



**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT**
Austin Community College

The Texas Education Code (51.301) mandates that “every college and university receiving state support or state aid from public funds shall give a course of instruction in government or political science that includes consideration of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the states, with special emphasis on that of Texas. This course shall have a credit value of not less than six semester hours or its equivalent.”

Therefore, the Government Department of Austin Community College has established the following goals:

1. To provide six semester hours of instruction in politics and government that acquaint students with the basic concepts used in studying politics and government and that meet the requirements of the Texas Education Code for every student receiving a degree from a state-supported college or university in Texas.
2. To offer an Associate of Arts degree in Government and provide all Government majors with an educational foundation that will allow them to successfully pursue a baccalaureate degree in government or political science at a four-year college or university.

The course offerings in the Government Department support the instructional objectives of many degree programs across the College, both on the academic transfer side and on the workforce side. Students taking Government classes at ACC develop their communication and writing skills, their critical thinking skills, and their ability to gather, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information in order to make informed judgments. These are skills that serve students well whether they desire to complete the core curriculum for transfer to a four-year institution, plan to complete an Associate’s degree here at ACC, or need specific job training and skills to enhance their employment opportunities.

In accordance with ACC’s Mission Statement, we seek to ensure that students have the general skills needed for future success, including “effective communication, gathering and critically assessing information, problem-solving, teamwork, leadership, and a focus on producing results of high quality.”



VISION SUMMARY

Government Department

In one sense, the vision of the Government Department has remained unchanged through the years. We seek to foster knowledge of the political system, to instill a greater understanding of the constitutional bases, institutions, processes and policies of local, state, and national politics and government, to encourage democratic participation in our political processes, and to contribute to a more informed electorate in “a rapidly changing democratic society.” (ACC Mission Statement) These goals will remain at the core of our vision of excellence for the Government Department.

In another sense, both teaching and learning are in the midst of fundamental changes, and we must be ready to embrace these changes. These changes reflect not only emerging technologies and their potential as effective teaching and learning tools, but also changes in the student population. ACC’s student body has been and will continue to be diverse in terms of age, academic skills, economic background, race and ethnicity. Many of the students in the Government Department are “nontraditional” students who have multiple demands on their time and attention. On the other hand, the continued growth of the Early College Start program means that more and more students taking Government classes are minors who are seeking college credit by taking courses in the core curriculum while still in high school. Our vision of the future must take into account the predicted growth in the diversity of our students and reflect our desire to seek excellence in instruction so as to best serve all our students.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board estimates that by 2015 there will be 50,000 additional college students in central Texas. ACC estimates that by 2010 the College will be serving 10,000 additional students. Since most of those additional students will be enrolling in Government courses, our Department must be prepared to meet present and future students’ needs by providing a quality teaching and learning environment. As the ACC mission statement says, we must seek “to provide a wide range of high quality educational services that meet the needs of our willing partners in learning”. This can only be done by expanding and upgrading facilities, expanding and upgrading the availability and effective use of technology in the classroom, expanding and upgrading professional development activities and pedagogical knowledge among our faculty, and expanding instruction, “to the extent possible, in methodologies which are not dependent on traditional classroom space.” (ACC Master Plan, Facilities Recommendation #5)

Both ACC’s Master Plan and ACC’s Strategic Priorities (1999-2004) envision continued growth in two areas that will particularly affect the Government Department: Distance Learning and the Early College Start program. Strategic Priority 2 asks ACC to “explore instructional delivery alternatives for courses and programs to ensure instructional flexibility.” For the Government Department, this means a vision of expanded course offerings in Distance Learning, strategies to increase the retention and completion rates for students taking Distance Learning Government courses, enhanced communication with and instructional support for our Distance Learning students, ongoing faculty training in instructional technologies that can facilitate teaching and learning, and initiatives to help us assess our effectiveness in Distance Learning instruction and then improve our performance in this area.

There are 28 independent and consolidated school districts in ACC's service area, and the Early College Start (ECS) program is growing by leaps and bounds in order to serve students in these school districts. High school students who want to get an early start on college demand core courses, including Government courses. For our Department, the continued expansion of ECS means recruiting capable faculty who appreciate and excel in teaching politics and government through this program. The Early College Start program is one tool for outreach that the Government Department must pursue. In addition, ACC's Master Plan (Facilities Recommendation #8) projects acquiring land for campuses in Williamson, Hays, and Bastrop counties. Our Department vision for the next five years reflects the College's goal to reach out to under-served and perhaps educationally disadvantaged populations in our eight-county service area, eliminating barriers to access to higher education.

Our outreach efforts should also take into account the College's emphasis on service learning. The Government Department must expand the number and availability of courses that include community service instructional components. This will not only be beneficial for our students with different learning styles, but will also allow us to develop stronger partnerships and greater visibility with groups and organizations in our community and thus build on the partnerships that have been developed by our existing internship course offerings.

Our vision also leads us to support the emerging Honors Program by developing creative and innovative Government courses that provide special learning opportunities for ACC's most gifted students. In addition, the Government Department must expand its participation in Learning Communities as another path to serving ACC's diverse student body. Learning Communities pair two instructors and the same cohort of students in two classes (e.g., a History section and a Government section are joined in such a community to facilitate student learning, student retention, and student success in both courses). And while the Department has been in the vanguard of the College's desire to internationalize the curriculum (with such things as the National Model United Nations Program), our vision of the future includes enhancing the international perspective in our course offerings in order to fully reflect the global society of the 21st century.

Our vision is not complete without focusing on our faculty. Because the Department will be asked to accommodate more students, place a greater emphasis on active learning, successfully adapt to diverse learning styles and new modes of instruction and delivery, we must be able to hire more full-time faculty who can help us achieve our goals for the future. As Strategic Priority 7 dictates, ACC (including the Government Department) must "ensure continued high quality teaching through expansion and continuous renewal of a strong core of professional faculty." Collegial Teaching Teams can be an integral part of our future as a department. Our vision demands greater dialogue and communication among the Government faculty, across the dividing lines of six comprehensive campuses plus outlying sites and centers, the dividing lines of class offerings ranging from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM, the dividing lines of full-time and adjunct faculty, and the dividing lines of long-time faculty and new faculty, old ways of doing things and new approaches.

The future of ACC's Government Department can be bright, but it will require the active participation of all our faculty, the availability and wise use of resources, the full support of the administration, and a commitment to integrity and excellence.



Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

The complete SWOT analysis can be found in the Government Department's documentation notebook. What follows is a summary of the SWOT that was conducted on October 4, 2002 and attended by six adjunct faculty, four full-time faculty, the administrative assistant for the Government Department, a current Government student, a full-time faculty member from the Political Science Department at Southwest Texas State University, and the Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences at ACC.

Strengths

The Government Department excels in a variety of areas. First and foremost, we believe that we have a capable, enthusiastic, animated, effective, and experienced faculty who reflect diverse teaching styles, care about our students, are prepared and accessible, and bring a variety of interests and experiences to the classroom, all of which enhance the learning opportunities available to ACC's students.

A second and related strength of the Government Department is in the area of technology. Collectively, our faculty are open to new technology, are technologically savvy, use technology effectively in our curriculum, and have a useful departmental Web site.

Another strength of the Department is citizen participation. For instance, students can attend and participate in the National Model United Nations program in New York City each year, or they can attend various departmental forums throughout the academic year that focus on current political issues, or they can register for our internship course. In addition, our program contributes to increased voter registration, democratic participation, community service, and an informed electorate.

A fourth strength revolves around a committed, dedicated and effective departmental leadership that promotes quality in instruction and fosters communication among all the faculty. The mentoring program is essential in integrating new faculty into the Department and is strongly supported by the departmental leadership. We have regular Task Force meetings, the faculty receive frequent e-mails and mailings from the Task Force Chair, we have a Government Faculty Handbook that is revised and updated each year and given to each faculty member, and we have a departmental Web site that provides a wide variety of links and information for our faculty. The Government faculty believe that the departmental leadership is effective in communicating policies and procedures, in setting goals and expectations, and in encouraging the sharing of teaching ideas and successes among the faculty.

An additional strength of the Government Department is student access. Our courses are offered throughout the ACC service area, from early in the morning to late in the evening as well as on Saturdays, at every campus, at ACC sites and centers, in 16-week, 12-week, and eight-week sessions, and in a variety of distance learning formats (PRN, DIR, PCM). Students have many choices in planning their course schedules and thus have maximum flexibility in choosing when and where to take required Government courses.

A final strength of the Government Department that should be highlighted here is innovation. The Government faculty believe that we have the ability and the opportunity to try new things. We have the freedom to seek out a wide range of faculty and professional development opportunities, we have a lengthy approved textbook list that allows for maximum choice for individual faculty members, and we have the opportunity to be creative in our teaching and learning activities. (There are more strengths listed in the complete SWOT analysis found in the documentation notebook.)

Weaknesses

The weaknesses of the Government Department primarily stem from things beyond our immediate control. Most importantly, we have budgetary weaknesses that reflect both internal budgetary decision-making (requesting additional money in the annual budget process that is never approved) and external factors (ACC's insufficient tax base and limited tax rate). As a result, we have an inadequate duplication budget, an inadequate travel budget, and insufficient funding for needed technology and professional development.

A related weakness is the insufficient number of full-time faculty. Given the large number of Government sections offered across the College – a number that will continue to grow in order to meet our expanding student population – we must be able to hire enough full-time faculty to ensure “a strong core of professional faculty” (Strategic Priority 7) who have a long term commitment to the Department, the College, and our students.

Another weakness that is beyond our control is access. Most ACC campuses suffer from moderate to severe parking problems. In addition, students with disabilities also find access across ACC's campuses, sites, and centers to be problematic at best.

The faculty also see the “One College” concept as a weakness that hampers our Department by seeing the campuses as “one size fits all” and by preventing campus-based decision-making.

Many of our faculty are over-committed (serving on College committees, taking on administrative duties in addition to teaching responsibilities, pursuing faculty and professional development on top of a normal teaching load) and we can end up shortchanging our students by taking on so many other obligations. There is a need for greater participation in Task Force decision-making by the faculty. Finally, some faculty are less inclined to be innovative and creative or to challenge their students or demand that their students meet high standards. We must find a way to promote the highest standards of professional excellence amongst all our faculty while balancing our various professional responsibilities so that our students are always well-served.

Opportunities

The Government Department at ACC currently has a wonderful opportunity to take advantage of a wide range of resources for teaching and learning. In addition to developing effective strategies (and finding the resources) to use emerging technology, we have an opportunity to enhance our community outreach, take advantage of resources from state and local government, expand our internship program for students, and develop closer ties with local governments and community groups. Such outreach

would not only facilitate student learning, but would also contribute to our faculty development.

We also have an opportunity to take greater advantage of the resources that are already available at ACC. These resources include the learning labs and computer labs for students, the libraries and all they have to offer to both students and faculty, the technology training that is available to faculty, and the many workshops offered by Instructional Technology and Faculty Development (ITFD) throughout the academic year.

A third opportunity that is available comes in the form of cooperative activities with other institutions of higher education in Central Texas. We should develop stronger ties with our sister departments at the University of Texas at Austin, Concordia University, Southwest Texas State University, Southwestern University, and St. Edward's University in order to facilitate faculty development and faculty symposia. We should also pursue partnerships with the private sector, local high schools, and state and local government in order to provide additional teaching and learning opportunities.

Threats

It probably isn't surprising that the Department sees its chief threats as revolving around administrative and budgetary issues. We are very concerned about the administrative decision-making process that reflects a lack of trust in the academic leadership, especially in the leadership of the Dean and the Task Force Chair. For instance, there is micro-managing of decisions that should be left to the discretion and best judgment of the faculty, in such things as full-time faculty hiring decisions and the budgetary process. The members of the Government Department see an atmosphere of mistrust and distrust of faculty in an array of decision-making and policy areas that is a threat to our ability to achieve our stated goals and objectives.

Secondarily, there is a perception among the Government faculty that College administrative rules, operating procedures, and administrative structure are all in a constant state of flux. Such a chaotic state does a disservice to our students as well as our faculty.

On the budget front, the threats revolve around reductions in the Department's budget that speak not only to an internal lack of trust, but also the external problems of ACC's low tax rate (which is capped at 5 cents per hundred dollars of property value) and limited tax base. To complicate the budgetary situation, we perceive a looming threat from the Legislature as it makes funding decisions in the midst of a projected shortfall for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 of somewhere between \$5 billion and \$12 billion.

A related threat comes from ACC's proposed tax referendum in the Spring of 2003. If the College is denied in its request to increase its tax rate, then the threats to program quality will only get worse. In addition, if the College fails to bring new independent school districts into the ACC district to expand our tax base, then the future is bleak indeed.



Program Need

Under legislative mandate, any student seeking a degree from a state-supported college or university must complete six hours of Government courses that include examination of both the U.S. and Texas Constitutions. Our Department provides these courses to students planning to transfer to a four-year school and to students seeking an Associate's Degree at ACC. Our program seeks to foster knowledge of the political system, to instill a greater understanding of the constitutional bases, institutions, processes and policies of local, state, and national politics and government, to encourage democratic participation in our political processes, and to contribute to a more informed electorate. We believe that we meet a fundamental need in our rapidly changing democratic society.

In addition, the Government Department is integral to ACC's desire to serve the community. We are a reflection of the mission (Board Policy A-1), values and ideals of the College (quality, flexibility, accessibility, diversity; Board Policy A-2). We are central to the goal of equal educational opportunity (Board Policy A-3). We work to meet the needs of the entire ACC service area (Board Policy A-5). We seek to enable students to meet their educational goals (Board Policy A-6). We are involved in College-community linkages (Board Policy C-6). Most importantly, we agree with Board Policy D-1 that says "in a free and democratic society, all persons should have a continuing opportunity to develop skills and knowledge as well as to enhance their understanding of the responsibilities in that society."

Enrollment Trends

	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002
Comb. Sects.	423	452	457	482	472
Enrollments	13,152	13,379	13,902	15,070	15,027
Enrolls/Sect.	31.1	29.6	30.4	31.3	31.8
Credit Hrs.	39,456	40,137	41,706	45,205	45,081
Contact Hrs.	631,296	624,192	667,296	723,360	721,294

Number of Degrees

	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01
Government	13	9	2	2	5

Most students taking Government classes at ACC are not seeking an Associate's Degree in Government. The ACC Fact Book for 2001-2002 indicates that 41.7% of all ACC students are taking courses for transfer rather than seeking an Associate's Degree.

Program Cost

The mission of the College includes offering freshman-level and sophomore-level academic courses that lead to an Associate's degree or that serve as the core of a baccalaureate degree program at a four-year college or university. In addition, the State of Texas mandates that all students seeking a degree from any state-supported institution of higher education must complete six hours of Government courses. Thus,

the minimal costs associated with the Government Department are more than justified by the fundamental service we provide to our students as well as the net revenue that we generate for the College.

The Government Department operates on a “bare-bones” budget each year. The pattern in recent years shows that we typically spend what is allocated in each area (supplies, for instance). In addition, our duplication budget has not been adequately increased as more and more Government sections have been offered in the last few years (especially with Early College Start expanding every semester), so we typically overspend in that budget area.

The single biggest cost to the College in support of the Government Department is faculty salaries (both full-time and adjunct) and benefits. In FY 2001, salaries and benefits cost \$1,412,368 out the total departmental budget of \$1,456,241; in FY 2002, the cost of salaries and benefits was \$1,635,442 out a departmental budget of \$1,679,315 (figures for FY 02 includes faculty overloads while figures for FY 01 do not); in FY 2003, Government faculty salaries and benefits will cost the College \$1,741,424 while the total Government Department budget is \$1,786,971.

Looking at contact hours, figures from FY 2001 reveal that the Government Department provided a total of 720,240 contact hours and brought in direct revenue of \$4,490,036. By the time direct and indirect costs are accounted for (indirect costs are allocated to instructional departments based on contact hours), the Government Department in FY 2001 provided a net surplus to the College of \$508,114.

Looking at it another way (again using figures from FY 2001), the Government Department brought in \$6.23 per contact hour, spent \$5.53 per contact hour, and provided a net surplus to the College of \$0.71 per contact hour.

Program Effectiveness

We believe that the teaching and learning, and the course offerings and student outcomes in the Government Department, all meet a high standard of quality. We also recognize the need for ongoing adaptation to new technologies and new pedagogies in order to maintain the quality of instruction and continue to seek to meet a standard of excellence. In addition, we must keep in mind that GOVT 2305 and GOVT 2306 are required courses and are taken by students across the College with varying interests and academic skills. The wide diversity of the student population in Government classes will of course be reflect in students' grades and student retention.

Student Achievement and Student Retention

The following table provides data for A-B-C-D-F-W rates in Government courses (both in class and distance learning) from Fall 1999 through Spring 2002.

TERM	Percentage of students earning each grade.											
	GOVT 2305						GOVT 2306					
	As	Bs	Cs	Ds	Fs	Ws	As	Bs	Cs	Ds	Fs	Ws
Fall 1999	20.4	25.7	18.8	5	9.6	20.4	22.2	27.8	16	3.7	8.1	22.2
Spring 2000	23.1	25.8	18.9	3.4	7.5	21.2	22.2	26.9	17.7	3.4	6.5	23.4

Summer 2000	29.9	33.1	21.8	2.5	1.9	10.4	28.7	33.9	23.1	2.1	3.1	9.1
Fall 2000	20.9	25.5	19.2	3.9	8.5	22	20.7	25.5	19.5	4.6	8.8	21
Spring 2001	24.0	24.6	18.4	3.7	9.6	19.6	21.1	27.3	19.2	3.8	6.5	22
Summer 2001	30.2	32.4	21.2	2.2	3.8	10.2	28.9	34.3	22	2.8	2.6	9.4
Fall 2001	20.6	27.2	19.4	4.8	8.3	19.1	20.9	26.9	20.6	5.3	6.9	18.8
Spring 2002	21.5	24.5	19.4	4	8.8	20.7	21.7	27.7	21.2	3.5	6.3	18.7

According to a report based on Fall 2001 data, the Government Department's combined D-F rate was 12.5%; the ACC average was 8.7%. The Government Department was one of 34 departments to exceed the College average; when consideration was given to the enrollment level of the instructional area (examining instructional areas with enrollments of at least 500 students), 11 departments had non-transfer rates higher than the ACC average. For withdrawal rates, the College average was 22.5% and the Government Department was below that average. Data indicate that the Government Department accounts for less than 10% of total withdrawals across the College, which is admirable given our high enrollment.

There is no specific information available regarding the number of students who completed degree requirements. While some students major in Government and complete an Associate's Degree, most students who enroll in Government courses are planning to transfer the hours. Data on transferring students is incomplete and only includes students who transferred to a public institution in Fall 2000: 63%.

Student Outcomes

The data available regarding number of students who transfer within one year had such a small number of students that it was unreliable. What we can say from anecdotal evidence is that our students go on to attend the University of Texas at Austin, Southwest Texas State University, Texas A&M University, Texas Tech University, University of Texas at San Antonio, University of North Texas, University of Houston, University of Texas at Arlington, Stephen F. Austin State University, Angelo State University, Tarleton State University, Sam Houston State University, University of Texas at Dallas, Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi, University of Texas - Pan American, Texas Woman's University, University of Houston – Downtown.

The transfer grade point average of ACC's students who received an Associate's Degree in Government and then transferred to a four-year school is also unavailable.

The Government Department has used a variety of instruments to assess student learning in recent years. We have used multiple choice pre-tests and post-tests, multiple choice exit tests, multiple choice questions embedded in exams throughout the semester, and short essay questions embedded in exams. In general, we have discovered that we teach some concepts better than others. In GOVT 2305 we teach such things as divided government, *Marbury v. Madison*, voter turnout well, but we could do a better job in GOVT 2305 of teaching such things as federalism, pluralist theory, and public opinion. In GOVT 2306 we have learned that we are effective in teaching such things as the characteristics of the Texas Constitution, Texas political culture, and legislative redistricting, but we are less effective in teaching local government.

As a discipline, we are constantly striving to improve our communication of course content as well as our tools for teaching.

Access

Government courses at ACC are offered at all hours of the day, at all campuses, sites, and centers, in 16-week, 12-week, and eight-week sessions, in traditional classrooms, with IVC equipment, and through distance learning (including Web-based courses, directed learning courses, and print-based courses). We offer Honors courses and special topics courses (Civil Liberties and Civil Rights; U.S. Foreign Policy), as well as offering our core courses with a particular emphasis (Minorities Emphasis in GOVT 2305; Land Use Policies in GOVT 2306). The accessibility of our courses for ACC students across the College is illustrated in the following table showing number of sections offered by campus.

	CYP	EVC	NRG	PIN	RGC	RVS	Centers	DL	Sites	Total
1999-2000	24	19	110	48	86	80	23	66	5	461
2000-2001	26	21	115	46	94	82	29	75	8	496
2001-2002	25	19	115	41	91	84	29	81	23	508

The following table shows the number of Distance Learning sections offered by semester.

Fall 1999	22	Fall 2000	23	Fall 2001	24
Spring 2000	26	Spring 2001	25	Spring 2002	24
Summer 2000	15	Summer 2001	18	Summer 2002	31

The following table shows course offerings by time of day.

	Morning	Afternoon	Evening	Weekend	
Fall 1999 - Summer 2000		207	123	124	7
Fall 2000 - Summer 2001		217	142	132	5
Fall 2001 - Spring 2002		159	112	81	3

The following table shows number of sections cancelled by course.

	GOVT 2305	GOVT 2306
Fall 1999 - Summer 2000	16	11
Fall 2000 - Summer 2001	16	12
Fall 2001 - Spring 2002	15	9

The following table shows number of full sections by course. This illustrates our continuing effort to meet the demands of ACC's students for courses at certain campuses and at certain times of the day or days of the week. When building schedules for future semesters, the Government Department typically creates three or four new sections each semester to meet high demand.

	GOVT 2305	GOVT 2306
Fall 1999 - Summer	63	41

2000		
Fall 2000 - Summer	74	39
2001		
Fall 2001 - Spring 2002	48	37

In addition to offering courses across the college and across the time spectrum, we also work with the Office for Students with Disabilities at each campus to ensure that any student with a special need is adequately accommodated in any Government classroom, thus eliminating the barriers related to physical or learning disabilities.

ACC students registering for Government sections would no doubt say that the chief barriers preventing them from taking the Government class of their choice are parking and classroom space. Parking is a problem at many of our campuses, and Government classrooms only accommodate 36 students - a barrier to those who all want to take a Government course at Northridge at noon on Tuesdays and Thursdays!

Curriculum

The Government Department works hard to ensure that our curriculum, our textbooks, our course syllabi, and our course learning objectives are up-to-date and well-defined. We have a Government Faculty Handbook that contains prescribed Learning Outcomes and Learning Objectives for GOVT 2305 (U.S. Government) and GOVT 2306 (Texas State and Local Government) – outcomes and objectives that are the result of a cooperative effort among the faculty over several years to define the basic content of our courses. A copy of the Faculty Handbook has been included in the self-study notebook for reference.

We update our approved textbook list each year in order to ensure that we are using the latest editions as well as providing our faculty with an annual opportunity to make revisions to the textbook list to reflect their ongoing pedagogical and curriculum preferences. The current approved textbook list can be found in the Government Faculty Handbook. In addition, the Department Chair has copies of syllabi from all current instructors.

Our course and program listings in the ACC catalog are also up-to-date. The Department revised its degree requirements in Spring 2002 in order to stay current with the core curriculum requirements of THECB and we also updated our listings and course descriptions for the 2002-2003 catalog.

ACC's Government faculty strive to take full advantage of the instructional resources that are available to us, including utilizing ACC's libraries (both books and periodicals as well as Web resources), the computer labs for both faculty and students, and the offerings available in the media centers. Many of us use videos, government Web pages, library assignments, and other tools to facilitate student learning. We could not effectively teach our classes without the help, availability, and support of ACC's instructional resources.

As a department we seek to use a variety of tools for assessing the effectiveness of our courses. Our student assessment process has been described in the "Student Outcomes" section of this report. In addition, we have a rigorous faculty evaluation process which includes detailed examination of course syllabi, exams and quizzes, required papers or

presentations, assignments, and any other elements of courses as they are taught by approximately 70 faculty members. Our evaluation process in recent years has sought to acknowledge what our faculty do well in addition to making suggestions for revision or improvement. All of this contributes to ongoing course effectiveness.

We have also sought to participate in the College's goal of internationalizing the curriculum through such programs as the NMUN (National Model United Nations) and the INMP (International Negotiations Model Project). At present, members of our faculty are investigating the possibility of participating in the Model Organization of American States, developing an honors course that focuses on globalization as it relates to American politics and government, and updating our U.S. Foreign Policy course. In addition, as a department we have actively participated in paired courses/learning communities (for instance, pairing students in a developmental reading course with a Government section; or, pairing students in both a History and a Government class).

Technology

Faculty members in the Government Department find technology to be a wonderful teaching and learning tool. For classrooms that have Internet hook-ups, the teacher can take his/her students to the Web page of an elected official, an interest group, a polling organization, a political party, a news organization, the Texas Legislature, or a city government in order to provide an opportunity for analysis, assessment, and critical thinking in an active learning environment. We can also build learning assignments around technology, helping our students by directing them to online resources that can be invaluable long after they have left the classroom. In addition, we can take advantage of technology (IVC classrooms) to simultaneously teach students at two locations, thus improving our course accessibility. While we can teach without technological bells and whistles, we certainly find technology to be a reliable tool in our pedagogical toolbox.

The following table illustrates our ever-expanding efforts to use technology effectively by showing the number of Government sections taught through our Distance Learning program in the past three academic years.

	Fall	Spring	Summer	Total
1999-2000	22	26	15	63
2000-2001	23	25	18	66
2001-2002	24	24	31	79

Faculty

Faculty in the Government Department meet the minimum SACS criteria (Master's Degree, at least 18 graduate hours in political science). In comparing the Fall 2001 semester with the Fall 2002 semester, 43% of all Government sections were taught by full-time faculty in Fall '01 and 40% of all Government sections were taught by full-time faculty in Fall '02. There is one faculty member on sabbatical in the 2002-2003 academic year, which accounts for most of that difference. Contact hour data for the Department from Fall 2001 show that 44% were taught by full-time faculty, 54% were taught by adjunct faculty, 3% taught by "other".

The Government Department is active in professional and faculty development, encouraging all faculty to take advantage of development opportunities that are

presented, either through the College faculty development office, through departmental offerings, or by attending professional conferences and symposia. The Department offers “brown bag” seminars during the lunch hour two or three times each semester as well as a Saturday faculty development colloquium once in the Fall semester and once in the Spring semester. For instance, in the 2001-2002 academic year, we offered a brown bag with Representative Dawnna Dukes of the Texas House, another with Toby Futrell (now Austin City Manager) on Smart Growth, and we offered a four-hour symposium with a panel of state judges discussing the judicial selection process. To date in the 2002-2003 academic year, we have heard from Ross Ramsey, editor of *Texas Weekly*, regarding the state executive and legislative elections; the author of a new biography of Sam Houston; and, an expert on adult learning styles.

In the 2000-2001 academic year, 75% of our active adjunct faculty participated in faculty development activities and 92% of our full-time faculty participated in faculty development activities. In the 2001-2002 academic year, 53% of our adjunct faculty and 100% of our full-time faculty participated in faculty and professional development activities.

Many of our faculty attend such professional conferences as the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, the Midwest Political Science Association, the Southern Political Science Association, the Southwestern Social Science Association, the Texas Municipal League, and the White House Historical Association.

Student evaluations over the years have indicated that the Government Department offers a sustained level of quality instruction. Students regularly comment on the knowledge, interest, enthusiasm, passion, and commitment of our faculty, as well as faculty members’ senses of humor and their ability to make these required courses interesting and relevant. The vast majority of Government faculty members receive a Very Good or an Excellent on their student evaluations each year.

Diversity

Our students reflect the diversity of the overall student population at ACC, as illustrated in the following data.

Gender

	Female	Male	Total
Fall 1999	2611	2486	5097
2000	7648	6569	14217
2001	8191	6113	15304
Spring 2002	2632	2356	4988

Ethnicity

	White	Black/ Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Non-Resident Alien	Other	Total
Fall 1999	3556	224	911	302	36	55	13	5097
2000	9438	622	2440	1213	76	259	169	14217
2001	9740	729	2644	1454	162	313	262	8191

Spring 2002 3145 257 989 331 58 98 101 4988

The following table reflects the diversity of the Government faculty who taught in Fall 2002.

Fall 2002			
	Female	Male	
	24	45	
Black	Hispanic	Anglo	Other
8	8	52	1

Student Satisfaction

Student evaluations in recent years tell us that our faculty set an admirable standard of excellence. Students regularly comment on our faculty's energy and enthusiasm, knowledge of the discipline, interest in students' learning, ability to effectively communicate information, and ability to make the subject matter interesting and relevant. This is particularly satisfying given the fact that we teach required courses that students must take, whether they have an interest in politics and government or not.

Transfer Institutional Satisfaction

ACC's Government courses are designed to transfer as part of the core curriculum or general education requirements, thus we have transfer agreements with all state-supported colleges and university in Texas as well as some private institutions such as St. Edward's University, Concordia University, and Baylor University. In addition we have transfer agreements with several universities in other states (typically for GOVT 2305, U.S. Government), including Saint Leo University in Florida, Bellevue University in Nebraska, Capella University in Minnesota, Governor's State University in Illinois, and the University of Phoenix Online.

The primary transfer problem arises when students take three hours of Government at another school and three hours of Government at ACC. Because the legislative mandate of six semester hours in Government can be met in two ways, transferability can sometimes be problematic. At about half of Texas colleges and universities, the legislative requirement is met by offering one three hour course in Texas state and local government (such as our GOVT 2306) and one three hour course in U.S. national government (such as our GOVT 2305). The other state universities and colleges offer six hours over two courses and cover national, state, and local government in both courses (such as UT's GOV 310L and GOV 312L). Government faculty, as well as ACC counselors and advisors, recommend that students take all six required hours at one school to avoid any problems of transferability. While an occasional complaint arises, such complaints are infrequent, especially since the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board adopted the common course numbering system.

Reliable data from transfer institutions concerning the success of ACC's Government students is unavailable. What is known is that 33.9% of first-time-in-college students who took at least 15 semester hours in baccalaureate transfer courses at ACC transferred to a four-year college or university within four years, which is slightly below the

statewide rate of 34.6%. In looking at GPAs for ACC's students who transfer, data from the 2000 academic year indicate that students transferring to Southwest Texas State University (655 students) had a cumulative GPA of 2.5, students transferring to the University of Texas at Austin (445 students) had a cumulative GPA of 2.9, and students transferring to the University of North Texas (179 students) and the University of Texas at Arlington (88 students) had a cumulative GPA of 2.7.



INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES

The Government Department has made a concerted effort since 1997 to develop, administer, and appropriately respond to reliable institutional effectiveness measures. We began the effort in 1997 by stating that students who complete a government course would possess a knowledge of the basic concepts and processes of politics and government, and we measured this with an exit test in randomly selected sections. Our initial results showed that students in the United States Government course scored a mean of 67.9% correct answers, while students in the Texas State and Local Government course scored a mean of 63.5% correct answers. This led to the initial development of what is now known as the Government Faculty Handbook which, in its first edition, included a list of key terms (approved by the Task Force) that should be covered in the two courses.

The following year (1998-1999) we administered a pre-test during the first week of the Fall semester and a post-test during the last week of the Fall semester to randomly selected sections of both courses. The results showed movement (correct answers on the pre-test vs. correct answers on the post-test), but the movement did not meet our goal of one standard deviation improvement, nor did the overall results on the post-test show that students completing the course scored an average of 70% correct. Relying on a Wilcoxon rank sum test, the differences between the pre-test results and the post-test results were statistically significant and, although the students' scores did not achieve the stipulated goal set by the Task Force, there were significant changes in the knowledge of the students who completed either of the two courses. As a result of this second effort, the Task Force developed more specific learning objectives to go along with the list of key concepts that had been developed the previous year, and all faculty were encouraged to rely on these learning objectives in teaching their courses.

In academic year 1999-2000, our intended outcome was that students who completed GOVT 2305 or GOVT 2306 would have a basic knowledge of core concepts and the related learning objectives. Core concepts for GOVT 2305 included democracy, political ideology, pluralist and elitist theory, separation of powers, checks and balances, federalism, judicial review, civil liberties, civil rights, iron triangles, interest groups, political socialization, suffrage, public opinion, party identification, elections, turnout, political action committees, legislative, executive, and judicial powers, the Bill of Rights, the federal courts, economic policy, social welfare policy, foreign policy, and defense policy. Core concepts for GOVT 2306 included democracy, the Texas Constitution, separation of powers, checks and balances, federalism, judicial review, the Texas Bill of Rights, civil liberties and civil rights in Texas, Texas political ideologies and political culture, political socialization, partisan realignment, primaries, voter turnout, interest groups, iron triangles, the Texas executive branch (governor, plural executive, bureaucracy), the Texas Legislature (including legislative redistricting), the Texas judiciary, state and local government revenues and expenditures, county and municipal government, municipal annexation, special districts, and public education funding.

To measure our effectiveness, in Fall 1999 we administered a 2305 or a 2306 pre-test and post-test (each consisting of 30 multiple choice questions related to the key concepts and learning objectives for that course) to randomly selected sections. Once again, while

the results showed movement (for instance, on the GOVT 2306 pre-test, students averaged 48% correct while on the post-test students averaged 57% correct), they did not meet the Task Force's standards of 70% correct on the post-test. Consequently, in the summer of 2000 the Task Force established more explicit learning outcomes and learning objectives for both 2305 and 2306 which were then distributed to all faculty for the upcoming academic year. In addition, we decided to forgo the pre-test and to administer a multiple-choice exit exam in Fall 2000 to all 2305 and 2306 sections in hopes of more accurately measuring what students had learned by the end of the semester.

As a result of these decisions, the Government Department now has well-developed learning outcomes and learning objectives for GOVT 2305 and GOVT 2306. The learning outcomes reflect broad areas of knowledge, and the learning objectives are explicit guides for each learning outcome. For GOVT 2305, the learning outcomes revolve around constitutional foundations, institutions of government, linkage institutions, political learning, campaigns and elections, civil liberties, civil rights, and public policy. For GOVT 2306 the learning outcomes focus on Texas constitutional foundations, institutions of state government, institutions of local government, linkage institutions in Texas, political learning in Texas, campaigns and elections in Texas, and public policy in Texas. All of these learning outcomes and objectives are included in the Government Faculty Handbook that is updated and distributed to all faculty at the beginning of each new academic year.

In the Fall 2000 semester, we administered our multiple choice exit exams to all sections of 2305 and 2306; our goal was a mean for correct answers of 70%. We did not meet this goal. After lengthy debate and focused effort over several years, the Government faculty in the Spring 2001 came to the conclusion that multiple choice assessment questions focus on discrete facts rather than synthesis and analysis of information. In an effort to more accurately assess whether students are learning to think critically and analytically about politics and government, the Task Force voted to move to a short essay based assessment test for the 2001-2002 academic year.

Short essay assessment exams were administered to randomly selected sections of GOVT 2305 and GOVT 2306 in the Fall 2001 semester. These questions were typically embedded in unit exams and the essays were then graded by two different faculty members (using a one to four grading scale and grading rubrics developed by the Task Force), with results reported in Spring 2002. Our hope was that 70% or more of students would score at least a three out of four on the short essay questions. While we were pleased at the number of students who scored a two or higher, we were not satisfied at the number of students who scored a three or higher. We decided to use short essay questions (from a "test bank" that had been developed for this purpose) again the Fall 2002 semester, since it was felt that it would take two or three years with this new assessment instrument to draw any firm conclusions. In addition, we decided to invite a colleague from Developmental Writing to a "brown bag" seminar open to all Government faculty to provide us assistance in teaching students how to write essays. Further, a faculty member volunteered to collect articles on teaching and learning (especially regarding critical thinking, effective writing, etc.) to be distributed to all faculty. And finally, we decided to hold a "brown bag" focusing on the area of public policy and another focusing on local government.

As of the writing of this report (Fall 2002), short essay questions are again being administered to randomly selected sections of 2305 and 2306 and answers will be graded and results reported to the Task Force in Spring 2003. The Task Force has been quite pleased with the way this multi-year process has helped us to develop learning outcomes and learning objectives for our two core courses. We are still dissatisfied, however, with our assessment instrument and measures as they relate to those learning outcomes and we will continue to seek the most effective way to measure what our students are learning.

As a result of this program review process, the Government Department Task Force has proposed the following new institutional effectiveness measures to be used in combination with our current short essay instrument.

- ❑ Compare completion rates of students in GOVT 2305 and GOVT 2306 with completion rates of students in all courses on the academic (transfer) side.
- ❑ Compare grade distributions (A, B, C, D) in GOVT 2305 and GOVT 2306 with grade distributions in all courses on the academic (transfer) side.
- ❑ Track success rates of students in GOVT 2305 and GOVT 2306 against their incoming reading scores on the TASP (Texas Academic Skills Program) test.
- ❑ Assess completion rates of students in Learning Communities (including paired reading courses) in which a Government section is partnered with another course.
- ❑ Assess completion rates of students in Government Honors courses and Government Internship courses.



RECOMMENDATIONS

One area of improvement focuses on our courses offered through Distance Learning. Open Campus Government sections typically have a noticeably higher attrition rate than those sections offered in class, and as a Department we would like to address that problem with the following recommendations.

- ❑ Create a Government Department-specific Distance Learning online assessment instrument to help students ascertain whether they are capable of succeeding in a Government Distance Learning course.
- ❑ Create a streaming video orientation for all Distance Learning students who enroll in a Government class.

While the recommendations regarding Distance Learning courses seek to use technology effectively, we would like to make some additional recommendations in that area, as follows.

- ❑ Develop a Government Department Blackboard page for faculty. This Bb page would be a resource for faculty to share assignment ideas, in-class projects, interactive learning tools, interesting Web sites, etc.
- ❑ Put a permanent computer projector in every Government classroom so that all Government faculty can effectively use such things as PowerPoint and the Web as teaching and learning tools.
- ❑ Schedule Government classes in the active learning classrooms that are to be provided at every campus under the Master Plan.
- ❑ Provide every full-time faculty member with a laptop computer to facilitate teaching and learning.

Another category of recommendations is curriculum development.

- ❑ Expand Honors course offerings.
- ❑ Create a new special topics course (GOV 2633) to offer as an alternative to Civil Liberties/Civil Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy.
- ❑ Expand Learning Communities course offerings.
- ❑ Continue to internationalize the curriculum, e.g., by getting involved in the Model OAS program to complement our NMUN course offering.

A final category of recommendations is faculty development.

- ❑ Develop an effective relationship with our sister institutions to offer cooperative faculty development opportunities.
- ❑ Support faculty attendance at professional conferences with adequate travel budgets.
- ❑ Offer a symposium once a year for students as well as faculty, perhaps utilizing the IVC rooms at each campus.



ACTION PLANS

Recommendation: Create a Government Department-specific Distance Learning online assessment instrument.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Create ad hoc committee.	Fall 2003	Dept. Chair
	Committee develops draft of instrument.	Spring 2004	Ad Hoc
	Estimated Year 1 costs:	none	
2	Instrument is piloted.	2004-2005	Chair and Ad Hoc
	Estimated Year 2 costs:	\$500	
3	Instrument is administered.	2005-2006	Chair, DL staff
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	none	
4	Instrument is updated and revised.	2006-2007	Chair and Ad Hoc
	Estimated Year 4 costs:	\$500	



Recommendation: Create a streaming video orientation for Government Distance Learning students.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Create ad hoc committee.	Fall 2003	Dept. Chair
	Committee develops content of orientation.	Spring 2004	Ad Hoc
	Estimated Year 1 costs:	none	
2	Committee works with tech support to produce video.	2004-2005	Chair and Ad Hoc
	Estimated Year 2 costs:	\$500	
3	Video goes online.	2005-2006	Chair, DL staff
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	none	
4	Video is updated and revised.	2006-2007	Chair and Ad Hoc
	Estimated Year 4 costs:	\$500	



Recommendation: Develop a Government Department Blackboard page for faculty use.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Solicit ideas from faculty regarding content.	Fall 2003	Dept. Chair
	Consult with tech support regarding development.	Spring 2004	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 1 costs:	none	
2	Put Blackboard faculty page online.	2004-2005	Dept. Chair
	Collect assignments, projects, learning tools from faculty.	2004-2005	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 2 costs:	none	
3	Update page with new submissions from faculty.	2005-2006	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	none	
4	Update page with new submissions from faculty.	2006-2007	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 4 costs:	none	



Recommendation: Put a permanent computer projector in every Government classroom.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Request funding through annual budget process for one at each main campus.	Summer 2003	Dept. Chair
	Purchase and equip six classrooms with computer projector.	2003-2004	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 1 costs:	\$5,000	
2	Request funding through annual budget process for one at each main campus.	Spring 2004	Dept. Chair
	Purchase and equip six more classrooms with computer projector.	2004-2005	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 2 costs:	\$5,000	
3	Since funding request will be denied, request funding again.	2005-2006	Dept. Chair
	Purchase and equip six classrooms with computer projector.		
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	\$5,000	
4	Request funding through annual budget process for six more projectors.	2006-2007	Dept. Chair
	Purchase and equip six more classrooms with computer projector.		
	Estimated Year 4 costs:	\$5,000	



Recommendation: Schedule Government classes in the active learning classrooms designated in the Master Plan.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Await funding and implementation of Master Plan.	2003-2004	Administration
	Estimated Year 1 costs:	none	
2	Schedule Government classes in new active learning classrooms.	2004-2005	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 2 costs:	none	
3	Schedule Government classes in new active learning classrooms.	2005-2006	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	none	
4	Schedule Government classes in new active learning classrooms.	2006-2007	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 4 costs:	none	



Recommendation: Provide every full-time faculty member with a laptop computer.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Request funding in annual budget process.	2003-2004	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 1 costs:	\$15,000	
2	When funding is denied, request funding again in annual budget process.	2004-2005	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 2 costs:	\$15,000	
3	Request funding again in annual budget process.	2005-2006	Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	\$18,000	
4	Request funding again in annual budget process.	2006-2007	Dept. Chair
	Purchase and distribute laptops.	2006-2007	Dept. Chair

Estimated Year 4 costs: \$20,000



Recommendation: Expand Honors course offerings.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Solicit interested faculty to create Honors courses.	2003-2004	Dept. Chair, faculty
	Submit proposed courses for approval by Task Force and Dean.	2003-2004	faculty, Dept. Chair, Dean
Estimated Year 1 costs:		none	
2	Schedule Honors course for Fall and Spring.	2004-2005	Dept. Chair
	Monitor enrollment in and demand for Honors courses.	2005-2005	Dept. Chair, Dean
Estimated Year 2 costs:		none	
3	Schedule Honors course for Fall and Spring to reflect demand.	2005-2006	Dept. Chair
	Solicit interested faculty to create additional Honors courses if needed.	2005-2006	Dept. Chair, faculty
Estimated Year 3 costs:		none	
4	Submit proposed courses for approval by Task Force and Dean.	2006-2007	faculty, Dept. Chair, Dean
	Schedule additional Honors courses as demand dictates.	2006-2007	Dept. Chair
Estimated Year 4 costs:		none	



Recommendation: Create a new special topics course (GOVT 2633).

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Solicit interested faculty to create special topics course(s).	2003-2004	Dept. Chair, faculty
	Submit proposed course(s) for approval by Task Force and Dean.	2003-2004	faculty, Dept. Chair, Dean
Estimated Year 1 costs:		none	
2	Schedule new special topics course for Fall, Spring or Summer as needed.	2004-2005	Dept. Chair
	Monitor enrollment in and demand for special topics courses.	2005-2005	Dept. Chair, Dean
Estimated Year 2 costs:		none	
3	Schedule special topics courses to reflect demand.	2005-2006	Dept. Chair
Estimated Year 3 costs:		none	
4	Schedule special topics courses to reflect demand.	2006-2007	Dept. Chair
Estimated Year 4 costs:		none	



Recommendation: Expand Learning Communities course offerings.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Solicit interested faculty to develop additional Learning Communities.	2003-2004	Dept. Chair, faculty
Estimated Year 1 costs:		none	
2	Schedule additional Learning Communities sections for Fall, Spring or Summer.	2004-2005	Dept. Chair
	Monitor enrollment in, demand for, and student success in Learning Communities.	2005-2005	Dept. Chair, Dean

	Estimated Year 2 costs:	none
3	Schedule Learning Communities sections to reflect demand.	2005-2006 Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	none
4	Schedule Learning Communities sections to reflect demand.	2006-2007 Dept. Chair
	Estimated Year 4 costs:	none



Recommendation: Continue to internationalize the curriculum, e.g. with Model OAS course.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Solicit interested faculty to pursue appropriate opportunities or programs.	2003-2004	Dept. Chair, faculty
	Estimated Year 1 costs:	none	
2	Develop something such as the Model OAS program.	Fall 2004	faculty
	Schedule Model OAS section.	Spring 2005	Dept. Chair
	Provide financial support for students/instructor to travel to meeting.	2004-2005	Budget authorities
	Estimated Year 2 costs:	\$5,000	
3	Monitor enrollment and success of new program.	2005-2006	Dept. Chair
	If demand warrants, schedule annually.	2005-2006	Dept. Chair
	Provide financial support for students/instructor to travel to meeting.	2005-2006	Budget authorities
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	\$5,000	
4	Continue to monitor enrollment and success.	2006-2007	Dept. Chair
	If demand warrants, schedule annually.	2006-2007	Dept. Chair
	Provide financial support for students/instructor to travel to meeting.	2006-2007	Budget authorities
	Estimated Year 4 costs:	\$5,000	



Recommendation: Develop relationship with sister institutions for faculty development opportunities.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Assign TF's Faculty Development committee to pursue connections.	Fall 2003	Dept. Chair, Committee
	Develop mechanism for exchanging information about seminars, panels, etc.	Spring 2004	Committee
	Estimated Year 1 costs:	none	
2	Pursue joint faculty development colloquium with sister institution.	Fall 2004	Committee
	Offer joint colloquium.	Spring 2005	Committee
	Estimated Year 2 costs:	\$1,000	
3	Pursue additional opportunities for joint seminars.	2005-2006	Committee
	Offer additional joint seminars or colloquia.	2005-2006	Committee
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	\$2,000	
4	Continue to exchange information about offerings elsewhere.	2006-2007	Committee
	Continue to pursue opportunities for joint faculty development.	2006-2007	Committee
	Offer additional joint seminars or colloquia.	2006-2007	Committee
	Estimated Year 4 costs:	\$2,000	



Recommendation: Support faculty attendance at professional conferences with adequate travel budgets.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	Request additional travel money during annual budget process.	Summer 2003	Dean
	Provide additional travel funds.	2003-2004	Budget authorities
	Estimated Year 1 costs:	\$5,000	
2	Since request will be denied, repeat request for additional travel money.	Spring 2004	Dean
	Approve travel requests from faculty.	2004-2005	TF, Dean
	Estimated Year 2 costs:	\$5,000	
3	Continue to request adequate travel budget to support faculty development.	2005-2006	Dean
	Approve travel requests from faculty.	2005-2006	TF, Dean
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	\$5,000	
4	Continue to request adequate travel budget to support faculty development.	2006-2007	Dean
	Approve travel requests from faculty.	2006-2007	TF, Dean
	Estimated Year 4 costs:	\$5,000	



Recommendation: Offer an annual symposium for students as well as faculty.

Year	Actions	Target Date	Responsible
1	TF's Faculty Development committee will agree on topic.	Fall 2003	Committee
	Speakers invited, symposium scheduled and publicized.	Spring 2004	Committee
	Estimated Year 1 costs:	\$1,000	
2	TF's Faculty Development committee will agree on topic.	Fall 2004	Committee
	Speakers invited, symposium scheduled and publicized.	Spring 2005	Committee
	Estimated Year 2 costs:	\$1,000	
3	TF's Faculty Development committee will agree on topic.	Fall 2005	Committee
	Speakers invited, symposium scheduled and publicized.	Spring 2006	Committee
	Estimated Year 3 costs:	\$1,000	
4	TF's Faculty Development committee will agree on topic.	Fall 2006	Committee
	Speakers invited, symposium scheduled and publicized.	Spring 2007	Committee
	Estimated Year 4 costs:	\$1,000	

