

## College of Liberal Arts Academic Plan 2004-2009

### I. Introduction/Executive Summary

#### A. The College in 2009

The College of Liberal Arts lives at the center of the “old campus,” its buildings clustered around the University Quad. We are a colorful, varied, dynamic mix of students, faculty, and staff who come together at the heart of the campus to talk, listen, read, write, learn, and teach. We are home ground for Texas State freshmen—their first point of academic contact with the University. And we serve more than 4,000 undergraduate and graduate majors in eight humanities and social science departments. Those departments—along with our nine centers—carry out the mission of the College: to create and sustain an intellectually challenging and diverse academic environment in which excellent teaching, research, and service can flourish.

This dynamic College, like the University as a whole, faces many challenges over the next five years: continued growth in the number of students enrolled in general education courses as we work to “close the gaps” in Texas; a projected increase of over 20% in the number of majors; and growing demands for quality graduate education. These new challenges will strain resources that are already stretched thin. The College currently faces a 30,000 sq. ft. deficit in classroom and office space; has an on-campus SCH/FTE of 526, second only to that of the College of Business; and has an average (mean) class size of 46, the highest of any college at Texas State.

Despite these heavy demands on its physical and human resources, the College continues to offer students a first-rate educational experience. But in order to maintain quality and, at the same time, build new programs and address new needs, the College must have additional resources over the next five years—more space, faculty, staff, and funding to carry out its essential work. As we have in the past, we will do our part. We will continue to be an efficient and productive academic unit, and we will work to secure external resources through grants, contracts, and endowment funding. But we will also need additional financial support from the University.

As the 2004-2009 planning cycle begins, the faculty and staff of the College are optimistic about the future and confident that Texas State will meet its many challenges. If a substantial number of the initiatives proposed in this plan are implemented, the College will be well positioned in 2009 to fulfill its educational mission and to help the University enhance its growing reputation for excellence.

We envision in 2009 a thriving College with significantly more students—especially graduate students—than it serves today. We also envision a faculty and staff large enough to give those students the quality education, advising, and other academic services they need. We expect our faculty and students to be

substantially more diverse in 2009 than they are today. And we expect our faculty to equal, or exceed, the outstanding record of research, creativity, and public service that they established in the past five years.

## **B. Ranking of College Initiatives**

The Dean of the College—in consultation with department chairs, center directors, and faculty representatives—ranked initiatives based on their importance in helping the College meet current obligations and achieve future goals. Proposed doctoral programs were ranked based on quality, need, cost, and each program's readiness to move forward in the approval process.

## **C. Top College Initiatives 2004-2009**

1. Plan new building for the social sciences. The departments housed in the Evans Liberal Arts Building face a critical shortage of space, with a current deficit of nearly 30,000 square feet. Cost: \$30 million from tuition revenue bonds. See Evans Liberal Arts space analysis, page 4, below.
2. Secure endowment funding. The College must raise matching funds for three major endowments: the NEH Endowment for the Southwest Regional Humanities Center (\$650,000); the National Geographic Society Endowment for the Grosvenor Scholars Program (\$420,000); and the W. Morgan and Lou Claire Rose MFA Endowment (\$750,000). In addition, the College seeks to endow existing Liberal Arts centers. All funding for endowments is external.
3. Improve student learning, engagement, and retention 2004-2005. The College plans to lower average class size in selected departments by adding critically needed faculty in (a) Spanish, (b) applied sociology, (c) physiological psychology, (d) cultural anthropology, (e) legal studies, (f) African/South Asian history, and (g) religious studies. Adding these 7 lines will also address program growth and development and enhance faculty and curricular diversity. Cost: \$280,000 plus fringe.
4. Improve student learning, engagement, and retention 2005-2009. In order to reduce average class size, strengthen course offerings, address program growth, and enhance faculty and curricular diversity, the College plans to add 8 new lines in (a) archeology, (b) Spanish interpretation/translation, (c) public history, (d) public administration, (e) health psychology, (f) applied social research, (g) Latin American philosophy, (h) and technical communication. Cost: \$320,000 plus fringe.
5. Bring SCH/FTE back to Fall 2000 levels. Achieving this goal will require a minimum of 10 additional faculty lines beyond those listed above in items 3 and 4. Cost: \$400,000 plus fringe.

6. Enhance diversity. The College will (a) help Texas State achieve HSI status by establishing “2+2” agreements with humanities and social science departments at San Antonio College; (b) promote multicultural curriculum transformation, increasing the number of degree programs that include 45 classroom contact hours of multicultural study; (c) develop the Dunbar Heritage District in partnership with the City of San Marcos. Cost: (a) \$15,000 plus fringe for a 1-year .5 FTE staff in the VPAA’s office to establish transfer planning guides; (b) \$54,000 in faculty assigned time over 3 years for curricular research and course design; (c) external funds to be determined.
7. Fund deficit in summer budget. Funding of this initiative will allow the College to offer a course schedule equivalent to that offered in summer 2003. Cost: \$258,000 for summer 2004, with increases in subsequent years for growth and faculty raises.
8. Develop PhD programs (listed in order of priority). (a) PhD in English Studies—ready to move forward in 2004; (b) PhD in Geographic Systems of the United States (includes 1 new faculty line)—ready to move forward in 2005; (c) PhD in Public Service (includes 3 new faculty lines)—ready to move forward in 2009. Net surplus after 5 years: (a) \$312,000; (b) \$215,000; (c) \$318,000.
9. Improve quality of learning in large classes. Add 16 Instructional Assistants to expand students’ opportunities for interaction, collaboration, and individual faculty support in large classes. Cost: \$144,000 plus fringe from course fees or other sources.
10. Add staff support. New administrative assistants are needed to relieve overextended staff, to address growth, to meet new program needs, and to provide better service for students, especially majors. New staff for Anthropology (.5), English (1), History (.5), Psychology (1), Sociology (1), and International Studies (.5). Cost: \$90,000 plus fringe.
11. Increase M&O. The College needs approximately 15% in additional M&O to adjust for inflation, to address growth in faculty and students, to promote faculty and student scholarly/creative activity, and to develop and maintain Websites. Cost: \$75,000.
12. Develop distance learning opportunities. The College plans to offer a BS in Psychology and two certificate programs (forensic psychology and professional ethics) at the RRHEC. The College will also develop 30 new online courses and 6 online certificates or minors. Cost: \$60,000 from distance learning funds.

**D. Total New Faculty Lines Requested**

For 2004-05--7; for 2005-09--22. Total new lines over 5 years: 29. (Of this total, 25 lines are needed to return the College to 2000 SCH/FTE levels.)

### **E. Total Funding Excluding New Faculty Lines**

For 2004-05—\$612,000; for 2005-09—\$2,352,000. (This amount does not include the following: cost of a new social science building, funding sought from external sources, anticipated growth in summer school budget, and fringe benefits for IAs and staff.)

## **II. Process Used to Develop College Plan**

In spring and early fall 2003, faculty participated in developing department and center plans; the College plan reflects their involvement. In spring 2003, the Dean also met individually with department chairs and center directors to discuss planning.

More recently—from October 15 through November 12, 2003—the Dean involved departments and centers in the planning process in several ways. First, the Dean conducted individual meetings with chairs to identify each department's planning priorities. Second, the Dean asked chairs and center directors to present their top three priorities at a meeting of the Liberal Arts Council. Third, after reviewing these priorities, along with departmental plans, the Dean developed a tentative list of College priorities, which was presented and discussed at a second Council meeting. Fourth, the Dean asked departments and centers to identify their top two priorities from sections III and IV.A of their plans; these priorities were then discussed and rated on a 5-point scale by chairs, directors, and faculty representatives elected from each department as members of the Liberal Arts Budget Committee. Fifth, based on these ratings, and on previous discussions with chairs and directors, the Dean presented top College priorities at a College-wide meeting. Finally, the College plan was revised and presented for final editing to the Liberal Arts Council and posted on the Web.

## **III. Program Maintenance**

College maintenance items are summarized in the attached matrix—"Part III: Program Maintenance." Other maintenance needs listed in department and center plans are excluded from this matrix because of limited space; nevertheless, the College recognizes the importance of these needs and will support them whenever possible.

## **IV. Planning Categories**

College initiatives are summarized in the attached matrix—"Part IV: Planning Categories." Other important initiatives in department and center plans are excluded from the matrix because of limited space; nevertheless, the College endorses these initiatives and will support their implementation whenever possible.

**Evans Liberal Arts Building (ELA)  
Space Analysis—Fall 2003**

Four departments are currently housed in ELA: Anthropology, Geography, Political Science, and Sociology. These departments have outgrown the available space, making the construction of a new social science building imperative. The College has made this critical space need its top priority.

In Fall 2003, Anthropology ranked first and Sociology second in SCH/FTE among the University's 42 departments. Political Science ranked fourth and continues to experience a rapid growth of majors in the BPA program, partly because of Business students moving to the department. Geography has a severe shortage of research space; the department currently uses space outside ELA (Tech 5), and faces growing needs for research space in the GI Science PhD program, needs that will increase dramatically as the Texas Center for GI Science develops.

Overall, ELA has approximately 47,140 sf of academic space, all of it currently filled to capacity. For the four academic departments housed in ELA, the combined Fall 2003 space deficit is 28,929. The following table illustrates this deficit.

Department	Approx. FTFE	CurrentSpace (sf)	Current % Evans	Total Space Needed (sf)	Ratio of Current Space to Total Space Needed (%)	Space Deficit (sf)
Anthropology	10	4174	8.9	9666	43	5492
Geography	32	248333	52.9	43430	57	18597
Political Science	25	20261	21.6	13601	75	3340
Sociology	16	7772	16.5	9272	84	1500
ELA Total	83	47140	99.9	75969	62	28929

**Notes:**

1. Current Space is defined as building space allocated to specific departments for departmental use.
2. FTFE is calculated as the number of full-time faculty plus one additional faculty for every 4 sections being taught by adjunct or part-time instructors.
3. Current % ELA is a department's current square footage divided by total academic space in Evans (47,140 sq ft).
4. Space deficit for each department is based on survey data and reflects current Fall 2003 needs.
5. Current Space/Total is calculated by dividing total current space by total space needed.

6. Space outside ELA (an Anthropology classroom and lab space for Geography) is included in the space deficit column. The Center for Archaeological Studies will remain at BMC-West and is therefore not included.