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Executive Summary

Over at least the last ten years the number and proportion of non-tenure track (NTT) faculty at W. P. Carey has continued to grow dramatically, yet our operational structures have largely resisted change. Leadership, recognizing that the structures and processes we depend upon must be evolved to foster our success in this new reality, has charged this task force with determining and proposing ways in which this transformation may begin. In this proposal we offer our recommendations for how to proceed in the areas of governance and management, operations, and space requirements.

After assessing the needs of the new structure, we propose the immediate creation and hiring of a high-level leadership position to take up the reigns of these changes and to act as a resource to the NTT faculty specifically in recognizing the needs of their roles and how to facilitate them in the operations and resourcing of the school. We further recommend the appointment of a faculty position in each department to act as a representative of their department’s NTT faculty and to work with the new leadership position to form and advance initiatives.

For operations, we identify relevant categories and explore each to determine key aspects that can be built or expanded. These categories include changes to how faculty are recruited, evaluated, and developed. Due to the inherent breadth of operational change, we introduce our recommendations at a high level in this proposal while providing a supplemental document where we elaborate a granular breakdown and associated detail.

With regards to space requirements, we specifically consider the implications of workspace and how it is allocated. After assessing the functional requirements of the NTT faculty and their associated staff, and the capabilities and limitations of the fourth floor BA space, we recognize that the 4th floor of the BA cannot fully accommodate the existing NTT faculty group. Further, this gap between what is needed and what the 4th floor provides will be dramatically exacerbated if expected hiring trends continue. We therefore strongly recommend that faculty should not be relocated until a plan is established that addresses the full scope of their functional needs. We also recommend that a broadened scope of space allocation planning be implemented at the school level, beyond the 4th floor. In order to generate a more complete understanding of these expanded requirements, we have created a detailed survey which should be distributed to faculty and used to inform future planning.

In this proposal we have endeavored to craft a comprehensive while necessarily preliminary solution that addresses both the operational process changes needed and the structural elements that will enable those changes. In embracing leadership’s challenge to confront the future, we believe what we have detailed here represents a compelling opportunity to advance the school and our mission at large.
Motivation
On August 30, 2017, Dean Hillman shared her conviction that we, as a school, need to evolve. She highlighted how the way we work has changed markedly, and gave voice to the rising demands and challenges we face. Coming from that first presentation and all the presentations and discussions thereafter, was a persistent charge and mandate that we recognize as both task force members and as faculty: We must embrace the new realities of our work and find the best path forward. Core to her message was the need to recognize the changing role of the NTT faculty, and the argument is compelling. Indeed, over maybe the last dozen years we’ve seen a dramatic change to our business model as we’ve moved boldly towards providing high volume teaching that is both affordable and accessible. This has, in turn, led to a very aggressive hiring of NTT faculty while T&TT hiring has stagnated, with a consequent and consequential shift in how revenue is generated for the school (see Figure 1). Considering recent messages from leadership at all levels about the need to pursue more economical ways to operate, coupled with what appears to be increasing scrutiny on the tenure system, this trend seems unlikely to reverse and may be predicted to accelerate.

Governance, management, and resourcing needs to evolve
to address the changing composition of the faculty we employ

Full-time faculty employed over time

Plot represents trend lines for measures at three points based on department records and a survey of hiring expectations for full-time faculty from Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, Management, Marketing, and Supply Chain for Spring 2008, Spring 2018, and projected Spring 2019.

Figure 1. The Changing Faculty Demographic
Despite this transformation in our business and the composition of our workforce, our organizational structure remains strongly rooted in one that was designed to support and reward a research-centric defining base of T&TT faculty. Given the dramatic shift in the operations and consequent requirements of the faculty collectively, a dramatic shift in operational structure and process is called for.

Implications

As the count and proportion of NTT faculty increases, the current structure has often become out of sync with contemporary demands. Let us be clear: We do not see this as an issue or shortcoming of a department structure or of the idea of organizing around areas of domain knowledge. Rather, we see these incongruities as manifestations within the department’s operations, where processes like recruitment, onboarding, review, and promotion have often been very slow to adapt. Legacy governance and management structures have preserved the practice of deferring decision-making to those who only represent a subset of the specific interests that need to be addressed. Leadership positions, whether individual or by membership in an authoritative committee, are often biased towards T&TT faculty if not exclusively reserved for them even as they represent a dwindling majority. We move closer to the true spirit of an aristocracy as we continue to reserve positions of authority for a smaller and smaller subset of the faculty base.

Many of the symptoms of the inconsistencies between our present system and the reality of our work are recognized anecdotally in our daily experiences. In some departments, NTT faculty are hired and reviewed by predominantly T&TT committees who may still apply a T&TT lens to the process. While NTT faculty perform the vast majority of teaching and are often as credentialed as T&TT faculty, decisions about teaching issues such as teaching loads and class sizes are often made by T&TT faculty. While these choices or situations may be individually frustrating, their greater relevance is in how they compromise the functioning of the school. In a time of rising change and transformation in business and society, we cannot afford these compromises. While the potential scope of change for the school is substantive, the start need not be: At the most fundamental level, we simply need to rationalize our system so that those closest to the work are recognized as the best authorities for the work, and empower them to begin the process of rationalizing our structure and processes for our mission.
Solution

*Begin making needed changes while building a structure to continue and sustain progress*

Governance & Management

Motivation

The Dean’s call for a matrixed organization that better represents and supports NTT faculty creates a need for governance and management structures. We addressed what we judged to be the best personnel, processes, budget, and committee structures that would help move the NTT group’s work forward throughout the school.

Recommendations

Our recommendations have four components:

1. **Identity**

Being a matrix structure, NTT faculty belong both to a department and to the (yet-to-be-named) Teaching Group. Overlap occurs in the realms of subject matter expertise and curriculum, research (where applicable), service opportunities and participation in departmental interests. The NTT group supports and partners with the departments in many functions, assisting in moving forward the school’s mission.

The teaching lead (a.k.a. the NTT Group Leader) advocates for, manages, and evaluates the non-tenure track faculty in the teaching group; acting as a support and voice for the group. The teaching lead represents the teaching group at the highest levels of organization in the school, including being a full voting member of the admin council. Given the large number of faculty in this leader’s purview and management structures, we recommend the leader be hired at the level of Associate Dean.
2. Organizational Structure

2.1 Leadership: The NTT group leader is appointed at the level of Associate Dean in order to advocate for and represent the interests of the NTT group at the highest levels of school administration. We further recommend that the group leader be supported by appointed leaders within the NTT faculty. The faculty leaders would be known as “Functional Liaisons” (FL) with one selected from each department. The FL would be responsible for maintaining a relationship with their assigned department and to be familiar with the concerns, issues, and processes facing the NTT faculty in that department. The FL would also interact with department faculty and staff as a representative of the NTT group.

2.2 Staff: The group would also require the support of a group business manager, approximately 8 full-time staff members and a number of operational staff to be determined later.
2.3 Faculty Governance: The faculty within the NTT group would need to be organized into committees to carry forward the work of the group. Final determination of committees would be determined by NTT faculty, but suggested possible committees include:

- Personnel Committee: Annual Evaluations, promotion
- AACSB (maybe within personnel committee or a standalone)
- Development Committee
  - General teaching development subcommittee: teaching seminar, effectiveness, classroom technology, outcomes assessment
  - Onboarding/Mentoring/Buddy program subcommittee
- Strategy and Innovation Committee: Suggestions, improvements
- Recruiting Committee
- Student Engagement committee
- External Committee: corporate contact, external engagement, Solutions lab(?)

3. Processes and Activities

The NTT group leadership and faculty will necessarily be involved in the regular activities required during the year to assign teaching and service to, evaluate, and recruit and retain NTT faculty. For most processes we see this work as being done collaboratively with the departments and the NTT group being a support and partner to the departments. For each major activity we make specific recommendations to processes below.

3.1 Scheduling
The scheduling process should be a collaborative process between departments and the teaching group liaisons and teaching lead. Details include (see diagram below):

- Department chairs and schedulers identify their needs and preferences for assigning faculty to classes and then pass that information to the teaching group.
- Teaching group leadership completes the allocation of faculty to courses in the schedule
- Functional liaisons communicate/negotiate with the department schedulers to coordinate, work out, address any potential conflicts.
- Departments and teaching group share equal say in determining finalized teaching assignments.
- Unresolvable conflicts (“ties” so to speak - elevated to Teaching Lead and Department Chair first) are broken/resolved by program leadership (faculty directors of programs, GPO, UPO).
In this process the Functional Liaisons are equivalent to “assistant department chairs” for the teaching group and are responsible for managing/navigating relationships with the departments and their schedulers. We anticipate that conflicts could be kept to a minimum by good relationships between functional liaisons and the departments and most issues can be handled by negotiation and influence at those levels.

3.2 Hiring and Retention/Firing
Hiring and retention/firing of NTT is a collaborative process between teaching group and departments. Both groups evaluate potential hires and current faculty and make a recommendation to the dean’s office. Either group can generate a request for a job posting which is reviewed and approved by the Dean’s office. Both groups participate in the retention or non-retention decisions of current faculty.

3.3 Teaching Evaluation and Mentoring
The teaching group performs teaching evaluation of NTT faculty and as a service to the departments to evaluate those T&TT faculty upon department request. The teaching group evaluates the teaching quality of faculty and makes recommendations to chairs and personnel committees. All new NTT faculty are assigned to a formal mentoring relationship. Departments can recommend T&TT faculty for formal mentoring relationship.

3.4 Research Evaluation
Departments review research of NTT faculty based on department journal lists and make recommendations to the teaching group. Teaching group reviews NTT faculty research based on their journal list and makes final judgment of research contribution for NTT faculty.

3.5 Service Assignment and Evaluation
Service assignments are determined jointly between teaching group and departments. Annual evaluation of service contribution is evaluated both by the department for department-level service and by the teaching group for all other service. The teaching group makes the final determination of “satisfactory” service for NTT faculty. We highly recommend that a quantitative scale of service contribution be developed for use in evaluation of service contribution. This necessarily requires the development of a comprehensive tracking system for service.
3.6 Curriculum Development and Maintenance
Curriculum is owned by the departments. Our strong recommendation is that all departments manage curriculum via department-level Undergraduate and Master’s committees and that each committee has significant representation from the teaching group on each committee.

3.7 Budget
The teaching group would need funds needed for (a partial list): Workshops, staff, student worker/GA support, technology, office supplies, travel, furniture, phones, catering for meetings and social activities, summer teaching development grants, summer research grants, research.

Possible proposal for how a budget would work in a NTT faculty group:

Budgetary policy recommendations for the NTT group:
- Discretionary budget amount for each FT faculty ($3,500) - Conference travel, teaching materials, additional technology,
- Summer development (research or teaching), new course materials development.
- Overload pay per section of a course: (standardize across school to 12.5% of salary with a cap of $17,500)
- Teaching Load Standardization
- Merit increases are considered part of “salary’ so the NTT group would receive its own allocation for distribution to faculty for teaching merit.
- Management of funds generated by NTT revenue-generating activities.
4. Teaching Lead Position Description

In order to best represent the evolving importance of NTT, we suggest hiring an overall teaching lead. In our Matrix-based structure, the unit lead would have strong impact in a multitude of areas defined in the corresponding table below. We see this role positioned significantly more as a resource for NTT faculty that can positively impact the performance and satisfaction of our increasing NTT faculty. Similar to the role of the WPC Undergraduate Dean that handles student issues for all faculty, we see the Teaching Lead being an Associate Dean that handles teaching issues for all faculty.

Currently, we foresee the completion of the formal position announcement to be Summer 2018. This will be shared through traditional channels as well as informal conversations to identify optimal internal and external candidates. Ideally, the position would be hired in the next twelve months and that person beginning in Fall, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary for Teaching Unit</th>
<th>Faculty Budgetary Issues</th>
<th>AACSB and Faculty Research Agenda</th>
<th>Community Relationship Building</th>
<th>Online Pedagogical Issues</th>
<th>Necessary Skills that Cut across All Responsibilities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build the brand of the Teaching Unit across all constituencies</td>
<td>Professional Development for conference presentations/ travel</td>
<td>Knowledge of AACSB requirements and procedures</td>
<td>Business consulting/ engagement experiences for NTT faculty</td>
<td>Familiarity with Best Practices for online course delivery, Blackboard/other course delivery platforms</td>
<td>Highly collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represent NTT at the college level</td>
<td>Equipment procurement</td>
<td>Communicate individual and group baseline goals</td>
<td>Application of faculty Use-Inspired research</td>
<td>Tech Support Integration including textbook publisher offerings</td>
<td>Manage multiple deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop well-defined overall unit goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify potential pedagogical issues with NTT faculty pursuing research</td>
<td>Project-based coursework opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectively deal with diverse personalities of academic professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in and develop teaching methods (e.g. workshops)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High trust/integrity and sense of equality across departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open line of communication/accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>True love for students with a positive, problem-solving orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduling</th>
<th>Onboarding, Mentoring and Recognition</th>
<th>Academic Integrity</th>
<th>Honors Thesis and Service Roles</th>
<th>Performance/ Course Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with Teaching Leads, University Programs Office</td>
<td>Develop onboarding procedures and instructional resources</td>
<td>Dean of Academic Affairs in-house</td>
<td>Develop programs to handle increasing number of WPC Honors students</td>
<td>Develop the process for evaluating in-class performance/ setting teaching standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching specific awards</td>
<td>Continue to shape policies and techniques</td>
<td>Manage dept-specific service roles (e.g. Student Org Faculty Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operations

Motivation

Dean Hillman’s directive to create an organizational structure that legitimizes rather than marginalizes the pillar of teaching and learning as an intellectual pursuit, provided a great opportunity to present a structure that would respond to the changing needs of our students while leveraging the talents of the faculty. We identified the following six areas where we could enhance current operations: Onboarding, Professional Growth, Faculty Mentoring Program, Culture, Performance Review, Recognition (for details please see the Operations Supplement). We were also asked to compile a list of possible names for the new area.

As the work progressed it became apparent that there was a misalignment between the concentric standards we face, including: External Accreditations, University Standards, School Standards, and Department Standards (the later of which are reflected in performance evaluations). A classic example of this may be how the University/School level requires all clinicals do research or have their teaching load increased, while the benefits of this relative to other standards is unclear. This misalignment compromises core outcomes, including research, teaching, learning, recruiting, and retention, and creates problematic incentives.

As a result of these findings, we decided to tackle two additional tasks:
1. Incorporate a more comprehensive AACSB listing of credentials that more closely aligns to the changing educational needs.
2. Consideration for a more comprehensive faculty grade level system that more appropriately matches current duties.

Furthermore, we were presented with an idea by Dr. Joseph Dorion to create an Online Peer Review Journal that would elevate the teaching faculty by providing an innovative form of publishing centered on the scholarship of teaching. We believe the idea has great potential, and have written a short proposal to capture how it work (please see Operations Supplement - Peer to Peer Research in the Scholarship of Teaching).

Recommendations

We recommend the Transition Committee assists the new teaching lead in addressing the following items:

1. Incorporate three additional topics for all new Research, Clinical, Adjunct Faculty to the 4-Hour W. P. Carey Training consideration for a collaborative effort between OAS and expert faculty members (or the new teaching lead for each department) to be responsible for the new training. The preferred presentation to remain in-person with consideration for 3-5 minute online tutorials for scaling purposes. Consideration to add the ACUE Modules currently being tested by W. P. Carey as a possible series of teaching refinement was put to the side by the committee until W. P. Carey determines its effectiveness. For now, the Development committee determined three additional topics could be immediately included to the current W. P. Carey Onboarding program (please see Operations Supplement - Onboarding):
   a. Using Technology (Blackboard, Grade Roster, Textbook, In-the-Classroom Technology)
b. Teaching Methods (Best Practices, Using Learning Analytics and Creating Data, Effective Syllabi, Academic Integrity, First Day of Class, How to Drive Discussions, Student Engagement)
c. Quick FAQ’s (Where to go for supplies-batteries, pens….., Who to Call for Help)

2. Begin a new professional growth series in multiple mediums for all Research, Clinical, Adjunct and PhD Students. Since there are a multitude of opportunities for faculty to garner the AACSB requirements, the Development committee determined these new additions would be based on voluntary participation (please see Operations Supplement - Professional Growth).
   a. Workshop Series
   b. Podcast Series
   c. Lunch and Learn
   d. Webinars
   e. YouTube Channel

3. Establish a Faculty Mentoring Program for all new Research, Clinical and Adjunct Faculty. The program would coincide with the 9 month contract and the new faculty member would be matched to a faculty mentor at the W. P. Carey Orientation (please see Operations Supplement - Faculty Mentoring Program).

4. Enhance the new W. P. Carey culture and community expansion of Coffee Chats, After School Chats, Tailgates, Retreats and Parties are suggested. A Buddy Program to welcome all new faculty members and foster workplace friendships to be established. New faculty to be paired with a buddy at the W. P. Carey Orientation (please see Operations Supplement - Culture).

5. Begin to overhaul the Performance Review process to better represent the multitude and new (e.g. faculty mentoring) work/services undertaken by the Clinical and Adjunct Faculty to help determine par raises, promotion and multi-year contract eligibility (please see Operations Supplement - Performance Review). Items to include:
   a. Service
   b. Industry Partnerships
   c. Publications
   d. Department Administrative Duties
   e. Other

6. Form an Annual Award committee to consider additional Recognition Awards to include more people at all service levels (please see Operations Supplement - Recognition) at W. P. Carey to include:
   a. Peer Recognition
   b. Teaching
   c. Student Engagement
   d. Master Teacher list (Positive Culture, Dean’s List for Teaching)
   e. Outstanding Faculty Mentor Award
   f. Outstanding Buddy Award
   g. Sharing Is Caring (for those willing to do podcasts, workshops…)
   h. Sensible Shoes Staff Award
7. Select a name for the new area or unit. Three names were selected as possibilities for the new area, however, the Task Force determined further exploration was necessary and called on the assistance of Dr. Nancy Gray. An additional eight names were added to the original three:
   a. W. P. Carey School of Business | Catalyst
   b. W. P. Carey School of Business | AU (Gold)
   c. W. P. Carey School of Business | OmnX
   d. W. P. Carey School of Business | Moniker
   e. W. P. Carey School of Business | Accelerate
   f. W. P. Carey School of Business | Chiron
   g. W. P. Carey School of Business | Ecqeti
   h. W. P. Carey School of Business | Profhaus
   i. W. P. Carey School of Business | Saphr
   j. W. P. Carey School of Business | Equipe
   k. W. P. Carey School of Business | I

8. Develop a more comprehensive AACSB listing of credentials that more closely aligns to the changing educational needs and more closely aligns with the employee evaluation

9. Create a more comprehensive level of grading for faculty members that more clearly reflects the duties actually being performed in congruence with W. P. Carey’s mission and goals (please see Operations Supplement - UCL Academic Career Framework)

10. Begin a pilot program for the Online Peer Review Journal to elevate the teaching faculty (please see Operations Supplement - Peer to Peer Research in the Scholarship of Teaching).

Implementation

The Development committee recommends the new teaching lead heads the Transition Team to begin the operational enhancements suggested in this report with the understanding that we do not endorse implementation of any of the new programs until a thorough assessment is made of the current faculty duties. The recommendations for the new teaching lead and Transition Team are as follows:

1. Work with Dr. Kay Faris to reconfigure/begin the initial six areas of focus undertaken by the Development committee (Onboarding, Professional Growth, Mentoring programs, Culture/Community, Performance Review and Recognition). The Transition Team should consider forming sub-committees for each area e.g. Onboarding committee, Professional Growth committee…..(please see Operations Supplement).

2. Create a more comprehensive AACSB listing of credentials that more closely aligns to the changing educational needs and more closely aligns with the employee evaluation to include Social Media activity that is ASU-endorsed/linked by the Graduate College ‘Knowledge Mobilization’ initiative https://graduate.asu.edu/node/2009 to include: blogs, W. P. Carey Ted Talks, YouTube, Twitter, Interdisciplinary journal publications (to encourage collaboration among/between disciplines), Honors Contracts, Honors Thesis Advisor/committee member, Student advising/mentorship, ASU-endorsed/linked to charity/community outreach, Club advising, Formal Faculty Mentoring Program, Formal Buddy Program, Pedagogical Presentations to
include Brown Bags and Onboarding presentations, Serve as committee chair, Serve on at least 1 committee a year, Received award for teaching or advising/mentoring, Other activities: e.g. coaching a case competition, chaperoning students on a trip. To begin this process the following steps are suggested:

a. Develop a survey to determine the amount of time and effort placed in each task to determine point allocation
b. Revamp the current performance reward system to ensure consistency with the AACSB credentialing process
c. Determine a more fair and equitable distribution of responsibilities that will promote buy-in and ensure systemic reform is possible e.g. offering more flexible clinical contract

3. Create a more comprehensive level of grading for faculty members that more clearly reflects the duties actually being performed in congruence with W. P. Carey’s mission and goals.

a. Consideration to be given to incorporating the UCL- London’s Global University Academic Career Framework [www.ucl.ac.uk](http://www.ucl.ac.uk) that was developed to promote appraisal discussions and planning careers; it provides different grade levels for faculty members in the area of Research, Education, Enterprise and External Engagement and Institutional Citizenship (please see Operations Supplement - UCL Academic Career Framework).

4. Begin a pilot program for the Online Peer Review Journal to elevate the teaching faculty (please see Operations Supplement - Peer to Peer Research in the Scholarship of Teaching).

a. Determine a grid/matrix to determine/measure what an “effective” educator means to a business school (possibly a different matrix for each discipline)
b. Set up a set of policies/peer review guidelines and an editorial board
c. Search for grant money

We are convinced a higher level of engagement among and between faculty sparking conversation to transform learning in the new collaborative environment will change the workloads of faculty and teaching assignments. Accordingly, a fluid view of clinical contracts, teaching loads, professional development funds, stipends, decreased workloads will need to be considered by management to ensure a more equitable distribution of teaching and administrative service duties are allocated. It will assure the faculty that administration is aware of the opportunities/problems this new structure will entail, and assure the faculty, administration is willing to resolve them as they arise in this new structure.

We believe reward and acknowledgment for faculty and staff is key to the university’s wider ambitions for its research, education, innovation and enterprise activities and we are confident this will push W. P. Carey forward into the new world of academia.
Space Requirements

Motivation
A major concern for the W. P. Carey Forward Initiative has been planning for the innovative workspace to be housed on the 4th floor of the Business Administration building. Given the scope of faculty and staff that are impacted by the removal of all NTT faculty from current office spaces within departments, the importance of information and planning before any move takes place is fundamental. Prior to making recommendations, it was important to understand the needs and motivation for space and resources to support NTT faculty in the W. P. Carey Forward Initiative.

ASU’s faculty demographic reflects noted trends in higher education as we move away from a reliance on T&TT faculty and increase the NTT portion of faculty in the delivery of education. This is represented in a faculty demographic trends (Fig. 1, above). Given the shift in faculty proportions, we also note the significant number of faculty impacted. By Fall 2018, W. P. Carey will have an estimated 103 NTT faculty. In addition, changes in space will also need to accommodate support staff, teaching support, and a high proportion of students (calculated by both teaching load and class size) taught by NTT faculty.

The 4th floor of the BA building was offered as a candidate space to accommodate these needs and consolidate the workspace for NTT faculty, as well as encourage collaboration across departments. Encouraging innovation through the development of a collaborative space requires more open meeting spaces with casual amenities as we transition from the traditional closed-office environment.

Recommendations
All Task Force recommendations for space highlight the need to support faculty success in fulfilling the teaching and research mission of the University. The goal of these recommendations is to maintain a sense of community and connection with W. P. Carey rather than encourage faculty to work from home, which would undermine both culture and collaboration. To provide faculty with functional space to fulfill the diverse types of work they engage in on a daily basis, the activities to be supported in the space include:

- Quiet workspaces for course planning, research, writing, and projects
- Protected collaborative space for generating innovations in teaching and practice
- Meeting and office hour space for engagement with students
- Convenient co-location of staff, tutors, TAs and needed resources for teaching
- Secured storage space for teaching materials, exams, computers, and personal items
The scope given to the Task Force by focusing on the 4th floor of the BA building restricted the ability to make immediately actionable recommendations. This is due to the limitations of space in terms of both the number of people it is intended to serve and the diversity of functions needed to support the mission of W. P. Carey. We observe in our recommendations that the space can be used to either accommodate faculty workspace or student meeting space, but does not have the capacity to support both. Research on the square footage and the examination of multiple design plans indicate that the 4th floor has a maximum capacity of 126 people at any given time, if they are all standing. Practical use considerations puts the count closer to 115 for a diverse blend of seating, with traditional workspace counts being notably less.

We also note that inefficiencies in the use of space is a broader problem for the college and a redesign of the 4th floor intended to relocate NTT faculty to that space only partially addresses those concerns. Current inefficiencies in the use of office space deserves additional attention that was not supported under the charge of the Task Force. Thus, we recommend a transition team broaden the scope by evaluating space use across the college and within the departments prior to the relocation of any faculty or department to a redesigned 4th floor space by examining the use of offices by all faculty across various functions (office hours, research, meeting space, class preparation, et cetera). This evaluation must take place prior to NTT faculty relocation to ensure that faculty are not limited from fulfilling their responsibilities due to lack of workspace.

To assist in this evaluation, we recommend distributing a survey on workspace use and preferences to the impacted faculty. Use of the survey we have provided will ensure that we create an innovate space that meets the needs and expectations of faculty, reinforcing their desire to use the spaces and fostering continued contributions to a strong organizational culture. Moves made prior to the presentation of recommendations from a team charged with a broader scope in planning for these functional needs will only create confusion, attenuate faculty attempts to work with students on campus, and unintentionally reduce faculty motivation to be physically present. Such risks would undermine the mission of the school and the W. P. Carey Forward initiative.

Implementation

Moving forward, a transition team should be appointed to address an expanded scope for the evaluation of space. The scope of this team should include the entire college, identifying and designing the additional spaces needed for student interactions such as office hours, mentoring, and overseeing student clubs or teams. A survey to investigate office use within departments would also help to ensure recommendations for efficient use of space and pressure points.

The scope should allow the team to examine the possibility of meeting with students in spaces that could be located within departments to minimize student confusion in locating faculty. Students tend to identify faculty with department, rather than title, so interactions within identifiable department locations alongside T&TT faculty will provide ease of use for students.
This step of further evaluation should come prior to the removal of NTT faculty from departments.
Moving Forward

Motivation

We recognize that great work has gone into creating structures and recommendations that would be of great benefit to NNT faculty across the school. In particular, the growing percentage of NNT faculty represents a significant demographic shift in the school that requires acknowledgment and adjustments in administration for better representation and evaluation. As a result, our stated goal is full implementation of those recommendations. In recognition of the reality that changes take time and funding, it seems of value to identify intermediate steps that can create value for NTT faculty on the path to a full transition to the task force recommendations.

Recommendations

Step 1:
The first step is focused on hiring the teaching lead in order to give leadership, representation and voice to the overall transition process. It is also crucial at this point that the leader begin to develop and articulate a higher-level vision of the NTT group (beyond administration) including external activities, development, revenue generation, and future objectives of the group. The leader’s objectives at this stage are as follows: Lay the groundwork for and prepare to oversee the creation of the NTT group. Get to know the NTT faculty in order to become familiar with their experiences and concerns. Advocate for NTT faculty across the school and departments, including their representation on appropriate committees. Implement the onboarding, mentoring and “buddy” programs as recommended by the Development subcommittee in this report. Become familiar with AACSB evaluation criteria and processes with an eye to guiding the group to recommend future revisions. Become familiar with W. P. Carey and ASU bylaws, processes, and policies. Of some significance at this step is the need for social activities so that members of the large NTT faculty get to know each other in order to eventually feel part of the group as an identity and be able to work together.

Step 2:
The second step is to appoint the Functional Liaisons in order to begin to establish the processes and policies that will be needed for administration of the group when formed. This leadership group will determine standards and processes for faculty evaluation, assigning and evaluating service, evaluating research, and establishing classroom standards. These responsibilities will require the assistance of a task force drawn from NTT faculty to guide the establishment of the policies and processes. Functional Liaisons will be responsible for transparent communication with NTT faculty in their department and representing their voices during the process.
Step 3:
The final step is to hire staff to support and take on the full set of processes and responsibilities outlined in the governance and development recommendations of this report. At this point the group is fully developed and ready to adopt the processes discussed in part 3 of the Governance section. These responsibilities include scheduling, evaluation of research and teaching, budget management, and hiring and firing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire teaching lead</td>
<td>Assign functional liaisons</td>
<td>Full implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions/Objectives</th>
<th>Actions/Objectives</th>
<th>Actions/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay groundwork for and oversee creation of the NTT faculty group</td>
<td>Further develop group identity, objectives and activities.</td>
<td>Solidify and work to implement the group objectives and vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Dean-appointed transition task force.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissolution of transition task force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore broader vision for group’s activities and identity</td>
<td>Establish standards and processes.</td>
<td>Hire staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACSB mapping/evaluation (research and determine what goes in the spreadsheet evaluation; SA, PA, IP, SP, other)</td>
<td>Standards for NTT faculty evaluation</td>
<td>Take on full responsibilities of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for/Determining NTT representation across school and departments</td>
<td>Standards for assigning and evaluating service (e.g., honors theses)</td>
<td>Scheduling (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/identity: get to know the people, processes and issues.</td>
<td>Standards for evaluating research</td>
<td>Faculty hiring and retention (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty development (Onboarding, Mentoring, “Buddy” program)</td>
<td>Classroom (virtual classroom) standards (research and come up with standards)</td>
<td>Budget (3.6) Evaluation of teaching, research and service (3.3 - 3.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix

A1: Task Force Membership

Figure 2 depicts the official Task Force roster. Two faculty members were chosen by each department to represent them. In addition, Angelina Saric was asked to join to represent staff considerations, Elaine Armfield was asked to join to provide project assistance, and Michael Goul was asked to act as the facilitator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Samuelson</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Melissa.Samuelson@asu.edu">Melissa.Samuelson@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Shields</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:David.Shields.1@asu.edu">David.Shields.1@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvin Wong</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kelvinwong@asu.edu">Kelvinwong@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexia Shonteff</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Alexia.Shonteff@asu.edu">Alexia.Shonteff@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Hughner</td>
<td>Agribusiness</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Renee.shaw@asu.edu">Renee.shaw@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell Licon</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>wendell/licon@asu.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Frutiger</td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mike.Frutiger@asu.edu">Mike.Frutiger@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert (Bob) Wood</td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.E.Wood@asu.edu">Robert.E.Wood@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindy West</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mindy.West@asu.edu">Mindy.West@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathias Arrfelt</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mathias.Arrfelt@asu.edu">Mathias.Arrfelt@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detra Montoya</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Detra.Montoya@asu.edu">Detra.Montoya@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Eaton</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td><a href="mailto:John.Eaton@asu.edu">John.Eaton@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Davila</td>
<td>Supply Chain Management</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Eddie.Davila@asu.edu">Eddie.Davila@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynold Byers</td>
<td>Supply Chain Management</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Reynold.Byers@asu.edu">Reynold.Byers@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelina Saric</td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Angelina.Saric@asu.edu">Angelina.Saric@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Armfield</td>
<td>Dean's Office</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Elaine.Armfield@asu.edu">Elaine.Armfield@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Goul</td>
<td>Dean's Office</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Michael.Goul@asu.edu">Michael.Goul@asu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Task Force Membership

In addition to the existing task force membership, the guests shown in Figure 3 have been providing voluntary support for the efforts of the task force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Canales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Eaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Gray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Task Force Volunteers
A2: Charges and Working Committee Membership

Upon forming the Task Force, Dean Hillman provided the following seven charges. To address these, four working committees were formed around topical subsets of the tasks as follows:

Space Planning
- Make recommendations on space planning\(^1\)

Management
- Teaching lead and associated national/internal search\(^2\)

Governance
- Make recommendations on the matrix structure to retain strong discipline identification and rich connections with research units
- Work with department chairs to establish roles for discipline-specific teaching leads who will be the chief liaisons with the research units

Development
- Decide if “Professionals in Practice” should be the ongoing moniker; recommend alternates if not
- Set priorities for teaching development workshops
- Begin working on a mentoring program for all new teachers (and related onboarding activities)

Committee Membership

Figure 4 shows the existing committee membership. Names shown in bold represent the chairs of each committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Planning</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Frutiger</td>
<td>John Eaton</td>
<td>Mathias Arrfelt</td>
<td>Kathryn Eaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell Licon</td>
<td>Wendell Licon</td>
<td>Reynolds Byers</td>
<td>David Shields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Melissa Samuelson</strong></td>
<td>David Shields</td>
<td>Wendell Licon</td>
<td>Alexia Shonteff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexia Shonteff</td>
<td>Mindy West</td>
<td>Detra Montoya</td>
<td>Kelvin Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Canales</td>
<td>Robert Wood</td>
<td>Melissa Samuelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td>Angelina Saric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Committee Membership

---

\(^1\) Originally “Consult on and design the new workspace”; new language introduced 9/27/2017

\(^2\) Additional charge introduced 9/27/2017
In estimating the size of the population based upon the departments included in the initiative we compiled Figure 5. All categories of NTT within these selected departments would be included, in addition to all faculty associates and an estimated 6-10 staff members. Note that this scope of those included does not consider the potential additional staff who may be recruited to support the W. P. Carey Forward initiative’s Solutions Center (aka Solutions Lab). The Solutions Center is not currently within the scope of the Task Force’s activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Accountancy</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Supply Chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;TT</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof of Practice</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Assoc</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Faculty Employed by Included Departments as of Fall 2017

It is worth noting that the included NTT faculty groups are expected to continue to grow significantly over the course of the next few years.

---

3 Economics and Agribusiness are not currently included in the scope of the initiative.