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Overview of the Analytical Framework

Wanca-Thibault and colleagues’ (2002) study of faculty participating in FYE programs found that perceived opportunities and challenges for program participants fell into three thematic categories: professional, political, and personal. An analytical framework was developed for this study (Figure 1.0). Thematic categories served as a foundation to understanding participating faculty perspectives of teaching in the MUSE program within the institutional environment of SJSU. The researcher was able to determine specific factors that can influence the faculty perspectives from the review of literature, which included factors from college student development theories, retention theories, and organizational politics theories. Examples of these specific factors are: the institutional resources available to the program, cross-institutional networking, understanding first-year students, and one’s role as a teacher. All of these factors were then matched with the related thematic categories determined by Wanca-Thibault et al. (2002). The analytical framework depicted is a Venn diagram developed as a way to understand the complex role of faculty and the various factors that affect faculty perspectives on participating in the MUSE program.

Overview of Key Terms

The terms in the analytical framework were derived from the literature reviewed. Wanca-Thibault et al. (2002) stated that the “personal effects focused on issues of self-awareness and social interaction which impact interpersonal relationships. Professional effects were identified as those issues having to do with an individual’s development as a teacher and scholar. Political effects emphasized the perceptions of those in power and the impact of those perceptions on another individual’s career progress” (p. 30). Among personal effects, faculty members can be influenced by their internal value systems or goals as well as by the relationships they are able to build with colleagues across the university. Professional effects can be characterized by opportunities for the development of teaching pedagogies, or his or her ability to work with different types of students. Political effects include factors such as the abundance or scarcity of resources, and the mission of the institution. Some factors were placed inside the overlapping areas of the Venn diagram to demonstrate their effect in more than one thematic category.
Focus Group Findings & Conclusions
(Adapted for the objectives of this workshop)

The Benefits of Participating in the MUSE FYE Program

- The students
  - Experience teaching freshmen
  - Genuine interest in the well-being of FY students: altruistic nature
  - Opens the minds of faculty to the world view of today’s freshmen
  - Personally rewarding – faculty tend to believe in the program’s purpose

- Relationships
  - With students (small seminar environment) - both short and long term
  - With other faculty across disciplines
  - Opportunity to have a positive influence on FY students
  - Opportunity to talk with peers about teaching/learning
  - Network of support

- Professional Development
  - Broad range of experience
  - Pedagogies learned, developing one’s own curriculum, working with faculty across disciplines and teaching a different type of student (compared to advanced GE courses for example)
  - Opportunity/freedom to teach in new and creative ways
  - Exposure to the many resources on campus, Student Affairs, Academic Services, etc.

The Challenges of Participating in the MUSE FYE Program

- Workload and compensation
  - Added workload strains any other professional responsibilities
  - Increased time commitment (curriculum development, advising, MUSE faculty events)
  - Tenure/RTP process – faculty trying to get tenured will only teach for one semester to get the experience and then move on to fulfill the other objectives that need to be achieved during the RTP process

- Organizational politics between Administration and Colleges
  - Departments compensated based on number of students taught – small seminars are at a disadvantage when Deans/Chairs are decision making
  - Decrease in resources within a department may put other faculty/staff positions in jeopardy which creates an environment of resentment toward MUSE

- The students
  - Lack of preparation
  - Difficult to teach an appreciation for learning that they have not been taught in high school
  - High level of students in remediation (over 60%)
Recommendations for the Future

The recommendations are focused on enhancing the MUSE faculty experience in order to improve faculty retention, develop faculty recruitment strategies, and to improve the program’s ability to meet its desired outcomes.

1. Provide more opportunities for MUSE faculty to engage in discussions around teaching and student development

2. Create a clear definition for the purpose of the MUSE program, its goals, and specific objectives related to each goal

3. Extend or revise the MUSE Faculty Orientation to include additional training on first-year student development and guidelines for achieving the goals for the program

4. Encourage or require faculty participating in the MUSE program to be more intentional and conscious of the goals of the program, while sacrificing as little freedom and creativity as possible

5. Research opportunities to improve the RTP process to include recognition and/or compensation for participating in campus programs such as MUSE

6. Continued research on the factors affecting the faculty experience in FYE programs; Research on the personal or intrinsic influences will help professionals and administrators understand their faculty and strengthen the existing analytical framework; Research on the professional factors involved in participating in a FYE program will help administrators develop and refine the ways these programs are designed with regard to outcomes, measurement, and sustainability

Additional Recommendations/Suggestions

*Taken from The National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience® & Students in Transition Annual Conference on the First-Year Experience®

February, 2005 Phoenix, AZ*

1. Communicate theories of student retention and development to department chairs (FYE Newsletter to departments)
2. Hold “relational meetings” (similar to community organizing strategies) with department chairs – ask for their input and feedback on the program
3. DIALOGUE (“How can we make this work with what you have going on?”) – People support what they helped to create (take advantage of advisory boards and topic specific committees)
4. Have Peer Mentors recruit faculty to participate in the program
5. Establish a directory of “Experts” on campus in student resources for faculty
6. Have returning faculty partner with new faculty in a mentoring relationship
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## Participating Faculty Perspectives on Teaching in the First-Year Experience Program
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Issue</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the purpose?</td>
<td>The purpose was to explore and understand faculty perspectives on their experience helping students achieve the goals of the first-year-experience MUSE Program at San José State University. The program goals are (1) to teach students what it means to be a university scholar, (2) what it means to be part of a metropolitan university, and (3) increased retention. Insights from this study could provide valuable information for making decisions regarding faculty development for the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is doing it?</td>
<td>Ashley Raggio, a Masters student at San José State University, and a current Graduate Assistant for the MUSE Program will be conducting this research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why were faculty perspectives selected?</td>
<td>Former and current MUSE faculty were selected to evaluate achievement of program goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is being studied?</td>
<td>MUSE faculty perspectives on teaching in the first-year experience program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is this being done?</td>
<td>Qualitative analysis using focus groups, surveys, and program documentation of current and former MUSE faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What report will be made?</td>
<td>The final product is a qualitative research study, available through San José State University’s Educational Leadership Department, open to all study participants and other interested persons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>