- 12% *
ENGINEERING	12	14	+ 17%
Counseling		7	
Dental	1	9	
Family Medicine	4	1	
Health Education	3	7	
Health Care Administration	3	3	
Idaho Dental Education	1	2	
Nursing	13	10	
Physical Therapy	4	7	
Physician Assistant		1	
Radiographic Science	3	2	
Speech Pathology	10	9	
TOTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONS	68	60	- 10%*
Pharmacy Practice	13	16	
Pharmacological Science	13	11	
TOTAL PHARMACY	26	27	+ 4%
LIBRARY	11	10	- 9%

*Figures skewed by addition of Counseling to Health Professions

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty by Department

<u>DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Resulting % Non-tenure-track</u>
Anthropology	1	1	17
Art	1	0	0
Biology	2	1	3
Chemistry	1	1	10
Economics	0	0	0
English & Philosophy	11	15	39
Geology	1	1	14
History	0	4	36
Language	3	5	38
Mathematics	10	15	45
Music	0	2	10
Physics	2	3	27
Political Science	0	0	0
Psychology	0	0	0
Sociology	1	0	0
Speech Communication	5	6	32
TOTAL ARTS AND SCIENCES	38	54	23
Accounting	1	2	22
Computer Information Systems	2	2	33
Finance	0	0	0
Management	2	2	18
Marketing	1	1	20
TOTAL BUSINESS	6	7	20
Education	1	2	10
Occupational Education	0	0	0
Physical Education	0	2	33
Secondary/Special Ed	1	1	17
TOTAL EDUCATION	2	5	12
ENGINEERING	2	1	7
Counseling		0	0
Dental	1	0	0
Family Medicine	5	3	75
Health Education	2	1	13
Health Care Administration	0	0	0
Idaho Dental Education	0	0	0
Nursing	2	5	33
Physical Therapy	0	2	22
Physician Assistant		2	67
Radiographic Science	0	0	0
Speech Pathology	1	7	38
TOTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONS	11	22	27
Pharmacy Practice	5	3	16
Pharmacological Science	2	0	0
TOTAL PHARMACY	7	3	10
LIBRARY	0	2	17

College of Engineering

Department	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	+6	+7
Engineering				*						

Kasiska College of Health Professions

Department	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	+6	+7
Counseling					*					
Dental Ed			*							
Dental Hyg				*						
Health Care				*						
Health/Nutr										
Nursing						*				
Phys Asst			*							
Physical Th										
Rad Sci		*								
Speech Path										

College of Pharmacy

Department	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	+6	+7
Pharm Sci			*							
Pharm Prac			*							

College of Engineering

Department	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	+6	+7
Engineering								*		

Note: College of Engineering also employed 6 fewer part-time adjuncts in 2000 than in 1993.

Kasiska College of Health Professions

Department	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	+6	+7
Counseling				*						
Dental Ed			*							
Dental Hyg			*							
Health Care			*							
Health/Nutr										
Nursing										*
Phys Asst			*							
Physical Th										
Rad Sci			*							
Speech Path										

Note: Figures do not include affiliates.

College of Pharmacy

Department	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	+6	+7
Pharm Sci		*								
Pharm Prac					*					

Note: Figures do not include affiliates.

Number of Students by Major Compared to Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty, 1997

Source: figures from Institutional Research

* ratio of majors/faculty exceeds college ratio for full time or total, or both

MAJOR	PART TIME	FULL TIME	TOTAL	TENURED/T TRACK
American Studies	4	6	10	
Anthropology	18	46	64	7
Art and Pre-Architecture	31	81	112	7
Biological Sciences*	147	638	785	34
Chemistry	18	57	75	11
Communication & Theatre*	47	194	241	8
Criminal Justice	14	38	52	
Economics	2	14	16	6
English and Philosophy	55	109	164	17
Foreign Languages	8	46	54	7
General Studies	40	73	113	
Geology	17	55	72	6
History	26	81	107	7
International Studies	9	27	36	
Mathematics	19	44	63	14
Music	8	39	47	7
Physics	19	47	66	5
Political Science*	43	123	166	6
Psychology*	54	237	291	11
Sociology and Social Work*	91	318	409	9
Undecided Arts and Sciences	485	499	984	
No Major/College Preference	318	344	662	
TOTAL ARTS AND SCIENCES	1,473	3,116	4,589	171

RATIO OF TOTAL STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 27

RATIO OF FULL TIME STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 18

DEPARTMENT	PART TIME	FULL TIME	TOTAL	TENURE/T TRACK
TOTAL ENGINEERING	71	283	354	11

RATIO OF TOTAL STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 32

RATIO OF FULL TIME STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 26

MAJOR	PART TIME	FULL TIME	TOTAL	TENURE/T TRACK
Accounting	53	199	252	6
Computer Information Sys.	45	117	162	5
Computer Science	27	57	84	
Finance	30	72	102	4
General Business	7	11	18	
Management & MBA	198	211	409	9
Marketing	25	72	97	3
Pre Business	69	183	252	
TOTAL BUSINESS	454	922	1,376	27

RATIO OF TOTAL STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 51

RATIO OF FULL TIME STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 34

MAJOR	PART TIME	FULL TIME	TOTAL	TENURE/T TRACK
Education*	572	1,020	1,592	30
Human Resource Training*	184	65	249	4
Physical Ed. And Dance	34	62	96	
Special Ed./School Psych	44	31	75	4
Undecided Education	41	68	109	
TOTAL EDUCATION	875	1,246	2,121	38

RATIO OF TOTAL STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 56

RATIO OF FULL TIME STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 33

MAJOR	PART TIME	FULL TIME	TOTAL	TENURE/T TRACK
Counseling	42	48	90	6
Dental Hygiene	30	175	205	7
Family Medicine	1		1	
Health & Nutrition Sciences*	63	151	214	6
Health Care Administration	8	44	52	3
Idaho Dental Ed. Program		6	6	
Nursing*	119	306	425	11
Phys & Occ. Therapy		63	63	7
Physician Assistant	7	89	96	
Radiographic Science*	16	97	113	2
Speech Path and Audio.	33	129	162	10
Undecided	68	237	305	
TOTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONS	387	1,345	1,732	52

RATIO OF TOTAL STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 33

RATIO OF FULL TIME STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 26

DEPARTMENT	PART TIME	FULL TIME	TOTAL	TENURE/T TRACK
TOTAL PHARMACY	51	305	356	24

RATIO OF TOTAL STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 15

RATIO OF FULL TIME STUDENTS TO TENURED/T TRACKED FACULTY: 13

MAJOR	PART TIME	FULL TIME	TOTAL	TENURE/T TRACK
Bach. Applied Tech.	23	15	38	
Bach. Univ. Studies		5	5	
General Interdisciplinary	2	5	7	
Professional Dev.	371		371	
Waste Mgmt. & Env. Sci.	11	12	23	
TOTAL INTERDISCIPLINARY	407	37	444	

Class Size

One of the most common themes to emerge in interviews with the department chairs was class enrollment. Forty-seven percent (47%) of department chairs report having an increase since 1989 in the number of classes that close. Many departments have responded by increasing the number of sections to accommodate students, a strategy that has resulted in hiring additional faculty (often non-tenure-track faculty) or in having current faculty teach overloads. Many departments have responded instead by raising course "caps" up to room capacity, a strategy that creates wider ranges in class size and has an impact on faculty workload, in particular the time required for grading and meeting students in office hours. When combined with the strategy of multiple sections, using room size as a course cap can also produce a wide range of class sizes, making the students' and the faculty members' experience a quite different one from section to section.

Record-keeping

As with data regarding faculty, data regarding class size are somewhat difficult to assemble. Class size can be averaged for multiple sections, for example, but our current system of section numbers creates "ghost" sections that are actually cross-listings to distance learning segments of a course or to programs such as American Studies, for which a few seats are reserved. These ghost sections also create difficulties in calculating median course sizes.

Shifts in Class Size

For this study the Registrar's Office provided us with a printout of course enrollments from the earliest semester available on the current computer system, fall 1992, and from fall 1999. By 1992 ISU had experienced three years of significant growth, so figures from that year indicate already-large class sizes. Between 1992 and 1999 many of the departments whose courses were oversubscribed were able to correct for large class size through creating multiple sections; the 1999 figures therefore indicate an improved situation for several departments. With the major exception of Biological Sciences, most departments were able to reduce their peak class size and to adjust the range of class sizes so that student and faculty experience in the classroom is less variable (fewer very small and very large classes). The 1999 figures do indicate one oddity: a number of very small classes that were part of the CLASS program, which was undersubscribed for fall 1999.

As of fall 1999, the largest majors classes (30 students and greater) are found in:

College of Arts and Sciences:

- Biological Sciences
- Political Science
- Psychology
- Sociology/Social Work

College of Business:

Finance

College of Education:

Sports Education/PE

Teacher Education

Kasiska College of Health Professions:

Dental Hygiene

Health Care Administration

Health/Nutrition

Nursing

College of Pharmacy:

both departments

The largest general education classes (60 and greater) are found in the social sciences and sciences:

Anthropology

Psychology

Sociology/Social Work

Biological Sciences

Physics

Standards for Class Size

Eleven (28%) of the departments at Idaho State University report having some sort of national standard for class or clinical size. Among these, six are able to meet the standard, while five report exceeding it:

English/Philosophy (the English part of that unit)

Foreign Languages

Sociology/Social Work (the SW part of that unit)

Sport/Physical Education

Physical Therapy

Concerns about Class Size

Source: Interviews with department chairs. Comments pertain to changes since 1989. Ratios are number of chairs stating the concern to number of chairs in the college.

College	Increase in sections closing	Increase in size of majors classes	Increase in size of general education courses	Have National Standards for Class Size	Exceed National Standards for Class Size
Arts/Sciences	10/16	10/16	10/16	4/16	3/16
Business	2/5	3/5			
Education	2/4	3/4		1/4	1/4
Engineering			1/1	1/1	
Health Prof	3/10	6/10	3/10	5/10	1/10
Pharmacy	1/2				
Total	18/38	22/38	14/38	11/38	5/38

Class Sizes, 300/400-level Courses

Source: Registrar's Office

Figures are averages of all sections for multiple-section courses. Figures do not include laboratory sections, internships, independent studies, clinics, practicum sections.

* = fall 1992

= fall 1999

College of Arts and Sciences

Department	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100	101-110
Anthropology	*#	*#									
Art/Arch	*#	#									
Biol Sci	*#	*#	*#	*#	#	*#	#	#	#	*#	*#
Chemistry	*#	*#	#					#			@
Comm/Th	*#	*#	*#	*							
Economics	*#	*#									
Eng/Phil	*#	*#	*#								
Foreign Lang	*#	*#	*#	*							
Geology	*#	*#									
History	*	*#	#		*	*					
Mathematics	*#	*#	#	*							
Music	*#	*#	#								
Physics	*#	*	*								
Political Sci	*#	*#	#	*#	*#						
Psychology	*#	*#	*#	*#	*#		*				
Sociology/SW	*	*#	*#	*#	*#	*	#				

@one course of 175 students in 1992 (organic chemistry)

College of Business

Department	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100
Accounting	*	*#	*#							
CIS	#	*	*#	*						
Finance		*#	*#	*#						
Management	*#	*#	*#	*						
Marketing	*#	*#	*#							

College of Education

Department	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100
Ed Leader +	*#	*#	*#							
HRTD	*#	*#	*#							
Sport/PhysEd	*#	*#	*#	#						
Teacher Ed	#	*#	*#	*#						

+ 500-600-level courses

College of Engineering

Department	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100
Engineering	*#	*#	*#		*					

Kasiska College of Health Professions

Department	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100
Counseling+	*#	*#	*							
Dental Ed +	*#									
Dental Hyg			*#	#						
Health Care	*#	*#		*#						
Health/Nutr	*#	*#	#	#						
Nursing	*	*#	*	#	*#					
Phys Asst	#	#								
Phys Th+	#	#	*#							
Rad Sci		*#								
Speech Path	*#	*#	*#							

+ includes 500-600-level courses

College of Pharmacy

Department	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100
Pharm Sci	*	*#	*#	#	*#	*				
Pharm Prac					*#	*#				

Pedagogical Changes/Changes in Nature of Students

Pedagogy

Sixty six percent (66%) of department chairs report that they have had growth in their major since 1989. Along with this, fifty-eight percent (58%) report that the size of their major classes has increased and thirty-seven percent (37%) report an increase in the size of their general education classes. With these increases, some faculty have made changes in their pedagogical methods for content and evaluating students:

- 24% of departments report an increase in multiple choice exams
- 18% of departments report a decrease in the number and size of research projects and papers
- 13% of departments report fewer essay exams
- 8% of departments report fewer class presentations (or more group rather than individual presentations)
- 5% of departments report giving less homework

While some department chairs also reported changes in teaching style, such as shifting to a purely lecture mode, these responses were not significantly represented.

Students

The average ACT score for entering freshmen at ISU has shifted slightly upward between 1990 and 1999, from just below the national average to slightly above average. In 1990 ISU's ACT average score was below the national average: 20.1, composite, while the national average was 20.6. In 1999 ISU's ACT average score was 21.8, while the national average was 21.

Percentage of attention to remedial needs of students has remained constant over the past few years. In FY1992, 2.48% of credit hours at ISU were devoted to remedial courses (less than 100-level courses). During the years since then, that percentage has shifted upward slightly, to a high of 3.14% in FY1994, and in FY1999 the percentage was 2.54%.

In spite of little increase in remediation and a slight increase in ACTs, nearly half of the department chairs report a concern with student behavior. Forty seven percent (47%) of departments reported an increased number of behavioral disruptions in class since 1989. However, only seventeen percent (17%) attributed the disruptions to growth. Sixty-one percent (61%) felt it was due to the type of student we now have and eleven percent (11%) felt it was due to other reasons, such as a decrease in civility in American culture generally. Many department chairs commented that students coming to ISU over the past few years have a sense of entitlement, or consumerism. Additionally, twenty nine percent (29%) of department chairs reported that faculty are encountering more ill-prepared students, especially in writing skills. Some departments have adjusted their requirements for the major to include courses that might help students improve these skills, such as 300-level professional writing courses.

Classroom and Other Space Needs

In interviews with the chairs, nearly every department, whether or not it has experienced a great deal of growth, expressed a need for more space. Departments are varied in their needs and the following is a summary of the major space needs across campus:

- 54% of departments expressed a need for additional faculty offices
- 38% of departments expressed a need for either more classrooms or larger classrooms
- 21% of departments expressed a need for more laboratories
- 10% of departments expressed a need for more clinic space
- 8% of departments expressed a need for general office space
- 5% of departments expressed a need for additional computer lab space

Classroom Space

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of the department chairs report that they compete with other departments for classroom space. Classroom space also is seen as limiting the number of sections that can be offered in multiple-section courses and as limiting the number of students who can be served in courses that are typically offered as lecture courses. The growth in assignable on-campus classroom space between 1989 and 1999 was 7.2%. Growth in the population of full-time students was 73%, a disparity that speaks for itself. Even when adjusted with availability of space in Idaho Falls and on-going remodeling of dormitories, the student population growth has far exceeded the growth in classroom space.

Classroom Technology

Not only is the capacity of the classroom an issue, but also the technology available within existing classrooms is seen as a problem. Twenty-three percent (23%) of department chairs report that they have a problem obtaining classrooms that are adequately equipped with the technology they need. Some departments (8%) also mention that they have lost classrooms to either computer laboratories or distance learning classrooms.

On-campus Housing

A potential space problem is on-campus housing for students. In the past five years there have been two major losses from what was once university housing: (1) the area between Owen/Redfield was converted to academic space, and (2) the Garrison Residence Complex was converted to academic space. These remodelings represent the loss of single student housing. At the same time, additions have been made to married student housing.

Classroom Facilities as Compared to Student Headcounts

Year	Square Footage of Assignable Classrooms	Full Time Student Headcounts
1989	135,754	4,193
1990	133,865	4,555
1991	128,288	5,570
1992	132,013	6,025
1993	137,208	6,413
1994	126,279	6,901
1995	128,526	7,103
1996	137,041	7,229
1997	137,041	7,189
1998	145,609	7,254

Total Growth of Classroom Facilities Assignable Space: 7.2%

Total Growth of Full Time Students: 73%

Library Resources

Interviews with library staff indicate that growth since 1989 has had an impact on the library's ability to serve faculty and students.

Space Needs

The problems facing the library include space needs. There is a lounge overflow and students cannot find seats for study and library use. Space needs are complicated by the necessity of balancing available space between seating for patrons and space for books and periodicals. Additionally, there is a concern about computers and copiers meeting the demands of students. Any place a line collects indicates a need for another machine.

Budget and Staffing

The library budget has also not grown in the same way the student population has. Library expenditures in 1989 were \$101 per student. In 1999 expenditures were \$118 per student. This is well below the figure required to keep up with inflation, which would be \$210 per student for 1999. As a consequence, the library has been limited in its ability to add new resources and provide adequate staffing. Staffing is particularly a problem on weekends, around finals, and during breaks. The library also does not have a large enough personnel budget to pay staff to keep the library open during times that students would like additional access. This also affects library instruction. At least half of the staff is now teaching library instruction, including non-professional staff. The library also does not have personnel budget to pay a staff member to maintain electronic resources.

Circulation

There has not been a large increase in circulation. This may be due to the fact that some instructors are not assigning as many writing and research projects to their larger classes. It may also be due to the increased availability of electronic resources and interlibrary loan. There has been a sharp increase in interlibrary loan, especially between the years of 1992 and 1993.

Concerns of Department Chairs

In interviews with department chairs, the following concerns emerged:

59% reported that the library resources have not kept up with growth at ISU

26% reported that library services are adequate. However several chairs qualified this statement by noting that their departments rely upon electronic resources and interlibrary loan to augment local library resources.

100% of chairs in the College of Business noted a cut that has hurt that college: Pro Quest was an essential tool and is no longer available to them.

Library Holdings Compared to Student Growth

	# OF VOLUMES OF BOOKS	# OF CURRENT PERIODICALS	# OF BOUND PERIODICALS	# OF GOVT DOCUMENTS	# OF MICRO FILMS	# OF MAPS	# OF STUDENTS
1989	401,904	3,043	53,419	371,942	1,396,680	42,093	4,193
1990	406,373	3,051	55,489	383,504	1,397,886	43,359	4,555
1991	363,306	3,324	105,797	375,697	1,470,085	44,328	5,570
1992	388,253	3,326	94,540	399,324	1,293,361	45,062	6,025
1993	431,778	3,284	102,777	392,398	1,622,164	45,389	6,413
1994	406,544	3,350	105,560	416,261	1,690,713	42,714	6,901
1995	415,273	3,302	107,657	422,640	1,738,507	42,884	7,103
1996	426,156	3,139	110,355	424,709	1,785,333	43,191	7,229
1997	430,465	3,292	113,232	432,074	1,818,723	43,369	7,189
1998	440,587	3,336	115,960	436,277	1,847,091	44,490	7,254
% INCREASE SINCE 1989	9.6%	9.6%	117%	17%	32%	5.7%	73%

Distance Learning/Outreach

Teaching at outreach sites such as Idaho Falls and Twin Falls and distance (broadcast) learning came up as a theme for some departments but not all. Some of the chairs noted that there are academic programs in which distance learning is not appropriate because of the necessity of laboratories or clinical experience. On the other hand, some departments would like to use distance learning but are unable to because of room scheduling problems.

The main concerns raised by the departments that are involved in either distance learning or teaching at outreach sites are as follows:

28% of department chairs reported that distance learning has increased faculty workload because of the inordinate amount of planning and organization it takes to teach a satellite course,

23% of department chairs reported that driving time to Idaho Falls and other sites was a major drain on faculty time,

18% of department chairs reported that competition for a satellite room was so great that they could not gain access.