

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

Thursday, March 23, 2000

3:30 PM

Board of Trustees Conference Room

### **Present:**

Idir Azouz, Ann Barnes, Luciane Berg, Bonnie Bishop, Morris Brown, Jim Cotts, Thomas Cunningham, Danielle Dubrasky (proxy for Elise Leahy), Neil Gailey, Brian Hoover, Roxann Johnson (proxy for Jim Aton), Lamar Jordan, Rick Lambson, Paul Larson, Gary McIntyre, Earl Mulderink, Jean Reeve (proxy for Ben Davidson), Bill Romey, Lila Schwaner.

### **Absent:**

Michael McGarvey.

### **Excused:**

Jeff Barnes, Carol Ann Modesitt, Dan Pence, Greg Powell.

### **Visitors:**

Mike Richards, Assistant Provost; Doris Williamson.

### **I. Call to Order**

Earl Mulderink, Senate President, called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM.

### **II. Old Business**

A. Program Prioritization, focusing on Evaluation Criteria

Earl stated that Provost Reutzel was out of town and unable to attend this meeting, and he introduced Associate Provost Mike Richards. Mike remained through the meeting to answer questions and discuss faculty recommendations. Earl reiterated that the Faculty Senate, according to our Bylaws, has a "primary responsibility" to evaluate and weigh criteria for program prioritization.

#### *Prioritization Process and Agenda*

Discussion began with the document entitled "Prioritization Process and Agenda." Earl noted that we are presently at Stage 1 and will soon begin Stage 2, and he opened the floor for comments. Jim Cotts asked if prioritization is a foregone conclusion in light of the ongoing discussion of competing "visions" for the University. Mike Richards suggested that finding a vision was integral to the prioritization process, and he noted that a survey will soon be distributed through which faculty can express their views. Earl mentioned that this survey will likely contain five "visions," and Mike added that the responses will permit a wider range of answers through Likert-scaled responses and opportunities for written comments. The Faculty Senate will play an important role throughout the prioritization and reallocation process, as outlined in this document.

### *Prioritization Definition, Schedule and Programs*

The document entitled "Prioritization Definition, Schedule and Programs" was then discussed. Earl first distributed an updated list of 171 discrete academic programs, and he pointed out that the information-gathering stage will take nearly a year, through March 2001. Two departments, Physical Science and Business, will be evaluated in April 2000, and the prioritization instruments and process will be refined during Summer 2000. It was suggested that Physical Science and Business have an opportunity for subsequent analysis in light of any refinements made to the prioritization criteria after their initial review. One senator raised a question about discrepancies in the programs list, particularly, in Teacher Education, and it was suggested that clarifications and changes be brought first to the deans and from them to the Provost's Office. A question was raised about the deadlines faced by departments that are to be reviewed in September 2000; Mike Richards stated that their materials would be due at the end of September, and all departments would also face end-of-month deadlines.

### *Evaluation Criteria*

"Evaluation Criteria" were discussed on a point-by-point basis, with suggestions and recommendations detailed below.

#### *1. Qualitative Criteria*

Mike Richards explained that not all criteria under Item 2a will apply to every department or program. These criteria are examples rather than an exhaustive list.

- It was suggested that "Exhibitions" and/or "Performances" be added to the list under 2a so that the Fine Arts and Performing Arts can be better represented.
- Under Item 3, the issue was raised about whether programs are related to General Education, majors or minors, or as service courses for another major? Mike mentioned that the criterion of service courses is addressed under Quantitative Criteria, Item 6.
- Following further discussions, Mike Richards mentioned that items 2c, 2d, 2e, and 2f need reworking, but it was not clear how these would be altered.
- In addressing Item 2b, the point was made that explanation and justification for small-enrollment classes, especially writing-intensive or foreign language classes, should be added.

#### *2. Quantitative Criteria*

Much of the data has been compiled by Mike Richards and will be provided by the Provost's Office.

1. "External demand" refers to national demand for a discipline or major as expressed in surveys of incoming students. The Provost's Office can provide this data.
2. "Internal demand" was discussed, with the major recommendation that the point scale be changed so that it is a graded scale with greater differentiation of points. Jim Cotts proposed a matrix with categories of "low," "medium," and "high" demand located on one axis and the categories of "increasing," "steady," and "decreasing" demand patterns on the other axis. For this category, the Deans' Council reserves the right to determine

definitions and scale, according to Mike Richards. Another recommendation was that the criterion of “incoming student quality” be dropped from Item 2b because we have no or little control over student quality. Mike mentioned that this could possibly be addressed on a “value-added” basis, and it could be repositioned with Item 3.

3. "Quality of Program Outcomes" raised the question, How do we conduct a value-added analysis? Mike Richards explained that external audiences, principally members of the State Legislature, want some measure of “value-added” education but have not defined the term or process. One suggestion is to have comparisons of entrance and final examinations.

4. "Size and Scope of Program" was then considered. Item M, the number of funded grants should be expanded to include the dollar amount of funded grants. One senator asked for clarification of Items L and R, the number of student/faculty publications, and the number of publications and creative projects. It was recommended that the words “peer reviewed” be added where appropriate. With respect to Item L, it was suggested that the word “collaborative” be added to reflect the nature of “student/faculty” publications.

5. The section on “Productivity” was viewed as being clearly stated, but some discussion centered on the differences between larger and smaller departments. Earl noted that “productivity” can be a helpful measure even for smaller programs that perform in an efficient or cost-effective manner. One suggestion was to provide explanation for smaller programs that are limited in size for specific reasons.

6. In discussing the criterion of “Internal Impacts,” some senators expressed confusion about the terms of “voluntary” versus “required” impacts. Because of the lack of clarity, a descriptor should be added that explains the meaning of these terms.

7. “Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program” led to a brief discussion of course fees. It was pointed out that course fees can work for or against a program; charging excessive fees, in fact, may hurt a program. The term of “services rendered” can include service to the community if it brings in revenue. A question was raised about academic support and resources generated by programs such as Faculty Development in the library. It was recommended that the sale of products, such as cattle and sheep by Agriculture, be included under potential sources of revenue.

8. The category of “Other Justification” was discussed at length, since its suggested point total was one-sixth of the total. The Provost’s Office has suggested moving this item into the qualitative category, and it is viewed mainly as section for faculty and departments to add comments on the benefits of sustaining a program.

As noted in the discussion and underscored in several documents, the Faculty Senate and the Deans’ Council will both engage in the prioritization and reallocation process and will put forth their own rankings of programs. Each may decide to rank programs within colleges and the university. An important point was made that some programs may receive “low” scores but not face elimination or significant change because of their centrality to the mission and vision of the university. Finally, programs still in the planning stages can be mentioned in the prioritization process through the narrative and qualitative sections.

### *Prioritization Forms and Formats*

The Faculty Senate reviewed and discussed the suggested prioritization forms and templates. The first is the qualitative form; the second is an evaluation form, based largely on Dickeson's format, to be used by the Deans and Provost; and the third is the quantitative form. Earl also distributed samples of a "Program Revenue and Cost Summary" form.

### *Concluding Comments*

Earl mentioned that all academic programs are facing close scrutiny in this process, and he asked how prioritization and reallocation would be applied to the administrative parts of campus. Mike responded that the administration will undergo similar scrutiny, but that he was not sure about the details.

Earl commended the Provost's Office for trying to make prioritization a coherent and open process, and he asked for additional comments and questions. The issues of marketability, market demand, and areas of critical need in teaching were raised, and Mike noted that these may be built into Item 2 on Page 4. Danielle Dubrasky suggested that current market demand could be used as a reliable measure. When asked how long it would take to incorporate the suggestions of this body into revising the "Evaluation Criteria," Mike said he would do so expeditiously. He also made it clear that the Provost's Office will supply departments and programs with all necessary and relevant quantitative data collected by their office. Earl reminded the Faculty Senate that they will be immersed in prioritization after all data has been compiled, about one year from now. It was suggested that the Faculty Senate continue to monitor the process, perhaps through periodic progress reports from senators whose departments have gone through prioritization. Earl thanked all in attendance for a very productive meeting.

### **III. Executive Session**

None.

### **IV. Motion for Executive Session**

Jim Cotts MOVED for executive Session at the next meeting, SECONDED by Bill Romey, PASSED Unanimously.

### **V. Adjournment**

MOTION to adjourn by Luciane Berg, at 5:05 PM.