

Reorganization Data Analysis

Introduction

Throughout the spring 2021 semester, the Reorganization Working Group gathered community input on UVM structures and systems, including what community members thought was working well, and identifying areas and potential mechanisms for improvement. This input was gathered in a series of themed forums, meetings with specific groups, and through an online form that allowed individuals to submit feedback. Together, the transcripts, chat files, and spreadsheet of feedback represented thousands of notes and comments related to reorganization, a large and powerful data set¹. As the semester drew to a close, the Working Group discussed the need for a dedicated qualitative analysis of this trove of data through a process that would take advantage of faculty expertise.

The Internal Alignments subgroup of the Reorg Working Group suggested that the work of this analysis both needed to be conducted by a team to balance perspectives and reduce bias, and that the analysis process would allow for continued involvement of faculty and graduate students. The subgroup proposed a structure, which was followed: Vice Provost J. Dickinson (a co-chair of the Internal Alignments subgroup) and Executive Director of the Office of Institutional Research Alexander Yin worked with two graduate students to code the data. A faculty panel including qualitative researchers and faculty members of the Reorg Working Group met for two retreats: the first to establish the purpose of the analysis and the basic coding system, and the second to offer feedback on the coded data and initial analysis. Dickinson and Yin also met individually with two faculty who were not able to attend the second meeting. This report summarizes both the methodology used and analysis of some aspects of the results deemed most relevant to the goals of the project.

The qualitative analysis summarized in this report was undertaken with two goals, both of which were confirmed in discussion with the faculty panel:

1. Ensure that the voices/contributions of the participants in this process are heard, and
2. To understand and summarize key positions or beliefs shared by subsets of participants so that they can inform next steps.

The remainder of this report contains key takeaways from the analysis of the data, recommendations for initial next steps, and detailed information on the methodology, data set, and analytical process for this qualitative project.

General Comments

The following general notes provide context for more specific insights that the qualitative team (administrative, faculty, and graduate student members) chose to carry forward, outlined in the “Key Takeaways” section.

- Although reorg events and the feedback form were open to all members of the UVM community, there were many more faculty participants than staff or students across these events. For this reason, in most areas this data set primarily captures the voices of faculty

¹ For the full list of files see Appendix B.

participants in Spring 2021 discussions, and not those of staff and graduate or undergraduate students.

- Participants offered specific examples of places where structures and systems are creating barriers to collaborations, student success and research productivity. Gathering some additional data on the nature and causes of identified issues could help move beyond speculation and frustration to considering the best ways to address them.
- Aside from an animated discussion of the sciences and structures that would enhance research and teaching collaborations in applied and/or basic sciences, few specific proposals for restructuring emerged in this data set, even in places where participants were directly asked to consider how differences in University organization could improve the institution. Reasons for this are reflected in statements by many participants that they are deeply invested in productive relationships within their department or larger unit, and do not want those relationships to be disrupted by new organizational principles. This is an important consideration in effecting and managing any proposed changes.

Key Takeaways

While many voices expressed strong concerns regarding reorganization, these concerns can also be grouped thematically to highlight important components in a detailed vision of what a future UVM (i.e. UVM 2050) might look like.

Dolan and Swift, the graduate student members of the project team and primary coders of the data set, drafted a set of emergent themes and shared them with administrator facilitators and the faculty panel at the July 30, 2021, faculty retreat. After reviewing the significant amount of data contained in a subset of matrix cells (see Methodology section), the faculty panel worked through these findings with the coders and offered additional comments. The administrative leads then incorporated these perspectives and organized the information into the categories below:

Reorganization “Anqst”

- Both the graduate students and the faculty panelists emphasized a need to acknowledge participants’ strong reservations regarding the need to reorganize. Overall, participants in the spring 2021 expressed marked resistance to reorganization as well as significant amounts of fear and distrust. Gaining buy-in will be challenging, but team members expressed that there is a need to continue to work towards that buy-in for proposed changes to have a chance of succeeding. Many who participated in virtual meetings or contributed to the online form voiced continued confusion about why an academic reorganization is needed, what the goals and intentions are, and how reorganizing would meet those goals. Specifically, many voiced the need for changing systems rather than structures to address current challenges.
- Among participants represented in the data set, there are widely differing perspectives on how centralized or decentralized UVM structures and systems are, or should be, for our institutional size and mission. Across topics and areas, participants did not present unified views on issues such as overlapping degree programs, unit-level vs. centralized research, teaching and advising support, departmental autonomy, and many other issues. Participants also expressed a range of views regarding centralization vs. decentralization of budgetary and other decisions. At the

same time, participants questioned whether reorganization is necessary to address the issues that were raised.

- There is a perceived tension between UVM striving for R1 status and current approaches to graduate education. Both faculty and graduate student participants expressed the need for greater university-wide support for graduate recruitment and advising that would help elevate graduate students out of the isolation of individual academic units and into the broader narrative of institution. R1 status was also cited as possibly placing the "special sauce" of UVM at risk: the teacher/scholar model, relatively small class sizes, breadth of offerings within a small university, a focus on an excellent, faculty-driven undergraduate experience, strong majors, and a balance between liberal arts and professional programs with a strong liberal arts foundation, etc.
- There was tension between participants who saw a continued commitment to high-quality undergraduate education and the teacher-scholar model as a primary concern, and those who foregrounded improved support for research, grant-getting, and graduate training as receiving insufficient attention. Both of these areas had strong support in statements across the data set. While each had its proponents, what unified comments from some participants in both groups was a concern that one might receive preference over the other in a reorganization model, undermining key current UVM strengths and stated institutional goals.

UVM Strengths

When asked to name strengths, the following areas were frequently mentioned:

- current structures such as the location of departments, or current arrangements of schools and colleges; these statements reflected a strong sense that UVM's strength lies in the accomplishment of departments and units, rather than at the University-level. However, this may also derive from participants reflecting their own positive experiences within their units
- interdisciplinarity, where it exists, particularly in the context of discussing the value of research centers (e.g. Gund)
- the teacher/scholar model and a commitment to an excellent undergraduate education
- commitment to high impact practices such as experiential learning and community engaged learning
- CTL and other supports for teaching, often mentioned in the context of support for teaching during the pandemic; advising in some areas and identity center supports for students.

Frequently, these strengths were actually presented in the context of overcoming challenges such as funding models (IBB; F&A return), barriers to interdisciplinary or cross-unit work (usually IBB), and pressures to increase class sizes in order to maintain these areas of strength (financial barriers/IBB).

Areas for improvement

- Many participants felt that resource allocation decisions, particularly in the context of the IBB model, have created competition between units that erodes the ability to work collaboratively as an institution. IBB was repeatedly cited as a model that creates inequities and competition among units, and undermines collaborative endeavors that should define and strengthen the institution as a whole.

- Participants voiced a need for consistency in quality and processes across colleges with regards to advising; this would especially support those students with multiple majors, taking courses across colleges, or transferring between colleges at UVM. Consistent knowledge and practices for advising could encourage more cross-disciplinarity for students. Graduate level advising overall was also named as an area to strengthen.
- There is a demonstrated lack of understanding how Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) initiatives can or do relate to an academic reorganization. In addition, there was often a lack of response among faculty when asking about JEDI initiatives at UVM. The project team emphasized that *this silence is data*. There are many opportunities for improvement and ways that UVM can benefit by meeting the needs of underrepresented students, staff, and faculty in the reorganization process. One recommended way of measuring success with a reorganization is to measure progress with regards to JEDI at UVM. Centering the needs of the most marginalized (maximizing retention and promoting the success of BIPOC faculty, staff, and students) will benefit all in a reorganization.
- Of the cited “obstacles to success,” the winner by far (very far) was IBB, and perception that it has created destructive competition between units. Other obstacles mentioned, in rough order of frequency, include: Systems (e.g. hiring systems, systems for ordering materials); administrators (number of administrators; lack of leadership training; administrators’ lack of understanding of key issues and solutions); Disciplines split between multiple units esp. biology/life sciences; Territoriality regarding subjects/programmatic areas; Graduate student support; Bureaucracy; Inequity between units; lack of a culture of advancement for staff and faculty alike
- Areas for improvement most frequently offered by participants largely mirrored the obstacles to success, but with more frequent mention of advising, promoting team teaching, professional development, grad student housing and support, and consolidating teaching and learning support to reduce variation across units.

Possibilities with Change

- There is a respect and hunger for interdisciplinary collaborations across organizational structures, but there are hurdles to doing so. For some, these are operational – how faculty appointments and workload are counted, differences across units in terms of research support, how funds are allocated in the budget model. For others they are relational – not knowing who is doing what kinds of research, physical separation, etc. Suggestions were made to elevate places where interdisciplinary and cross-structural work is happening well and use those as models for future directions as well as to evaluate departmental teaching appointments and institute-level research appointments. While research centers were highlighted as a structural solution to explore, some faculty emphasized that these centers must rely on strong disciplinary programs as well.
- Regarding cross-college collaborations, there were thematic discussions regarding theoretical and applied work in related fields. Examples include English and Journalism, or mathematics and basic sciences, versus engineering and applied life sciences. While some acknowledged

Date Created: 7/9/2021

Last Edited: 8/26/2021

opportunities for better collaborations, many are also wary of combining units without preserving unit identity, strengths, and purpose or recognizing the distinct contributions of basic research programs and applied research programs.

- As we think about a reorganization, there is a call by many to consider how we reorganize around use of space and time, including assessing how physical structures and space assignments impact collaborations, and whether the traditional academic year limits the institution's potential.

Next Steps and Recommendations

We remind readers that this this version (8/10/2021) is still a draft document that must be reviewed again for final input by the faculty panel. That said, we have the following recommendations:

- that the final version of this report be made available on the Reorg website, and that the NVivo project files (MERGED Reorg Qualitative Data Coded Windows.nvp and MERGED Reorg Qualitative Data Coded MAC.nvp) be made available to community members for transparency purposes, upon request to OIR.
- that the feedback regarding specific areas of success, as well as specific challenges be carefully considered as the reorg process moves forward. In particular, a desire to continue successful endeavors should be taken into consideration. Other important challenges cited were the need to address: barriers to cross-unit teaching and research; inefficiencies in systems that cost time and money; and areas where modestly increased support could significantly improve research, JEDI efforts, and teaching and learning at the university.
- that to address the high level of uncertainty reflected in participants' feedback, next steps in the reorg process focus on proposing specific changes in organization, with information on how they will address broad categories of concerns discussed throughout spring 2021, such as research support, student experience, and reduction of barriers to accomplishing common goals

Appendix A: Methodology for this project

Table 1 provides a timeline from coding scheme development to the analysis of the reorganization data. It is estimated that over 200 hours were devoted to completing this analysis during June, July, and August 2021. The timeline below does not capture the 80 hours spent by the graduate students (Dolan Dolan and Emma Swift) coding the data.

Table 1: Methodology Timeline

Date	Activity
6/9/2021	Dickinson and Yin meet to create agenda for Faculty panel workshop.
6/15/2021	Faculty panel meets to set the goals for the qualitative analysis and develop high-level coding scheme.
6/24/2021	Dickinson and Yin update and train Dolan and Swift on coding procedures. Dolan and Swift begin initial code for norming and to identify possible additions to scheme.
7/8/2021	Dolan and Swift provide suggestions for coding scheme improvements. Dickinson, Dolan, Swift, and Yin agree to add sub-codes to the descriptive schema.
7/15/2021	Dickinson and Yin meet with van Eeghen to get approval for additional sub-codes and to discuss and confirm analytical process.
7/15/2021	Dickinson and Yin meet with Dolan and Swift to check on coding process and learn how to merge NVivo files.
7/21/2021	Dickinson and Yin meet with Dolan and Swift to learn to use NVivo for agreement analysis and create descriptive by value judgment matrix.
7/28/2021	Dickinson and Yin meet with Dolan and Swift to examine agreement analysis and provide guidance on analysis. Agenda for 7/31/2021 meeting is also created.
7/30/2021	Meet with faculty members to get approval of code agreement, analyze data, and confirm Dolan's and Swift's emergent themes.
8/2/2021 to 8/8/2021	Dickinson and Yin draft report.
8/10/2021	Dickinson and Yin to meet with Maynard to review process.

Code Scheme Development

The following faculty with expertise in qualitative research participated in developing the coding scheme for the reorganization data analysis:

- Tracy Ballysingh, Assistant Professor, Education
- Kelly Clark Keefe, Associate Professor, Education
- Meghan Cope, Professor, Geography
- Adrian Ivakhiv, Professor, Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources
- Alan Maynard, Clinical Associate Professor, Rehabilitation and Movement Science
- Constance van Eeghen, Assistant Professor, General Internal Medicine Research

Dickinson and Yin facilitated a four-hour meeting on June 15, 2021, to develop the initial high level coding scheme. These codes were developed after faculty reviewed chat transcripts from various forums and notes from note takers at all of the small groups for the 4/15 brainstorming sessions. Through consensus, the faculty developed two coding simultaneous schemes: Descriptive and Value Judgment

(Figure 1). The descriptive scheme is designed to capture “what” people were talking about with regards to the reorganization. The value judgment scheme is designed to capture participants’ reaction to and stance towards current structures as well as reorganization.

After discussing both approaches, the faculty panel concluded that simultaneously coding the data in both schemes would allow for a more complete analysis. When combined into a “descriptive by value judgment matrix” each cell of the matrix represents data points where pairs of descriptive and value judgment codes overlap. This dual-scheme coding process allowed for the identification of the broad range of specific topics covered in the collected data (the “what”), as well as how participants positioned these topics in relation to value-laden categories: obstacles to success; existing strengths; areas for improvement; and effecting and managing change.

Figure 1: Initial Coding Scheme

<p>Descriptive Scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Local culture and processes<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Unit-specific○ UVM-specific• Structural organization• University-wide support systems <p>Value Judgment Scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Obstacles to success• Existing strengths• Areas for improvement• Effecting and managing change
--

All coding occurred in NVivo. Dolan and Swift, doctoral students in the College of Education and Social Services, coded all of the Spring 2021 data files using these two coding schemes. In addition to the written comments collected through the online reorg feedback form, the files include transcripts of all Teams open forums and sessions with specific constituencies, transcripts of the chat for these sessions, and notes provided by designated moderators/notetakers for brainstorming sessions conducted on 4/15/2021 (see Appendix B for list of data files). After initial training and a period for sample coding of a subset of files, Dickinson and Yin met with Dolan and Swift to discuss refinements to the coding schemes. In this discussion, the team decided that the Value judgment scheme was adequate, but recommended additional subcodes in several areas of the descriptive scheme ensure that important information was captured for analysis (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Final Coding Scheme

<p>Descriptive Coding Scheme (In this coding scheme, text excerpts topically related to or referring to the following areas was coded.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• University-wide support systems (CTL; Libraries; professional development; graduate and undergraduate admissions; faculty, staff, and student retention, technology/IT)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Resource allocation + inequity across “units”○ IBB

- *[Advising: move to processes and local]*
- **Research support** (includes grant processes, F&A, UTA hiring, redesigned central guidelines)
- **Processes and local** (How we do things at UVM: leadership, internal relations, messaging, “climate”, institutional values):
 - **Advising**
 - **UVM-specific** (de/centralization, emergent patterns, structure: time and space use)
 - **Unit-specific** (Faculty workloads)
 - **JEDI/DEI** (Justice, Equity, Diversity, Inclusion/Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion)
 - **RPT** (Including what counts as academic output, access to tenure, who is tenure track, etc.)
 - **External contexts** (state relations, land grant mission, accrediting bodies, childcare and housing costs, funding agencies)
- **Structural organization** (Collaborations that are enhanced or made difficult by present structure, distance learning, units that might be poorly fit into colleges, schools, etc.)
 - **Cross-college issues** (faculty collaborations, students with multiple majors, interdisciplinarity, cross-college advising)
 - **Applied versus theoretical** (ex: English vs. Journalism, Coaching vs. movement science)

Value Judgment Scheme

- **Obstacles to Success**: Speaker identifies obstacles to success in one or more areas
 - Faculty success (research, teaching, collaborations, service, job satisfaction, retention of faculty, faculty morale) budget
 - Student success (completion/graduation, choosing right major, getting academic or other help, financial challenges, post-graduation success)
 - Research success (grant-getting; recognition of research outside of the institution; R1 status)
- **Existing Strengths**: Speaker identifies points of institutional pride and/or services or functions that work well (quality of fac/staff/students, areas of recognition, quality, support services)
- **Areas for Improvement**: Speaker notes something that needs improvement. This may overlap with the “obstacles” but it may also refer to areas where “we can do better.” This also includes redundancies, proposed solutions, suggestions, ideas, and identified needs.
- **Effecting & Managing Change** (past or future changes, communication strategies, attitudes, or reactions to changes, examples of change, opinions and beliefs about changes, motivations for academic reorganization)

Coders’ Positionality & Bias

The following information was contributed by Dolan and Swift, the two graduate students hired to do the intensive coding work necessary to complete this project in a compressed June/July timeline.

Date Created: 7/9/2021

Last Edited: 8/26/2021

Dolan is a nonbinary, queer, white Latinx PhD student in EDLP at UVM. They have a B.S. in mechanical engineering from Lehigh University and an M.Ed. in Higher Education & Student Affairs Administration from UVM. Following their M.Ed., they worked for 6 years in queer/trans campus resource work at Washington University (WashU) in St. Louis and University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB). They then returned to UVM to pursue doctoral studies, primarily focused on nonbinary college student experiences. Dolan considers higher education to be their field and is deeply curious about organizational theory and higher education systems and structures. They have studied and worked in different institutions - some highly centralized (UCSB, part of a 10-part University of California system, the largest public university in the US, on the west coast) or highly decentralized (WashU, a midwestern private institution with a thick institutional culture and "WashU way") - and they have reverence for the culture and leadership styles of each institutional organization. They are also highly attuned to the ways higher education was founded historically in the US, has evolved, and is evolving in highly uncertain times. They acknowledge that the pandemic; social injustices; climate change; and state, federal, and global political climates have and will continue to shape the future of education.

Dolan believes that education is about liberation and emancipation. Dolan is deeply rooted in anti-racist values and does not believe in meritocracy, colorblindness, or neutrality. Dolan is also wary of educational systems led as businesses, and they are wary of the ways education is sometimes measured by upward mobility. They believe in the holistic development of students and see education as a lifelong process rather than a product.

Swift is a PhD student in EDLP at UVM. She identifies as a White person and uses she/her pronouns. She holds a B.A. (International Studies & Spanish) and an Ed.M (Educational Organization and Leadership) from the University of Illinois. She has worked for over 15 years in international education in the United States at the University of Illinois and University of Vermont, and at Trường Đại học Quy Nhơn in Vietnam. Her research interests focus on how institutions make decisions around risk in international education and how they find balances in that work between their values, resources, and ethics. She is interested in the systems and structures that project what is valued by institutions, and in questions of how organizations bring their stated values to life.

Coding Practices

Both coders also provided a summary of their approach to coding the data. It is very important to recognize these differences, as they do affect which data items appear within the matrix. As confirmed in our discussions with the faculty panel, these small differences in coding should be seen as a productive component of qualitative analysis, rather than a source of potential "error" in results.

Dolan took the approach of over-coding rather than under-coding whenever possible. They coded whole passages rather than parsing through them for specifics. They did this in order to capture the context and the speaker whenever possible. At times, Dolan also included the question that was asked in case the context seemed helpful. For example, at times participants discussed an issue, but without the question, it would have been unclear if participants were listing existing strengths or obstacles and barriers to success. Nearly always, Dolan coded each passage with at least one descriptive and one value-based code. Often, there were more than one descriptive code applied to a passage. Again, when in doubt, Dolan over-coded rather than under-coded.

Date Created: 7/9/2021

Last Edited: 8/26/2021

Descriptive codes: Dolan followed the codebook as closely as possible when using descriptive codes. At times, they had a hard time consistently differentiating between the higher level "Local culture and processes" and the subcodes "Unit-specific" or "UVM-specific." At times, when participants discussed their impressions of UVM culture, they found it hard to differentiate between "Local culture and processes" and "UVM-specific." When the Research-1 university idea arose, Dolan often coded that as "UVM-specific." They also cross-coded any specific unit's suggestions, strengths, and obstacles with "Unit-specific." "Unit-specific" is also the code they used for staff unit information. When participants named a need for mentorship, HR support, tech support, hiring support, student retention needs, admissions or alumna issues, IT, libraries, CTL and CDE, Dolan coded that as "University-wide support systems." Often, Dolan noticed overlap in their coding between "Applied Versus Theoretical" and "Cross-college issues." "Cross-college issues" also often overlapped with "Resource allocation and inequity across units." Specifically within the spreadsheet, Dolan coded the entire column for question 5 as "JEDI."

Value-based codes: Anytime a passage included a suggestion, they coded the passage with "Areas of Improvement" in order to compile a list of ideas for change. Often, these passages overlapped with "Obstacles for Success," specifically when participants named or suggested that there were barriers in the way of improving a system or structure. For example, "Resource allocation and inequity across units" was often coded with both "Areas of Improvement" and "Obstacles for Success." Anytime a participant shared feedback about the reorganization process, they coded it as "Effecting and Managing Change." When participants named or listed explicit strengths or points of pride, Dolan coded them as "Existing Strengths." Specifically within the spreadsheet, Dolan coded the entire column for question 1 as "Existing Strengths" and question 4's column as "Obstacles for Success." As a pattern, Dolan noticed they coded most (but not the entire column) of question 2's responses in the spreadsheet as "JEDI" or "External contexts" when appropriate.

Swift took a pragmatic approach to coding given the time constraints of this project. Generally, this meant coding full passages unless it was easy to break content in clean ways. Swift coded the vast majority of content with at least one code from each schema, and completed the two coding schemas concurrently. She coded the first half of her documents more conservatively but became more generous in her coding volume after a mid-way check-in with the team.

Descriptive codes: Swift followed the codebook as closely as possible when using descriptive codes, but had similar challenges to Dolan with the overlap between Local Culture and Processes and the UVM-specific code. Swift likewise found the higher level "Structural Organization" code challenging to distinguish from the "Cross-College issues" and generally placed commentary regarding interdisciplinary work in the higher level "Structural Organization" code unless it was explicitly named as an issue related to systems that prevented work across colleges. Swift also would occasionally code comments regarding institutional leadership within "University-wide support" if it was about an office of the administration versus the ways that leadership were happening, but there may be some inconsistency in coding around institutional leadership because of this.

Value-based codes: Passages with recommendations or suggestions or needs (*would, should, could, must*) were coded by Swift as "Areas of Improvement". There was also overlap between "Areas of Improvement" and "Obstacles for Success" in certain instances. Swift coded all value-based comments related to issues of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion not being realized as fully as they could as "Obstacles

to Success.” Anytime a participant shared feedback about the reorganization process, including opinions on how to best manage this moving forward, past missteps, or general feelings about the current process, Swift coded this as "Effecting and Managing Change" and did not assign other value-based codes. She coded small and large positive comments about the institution as “Existing strengths.”

Coding Comparisons

The unweighted and weighted kappas were calculated to be .42 and .38, which is considered fair to moderate in strength with regards to coding agreement between Dolan and Swift (Landis & Koch, 1977; Altman, 1999; Fleiss et al, 2003)². While McHugh (2012) argues that kappa values below .6 are insufficient for some research purposes, given the compressed timeline for this project, it was not possible to recode the data set after differences in coding style between the two coders were identified. While Dolan chose to “overcapture” larger chunks of data to provide broader contextual information, Swift selected less additional surrounding text. During the July 30, 2021, faculty panel meeting with the coders, faculty reviewed the information regarding how each graduate student coded and evaluated the effects of these differences on the kappa and on the data as needed for the purposes of this analysis. Of the 38 files coded, the coders had 91.6% agreement. Appendix C provides coding comparisons matrices between the coders of the descriptive and value codes. At the faculty panel retreat, Ballysingh, Cope, and Ivakhiv participated in evaluating the coding and affirmed that intercoder reliability was appropriate for the purposes of this analysis.

Discussion

As recommended by the faculty panel at the June 15, 2021, meeting, we created a heat map of the descriptive by value codes (Table 2). The high cells are high concentrations areas where the descriptive and value judgment codes overlap, indicating areas where the value-laden codes were applied to topics (e.g. “Areas for Improvement” and “JEDI or DEI” frequently appeared together). In NVivo, by clicking within the cell, a document with all excerpts from the data set where the two codes overlap are created. The heat map helped the faculty panel prioritize areas for analysis given the limited time available in analyzing the data.

² Kappa calculations can be made available upon request

Table 2: Descriptive by Value Judgment Code heat Map

Value Judgment Codes Descriptive Codes	Effecting and Managing Change	Existing Strengths	Obstacles to Success	Areas for Improvement
Local culture and processes	Medium	Low	Medium	High
Advising	Low	Low	Low	Medium
External contexts	Medium	Low	Medium	High
JEDI or DEI	Medium	Low	Medium	High
RPT	Low	Low	Low	Low
Unit-specific	High	High	High	High
UVM-specific	High	Medium	High	High
Structural organization	High	Medium	Medium	High
Applied versus theoretical	Low	Low	Low	Low
Cross-college issues	High	Medium	High	High
University-wide support systems	High	Medium	High	High
IBB	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
Research support	Medium	Low	Medium	High
Resource allocation + inequity across “units”	Low	Low	Medium	Medium

After analyzing the “IBB” by the value judgment codes at the July 30, 2021, meeting, the faculty panel decided that a better strategy would be to analyze the main diagonal of agreement in the value codes between Dolan and Swift (Table 3). These cells are where both Dolan and Swift used the same value judgment codes in coding the documents

Table 3: Comparing Value Codes between Dolan and Swift

Dolan \ Swift	1	2	3	4
1: Areas for Improvement	366	77	38	209
2: Effecting and Managing Change	177	194	22	36
3: Existing Strengths	28	29	197	4
4: Obstacles to Success	83	44	6	219

After reading through transcripts on their own, and exploring the data set through both of the above matrices, the faculty panel reviewed “takeaway” conclusions by the graduate students who had performed the coding. These takeaways form the basis of the “Key Takeaways” section of this report (pp. 2-6). Faculty unable to attend the panel retreat on July 30 had the opportunity to review these points in individual meetings with Alex Yin and J. Dickinson, and to read, edit, and comments on the draft version of this report.

References for Methodology Section

Altman, Douglas G. 1999. Practical Statistics for Medical Research. Chapman; Hall/CRC Press.

Date Created: 7/9/2021

Last Edited: 8/26/2021

Fleiss, J.L., Levin, B. and Paik, M.C. (2003). The Measurement of Interrater Agreement. In *Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions* (eds W.A. Shewhart, S.S. Wilks, J.L. Fleiss, B. Levin, and M.C. Paik). <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471445428.ch18>

Landis, J., & Koch, G. (1977). The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159-174. doi:10.2307/2529310

McHugh M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochemia medica*, 22(3), 276–282. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3900052/>

Appendix B: List of Documents

1. Brainstorming session Teaching and Learning
2. Brainstorming Session Teaching and Learning 4 04152021
3. Brainstorming session Teaching and Learning Breakout 1 041521
4. Brainstorming Session Teaching and Learning Breakout 2 041521
5. Brainstorming session Teaching and Learning Breakout 3 041521
6. Brainstorming Session Teaching and Learning Breakout 5 041521
7. Brainstorming session Teaching&Learning Group 8 4152021
8. CHAT and email Arts and Communication forum
9. CHAT business and entrepreneurship
10. CHAT chairs directors reorg forum
11. CHAT Reorg health professions
12. Copy of Feedback as of June 2021
13. Notes from Guide-Research_Karson
14. Notes from Recruitment and Retention breakout room 6
15. Notes from Recruitment and Retention group KC and ASB
16. Notes from Recruitment_and_retention_AM
17. Notes from Recruitment_and_retention_Group6_pjc (1)
18. Notes from Recruitment_and_retention_RLDW Room 3
19. Notes from Recruitment_and_retention_JV notes
20. Notes from Research and Creative Activity Group 5
21. Notes from Research and Creativity breakout group
22. Notes from Research breakouts Room 8
23. Notes from Research_cushman facilitator
24. Notes from Research_ErnestoMendez_AsimZia Notes April 2021
25. Notes from Research_faciliator breakout CHerrick
26. Notes Recruitment_and_retention_
27. Notes Research & Creativity (Dita Sharma)
28. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (SSC, 03.17.21)
29. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (Arts, Media, and Communication forum. 03.2.21)
30. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (Business Entrepreneurship. 03.10.21)
31. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (CDE. 03.26.21)
32. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (Chairs & Directors, 03.31.21)
33. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (Education, Policy and Social Impact, 03.17.21)
34. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (Food, Environment and Sustainability, 03.23.21)
35. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (Health Professions, 03.25.21)
36. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (Identity Centers, 03.18.21)
37. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (STEM, 03.29.21)
38. TRANSCRIPT UVM Academic Reorganization (Work Group 02.24.21)

Appendix C: Coding Comparisons

Table 4: Comparing Descriptive Codes between Dolan and Swift

Dolan \ Swift	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1: Local culture and processes	12	7	10	22	5	20	62	31	2	1	20	3	5	7
2: Advising	1	53	1	3	3	11	4	16	0	3	3	3	2	7
3: External contexts	1	3	43	15	2	37	33	32	1	6	8	4	4	8
4: JEDI or DEI	12	3	13	166	5	19	21	20	1	1	19	3	1	12
5: RPT	2	1	2	5	29	17	6	12	0	0	0	4	5	7
6: Unit-specific	14	8	9	14	8	162	37	103	6	15	21	25	40	34
7: UVM-specific	21	6	14	14	3	53	59	63	2	11	39	14	19	19
8: Structural organization	1	1	0	1	0	4	8	11	0	3	1	4	0	7
9: Applied versus theoretical	3	1	2	0	0	17	6	21	16	5	3	4	1	1
10: Cross-college issues	7	14	9	9	8	99	43	185	11	44	16	23	16	16
11: University-wide support systems	14	17	19	49	5	59	74	63	1	8	113	7	14	31
12: IBB	5	0	1	2	0	9	5	13	1	4	1	69	1	4
13: Research support	7	3	5	8	10	50	18	44	1	11	19	5	75	9
14: Resource allocation + inequity across "units"	1	3	1	4	4	16	8	11	1	2	4	10	8	28

Table 5: Comparing Value Codes between Dolan and Swift

Dolan \ Swift	1	2	3	4
1: Areas for Improvement	366	77	38	209
2: Effecting and Managing Change	177	194	22	36
3: Existing Strengths	28	29	197	4
4: Obstacles to Success	83	44	6	219