



Composing a Harmonious Case for Compliance in 6.1 (Full-time Faculty) and 6.2.b (Program Faculty)

Stephanie Kolitsch

Patty Q. Flowers

University of Tennessee at Martin

SACSCOC Annual Meeting

December 2-9, 2020

The University of Tennessee at Martin

- Public, four-year institution
- Located in rural northwest Tennessee
- One of the campuses of the University of Tennessee system
- Approximately 7,100 students represent 44 states and 21 countries
- Offers Baccalaureate and Master's Degrees
- Main campus + 5 Centers spread throughout West Tennessee
- In 2019-20: 285 full-time faculty and 209 part-time faculty

Outcomes for Today's Session

1. Participants will learn how to organize and use institutional data to document sufficiency and adequacy of faculty.
2. Participants will learn how to use national data to document adequacy of faculty to support the institution's mission.

Comparing 6.1 to 6.2b

Principle 6.1: The institution employs an adequate number of full-time faculty members to support the mission and goals of the institution. (*Full-time faculty*) [CR]

Principle 6.2b: For each of its educational programs, the institution employs a sufficient number of full-time faculty members to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review. (*Program faculty*)

Comparing 6.1 to 6.2b

Principle 6.1: The institution employs an adequate number of full-time faculty members to support the mission and goals of the institution. (*Full-time faculty*) [CR]

- **Institution-level view**
- Focused on the relationship between the number of full-time faculty and the purpose and integrity of the **institution**

Comparing 6.1 to 6.2b

Principle 6.2b: For each of its educational programs, the institution employs a sufficient number of full-time faculty members to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review. (*Program faculty*)

- **Program-level view**
- Focused on the relationship between the number of full-time faculty and the purpose and integrity of the **program**

How do we
address
Principle 6.1
(Full-time
faculty)?

Principle 6.1: The institution employs an adequate number of full-time faculty members to support the mission and goals of the institution. *(Full-time faculty)* [CR]

How do we
address
Principle 6.1
(Full-time
faculty)?

Key phrases:

Principle 6.1: The institution employs an **adequate number** of **full-time** faculty members to **support** the **mission and goals** of the institution. (*Full-time faculty*) [CR]

How do we
address
Principle 6.1
(Full-time
faculty)?

Principle 6.1: The institution employs an adequate number of full-time faculty members to support the **mission and goals** of the institution. (*Full-time faculty*) [CR]

Describe your institution's mission and goals.

How do we
address
Principle 6.1
(Full-time
faculty)?

Principle 6.1: The institution employs an adequate number of **full-time** faculty members to **support** the mission and goals of the institution. (*Full-time faculty*) [CR]

Describe the roles and responsibilities of your full-time faculty:

- *Faculty Handbook*
- Institutional policies (e.g., HR job descriptions)

Connect roles and responsibilities to the mission and goals.

How do we
address
Principle 6.1
(Full-time
faculty)?

Principle 6.1: The institution employs an **adequate number** of **full-time** faculty members to support the mission and goals of the institution. (*Full-time faculty*) [CR]

What does “adequate” mean to your institution? We measured “adequacy” using the following:

- Workload reports
- Student-Faculty Ratio (IPEDS)
- Comparison to peer and aspirational institutions

How do we address Principle 6.1 (Full-time faculty)?

Using Workload Reports:

- Describe how to read your workload report and include copies of the reports in the supporting documentation
- Summarize numbers by department, college, and university-wide
- Include an explanation of how to interpret your numbers
- Include both counts and percentages
- Explain why your numbers are “adequate”

Dept./College	Fall 2017			Spring 2018		
	< 0.8	$0.8 \leq x \leq 1.3$	> 1.3	< 0.8	$0.8 \leq x \leq 1.3$	> 1.3
Agriculture, Geosciences, and Natural Resources	4 (12.9%)	24 (77.4%)	3 (9.7%)	2 (6.3%)	30 (93.8%)	0 (0%)
Family and Consumer Sciences	0 (0%)	5 (83.3%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)
College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences	4 (10.8%)	29 (78.4%)	4 (10.8%)	2 (5.3%)	36 (94.7%)	0 (0%)
Accounting, Finance, Economics, and Political	1	14	1	1	12	2

College of Humanities and Fine Arts	3 (6.3%)	71 (89.9%)	5 (3.8%)	3 (3.8%)	71 (89.9%)	5 (6.3%)
University-Wide	17 (6.1%)	239 (85.4%)	24 (8.6%)	17 (6.1%)	238 (85%)	25 (8.9%)

How do we
address
Principle 6.1
(Full-time
faculty)?

Using Student-Faculty Ratio:

- Reported as part of IPEDS and as part of Common Data Set
- IPEDS is easily accessible:
<https://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/>

The University of Tennessee-Martin
554 University Street, Martin, Tennessee 38238

Distance from ZIP:	0.3 miles from 38237
General information:	(731) 881-7000
Website:	www.utm.edu
Type:	4-year, Public
Awards offered:	Bachelor's degree Master's degree
Campus setting:	Town: Remote
Campus housing:	Yes
Student population:	7,280 (6,763 undergraduate)
Student-to-faculty ratio:	15 to 1

[Expand All](#) | [Collapse All](#)

+ GENERAL INFORMATION

TIUITION FEES AND ESTIMATED STUDENT EXPENSE

How do we
address
Principle 6.1
(Full-time
faculty)?

Using Student-Faculty Ratio (cont.):

- IPEDS compares the number of students to the number of full-time faculty
- Common Data Set compares the number of FTE students to the number of FTE faculty
- *Be sure you understand how the student-faculty ratio is being calculated!*
- For longitudinal data, explain any changes

Table 6.1-1: UT Martin Student/Faculty Ratios Reported to the CDS Initiative

Year of Report	Number of FTE Students	Number of FTE Faculty	Student/Faculty Ratio
Fall 2017	5419	353	15 to 1
Fall 2016	5396	363	15 to 1
Fall 2015	5917	363	16 to 1
Fall 2014	6203	371	17 to 1
Fall 2013	6466	382	17 to 1
Fall 2012	6800	381	18 to 1
Fall 2011	6802	375	18 to 1
Fall 2010	6956	360	19 to 1
Fall 2009	6672	358	19 to 1
Fall 2008	6226	350	18 to 1

How do we
address
Principle 6.1
(Full-time
faculty)?

Using Comparison to Peer and Aspirational Institutions:

- We have peer and aspirational institutions assigned by THEC
- Use IPEDS student-faculty ratios for these institutions to demonstrate “adequacy”
- If you don’t already have an assigned set of peer institutions, choose a group of 10-12 institutions with similar size, mission, programs, etc. (and be sure to explain how you chose those institutions)

Table 6.1-2: Number of Full-Time Faculty and Student/Faculty Ratio for Peer Institutions

Institutions	Full-time Faculty	Student/ Faculty Ratio
<i>Comparable Peer Institutions</i>		
McNeese State University	253	21:1
West Texas A&M University	320	21:1
Arkansas Tech University	367	19:1
Arkansas State University	515	18:1
Austin Peay State University	371	18:1
Midwestern State University	238	18:1
Morehead State University	333	18:1
University of Texas at Tyler	333	18:1
Frostburg State University	259	15:1
University of Tennessee at Martin	296	15:1
Auburn University-Montgomery	216	14:1
<i>Aspirational Peer Institutions</i>		
Southeast Missouri State University	410	21:1
Stephen F. Austin State University	544	20:1
Marshall University	811	19:1
University of Central Arkansas	545	17:1
Western Carolina University	473	17:1
Murray State University	447	15:1

Source: IPEDS Data Center; Fall 2016 data reports

How do we
address
Principle 6.1
(Program
faculty)?

**What data have you used
to demonstrate compliance
with 6.1?**

**How have you defined or
demonstrated “adequacy”?**

**Put your answers in the
Chat.**

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Principle 6.2b: For each of its educational programs, the institution employs a sufficient number of full-time faculty members to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review. *(Program faculty)*

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Key Phrases:

Principle 6.2b: For **each** of its **educational programs**, the institution employs a **sufficient number** of **full-time** faculty members to ensure **curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review**. *(Program faculty)*

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Principle 6.2b: For each of its educational programs, the institution employs a sufficient number of **full-time** faculty members to ensure **curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review**. *(Program faculty)*

Explain the faculty's role in ensuring curriculum program quality, integrity, and review—this was already covered in Principle 6.1 when we reviewed faculty responsibilities, but it is worth repeating here.

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Principle 6.2b: For **each** of its **educational programs**, the institution employs a sufficient number of full-time faculty members to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review. *(Program faculty)*

Examine EACH program individually.

We focused on the courses required for a program within its home department.

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Principle 6.2b: For **each** of its **educational programs**, the institution employs a sufficient number of full-time faculty members to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review. *(Program faculty)*

For completeness, we also analyzed the general education program since general education courses are often prerequisites to a major.

Finally, we analyzed each program by delivery mode and by location.

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Principle 6.2b: For **each** of its **educational programs**, the institution employs a **sufficient number** of **full-time** faculty members to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review. (*Program faculty*)

Types of analysis:

- Workload (also in Principle 6.1)
- Program-level credit hour analysis

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Using Workload:

We used the same workload summary table from Principle 6.1 and focused on the “underloads” and “overloads”

- Explain what conditions cause an underload or an overload
- Identify any programs with high percentages of underloads or overloads
- Explain why those underloads or overloads exist

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Using Program-level Credit Hour Analysis:

For each program:

- Identify courses within the program's home department that "count" towards the program
- For each semester, calculate the number and percentage of those courses' credit hours taught by full-time and by part-time faculty (total, by modality, and by location)

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Using Program-level Credit Hour
Analysis:

We created one spreadsheet for
each program, including general
education (by category).

We analyzed 3 years (6 semesters)
of data

We summarized data from
spreadsheets in simple tables

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Principle 6.2b: For each of its educational programs, the institution employs a **sufficient number** of full-time faculty members to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review. (*Program faculty*)

How did we identify what a “sufficient number” should be? We looked at our data and identified threshold percentages that *almost all* programs met. Our threshold percentages were dependent on location, mode, and major program vs. general education.

UT Martin's Threshold Percentages

Type of Program	Expectation*
Undergraduate Programs on the Main Campus, Face-to-Face Delivery	70% taught by full-time faculty
Undergraduate Programs at Off-Campus Sites, Combination of Face-to-Face, Hybrid, and Online Delivery	40% taught by full-time faculty
Graduate Programs, Combination of Face-to-Face, Hybrid, and Online Delivery	80% taught by full-time faculty
General Education	60% taught by full-time faculty

Column A: designated the FULL TIME and PART TIME groupings.

Column B: Instructor's name.

Columns C, D, and E: Subject, course number, and section number.

Column F: Title of the course

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	PROGRAM:	BS with a major in Geoscience				
2						
3		INSTR	SUBJ	CRSE	SECT	TITLE
4	FULL TIME					
30		Wallace, Timothy	GEOG	305	1	Prin of Meteorology
31		Wallace, Timothy	GEOG	472	1	Climatology
32		Wallace, Timothy	GEOG	492	1	ST: Weather Anaylsis
33						
34						
35						TOTAL FULL TIME CREDIT HOURS
36						
37						PERCENTAGE FULL TIME CREDIT HOURS
38						
39	PART TIME					
40		Alexander, Jason	GEOG	460	1	Atmospheric Dynamics
41		Ratliff, Joshua	GEOL	110	PX1	Introduction Physical Geology
42		Rhenberg, Elizabeth	GEOL	110	PW1	Introduction Physical Geology
43						
44						TOTAL PART TIME CREDIT HOURS
45						
46						PERCENTAGE PART TIME CREDIT HOURS

Columns G-K:
Locations of face-to-face courses (main campus and five off-campus centers; this particular example did not have any classes taught at our Somerville Center).

Numbers in the white cells represent the number of credit hours for that course.

G	H	I	J	K
MAIN CAMPUS	PW-Ripley Center	JS-Jackson Center	PX-Parsons Center	PE-Selmer Center
3				
3				
3				
73	3	0	0	3
94.80519481	42.85714286	0	0	100
4				
			4	
	4			
4	4	0	4	0
5.194805195	57.14285714	0	100	0

Column L: Tracks online sections. For programs that have hybrid courses, we included a column to track hybrid sections.

Columns M and N: Tracks hours taught in our dual enrollment programs and the location (usually a high school) where those hours were taught.

Column O: Provided program totals.

L	M	N	O
ONLINE	Dual Enrollment	Dual Enrollment Location	Program Total
12	0		91
100	0		88.34951456
0	0		12
0	0		11.65048544

Salmon-colored rows tracked the total full-time and part-time hours taught (by location, online, hybrid, or dual enrollment) and the corresponding percentages taught by full-time and part-time faculty.

TOTAL FULL TIME CREDIT HOURS	73	3	0	0	3	12	0		91
PERCENTAGE FULL TIME CREDIT HOURS	94.80519481	42.85714286	0	0	100	100	0		88.34951456

TOTAL PART TIME CREDIT HOURS	4	4	0	4	0	0	0		12
PERCENTAGE PART TIME CREDIT HOURS	5.194805195	57.14285714	0	100	0	0	0		11.65048544

Portion of “Main Campus” table

**Semester Credit Hours Taught by Full Time vs Part Time Faculty
Disaggregated by Undergraduate Program
Main Campus**

(Semesters in which the percentage of semester credit hours taught by full-time faculty fall below 70% are highlighted in yellow.)

College	Program		Fa 15	Sp 16	Fa 16	Sp 17	Fa 17	Sp 18
Pure and Applied Sciences	B.S. with a major in Geosciences	Number of FT	78	91	86	67	67	73
		<i>Percent of FT</i>	100	100	100	100	100	94.8
		Number of PT	--	--	--	--	--	4
		<i>Percent of PT</i>	--	--	--	--	--	5.2
	B.S. with a major in Agriculture	Number of FT	266	195	279	285	279	286
		<i>Percent of FT</i>	94.3	93.8	95.2	94.4	93.9	92.6
		Number of PT	16	13	14	17	18	23
		<i>Percent of PT</i>	5.7	6.3	4.8	5.6	6.1	7.4
	B.S. Natural Resources	Number of FT	258	119	266	272	245	267
		<i>Percent of FT</i>	95.6	93.0	95.3	93.8	95.3	92.6
		Number of PT	12	9	13	18	12	23

Portion of “Online” table

Semester Credit Hours Taught by Full Time vs Part Time Faculty Disaggregated by Undergraduate Program Online

These degrees are available at the UT Martin Centers (located in Ripley, Jackson, Parsons, Selmer, and Somerville) through a combination of face-to-face, online, and/or hybrid courses. Course data for the online format are presented here; other documents will include course data for the face-to-face and hybrid formats.

College	Program		Fa 15	Sp 16	Fa 16	Sp 17	Fa 17	Sp 18
CAAS	B.S. with a major in Agriculture	Number of FT	45	41	46	33	57	69
		Percent of FT	88.2	87.2	93.9	73.3	76.0	85.2
		Number of PT	6	6	3	12	18	12
		Percent of PT	11.7	12.8	6.1	26.7	24.0	14.8
CBGA	B.S.B.A. with a major in Management	Number of FT	27	36	45	39	21	36
		Percent of FT	32.5	43.9	59.2	60.9	34.4	59.0
		Number of PT	56	46	31	25	40	25
		Percent of PT	67.5	56.1	40.8	39.1	65.6	41.0
	B.S. with a major in Political	Number of FT	6	--	--	--	9	6
		Percent of FT	40.0	--	--	--	25.0	18.2
		Number of PT	9	18	18	15	27	27

Programs at our Centers are often a combination of Face-to-Face, Online, and Hybrid, so we also aggregated data for one year to give a more complete picture of a typical student's experience.

**Semester Credit Hours Taught by Full Time vs Part Time Faculty
Disaggregated by Undergraduate Program
UT Martin Selmer Center
Aggregate 2017-18**

(Semesters in which the percentage of semester credit hours taught by full-time faculty fall below 40% are highlighted in yellow.)

College	Program		Online + Hybrid		Selmer		Total	
			Fa	Sp	Fa	Sp	Fa	Sp
CAAS	B.S. with a major in Agriculture	Number of FT	57	69	--	--	57	69
		Percent of FT					70.4	79.3
		Number of PT	18	12	6	6	24	18
		Percent of PT					29.6	20.7
CBGA	B.S.B.A. with a major in Management	Number of FT	24	39	3	6	27	45
		Percent of FT					37.0	61.6
		Number of PT	40	25	6	3	46	28
		Percent of PT					63.0	38.4
	B.S. with a major in Political	Number of FT	12	9	--	6	12	15
		Percent of FT					23.5	26.3
		Number of PT	27	27	12	15	39	42

General education was analyzed by category (in this case, “Biological and Physical Systems”)

General Education
Biological and Physical Systems
Semester Credit Hours Taught by Full Time vs Part Time Faculty

	Fa 16	Sp 17	Fa 17	Sp 18	Fa 16	Sp 17	Fa 17	Sp 18
	Main Campus				UT Martin Ripley Center			
Number of FT	208	184	196	212	--	4	--	--
<i>Percent of FT</i>	96.3	93.9	89.1	96.4	--	33.3	--	--
Number of PT	8	12	24	8	12	8	12	12
<i>Percent of PT</i>	3.7	6.1	10.9	3.6	100	66.7	100	100
	UT Martin Jackson Center				UT Martin Parsons Center			
Number of FT	4	4	4	--	12	4	8	4
<i>Percent of FT</i>	50	33.3	100	--	37.5	14.3	28.6	16.7
Number of PT	4	8	--	--	20	24	20	20
<i>Percent of PT</i>	50	66.7	--	--	62.5	85.7	71.4	83.3
	UT Martin Selmer Center				UT Martin Somerville Center			
Number of FT	8	8	12	4	--	--	--	--
<i>Percent of FT</i>	66.7	66.7	100	50	--	--	--	--
Number of PT	4	4	--	4	--	--	4	4

Finally, we analyzed two years of dual enrollment offerings to demonstrate that we did not offer more than 25% of a degree program at any of these sites.

**Dual Enrollment Course Offerings
2016-2018**

Location	Disc	Num	Title	Hrs	Fa 16	Sp 17	Fa 17	Sp 18
Adamsville High School	BIOL	110	Intro Cell Biology & Genetics	4	X		X	X
Briarwood Junior High School--Camden	ENGL	111	Composition	3	X		X	
	HIST	201	Hist Of U S	3	X		X	
	HIST	202	Hist Of U S	3		X		X
	ENGL	112	Composition	3				X
Clarksburg High School	PLSC	110	Intro Plant & Soil Sci	3	X	X		X
Dickson County High School--Dickson	ENGL	111	Composition	3	X			
	ENGL	112	Composition	3		X		
	MATH	140	College Algebra & Elem	3			X	

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

Now we can identify programs (or locations or categories of general education) that occasionally fall below our established thresholds in some semesters.

We highlighted those percentages in yellow (you saw some of those in the samples) then explained why those exceptions occurred:

- A full-time faculty member retired but taught some of the courses post-retirement
- A full-time faculty member was ill for a semester and her courses were covered by adjuncts

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

We can also identify programs that routinely fall below our established thresholds in some semesters.

- Educational Studies licensure programs routinely fall below the threshold due to multiple sections of 6-credit hour student teaching courses.
- Health and Human Performance programs allow physical activity courses to count as part of the major.

In both cases, removing those courses from the analysis returns the programs to acceptable levels.

How do we
address
Principle 6.2b
(Program
faculty)?

**What data have you used
to demonstrate compliance
with 6.2b?**

**How have you defined or
demonstrated
“sufficiency”?**

**Put your answers in the
Chat.**

Questions?

Contact Us:

Stephanie Kolitsch
UTM SACSCOC Liaison, Director of Accreditation,
Interim Director of Institutional Research
skolitsc@utm.edu
731-881-7477

Patty Q. Flowers
Assessment Coordinator
pflowers@utm.edu
731-881-3477

www.utm.edu/assessment/

Tennessee Accreditation Network:
www.utm.edu/tan/