The Curricular Parameters Work Group is meeting weekly. Thus far, our work has focused on clarifying our charge, understanding how it relates to the work of the KIG, identifying first steps, and beginning to gather information/models to guide us in our work.

**The Charge**

The specific charge to our Group focuses on four areas. We are to (1) identify the kinds of courses (and high-impact learning experiences that are being taught outside of regular teaching load) at Stetson; (2) determine target enrollments (optimal and acceptable) for these different courses/experiences; (3) consider how these courses/learning experiences should be weighted in faculty load in order to achieve equity and efficiency across and within disciplines; and (4) articulate minimal/optimal standards for these different kinds of courses/experiences.

**Guiding Principles**

1. We each bring unique disciplinary perspectives and understandings about faculty work to this endeavor, but we are committed to developing a deeper understanding and appreciation of the different kinds of teaching work faculty do.

2. In order for our recommendations to have broad buy-in and credibility, we will engage faculty and administrative colleagues in conversation and dialogue throughout the process.

3. We are committed to an open and transparent process, and to transparency, flexibility, and equity in the construction of faculty load.

4. While we are encouraged to think flexibly and creatively, we will also need to remain mindful of the realities of limited resources. We do not anticipate resources sufficient to reduce the existing 3/3 course load; course loads and target enrollments must be sustainable within Stetson’s overall academic “economy.”

**Strategy/Work Plan**

We are working to develop a list of the types of courses/learning experiences offered at Stetson. Teams of 2-3 committee members will then start meeting with deans, chairs, and program directors to ensure that the list is comprehensive and that we are able to articulate what makes each type of course distinctive. At the same time, we will initiate discussions of target enrollments, based on course type, pedagogical approach, and national disciplinary standards.

We have also begun to review models of how different universities “weight” different kinds of courses/learning experiences. While our expectation is that most courses will count as one course in a faculty member’s load, we will consider—as a committee and in conversations with faculty, chairs, and deans—why in some cases it is equitable to weight a course or experience differently. We want to give
careful consideration to instructional work that has, traditionally at Stetson, not been counted as part of load.

Given differences in the teaching faculty do, we recognize that the “blocks” of work used to construct a faculty member’s work load will not be the same, but the goal should be to develop principles and a transparent process by which equitable loads can be constructed (for existing courses as well as courses/learning experiences that might be developed in the future) using differently weighted units of measurement.

The Chair has been in regular contact with the Key Indicators Work Group (chaired by John Schorr), which is working to identify key indicators in academic planning that pertain to faculty workload. If the KIG determines a need to survey the faculty on workload issues, we hope to collaborate—in the interests of efficiency and also so as not to bombard the faculty with different survey instruments. (We would, of course, also work closely with IR.)

Finally, we have created a blog for members of the Work Group to share documents and exchange ideas. Provost Paul and Noel Painter (academic liaison to the Steering Committee) also have been granted access, to facilitate awareness of our work/discussions.

Questions/Emerging Issues

(1) How will faculty weighted hours (FWH) be calculated/calibrated across the different schools—especially given the recent move of the CAS to a unit system that has not yet been adopted by the SoM and the SoB?

(2) While the primary focus of our committee is on the curriculum, and the part of faculty workload that involves teaching, to what degree do we need to consider other work that faculty do in the construction of load? [For example: advising, theatre direction, academic support (math lab/writing center)? To what degree do we need to be concerned with principles for granting course release or reassignment—if at all, in what areas?

(3) What, if any, surveys of faculty will we need—or will conversations with various constituencies give us the information we seek?