

Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting

January 19, 2000

The regular meeting of the 1999-00 Faculty Senate was called to order by Dan Spencer at 3:30 p.m. The following Senators were present for all or part of the meeting: Brady, Cairns, Gillespie, Hariman, Honts, McCrickerd, Parsa, Petersen, Phillips, Pomeroy, Romig, Schneider, Simpson, Sisk, Spencer, Stratton, Strentz, Torgerson, Walker, Wright
Absent: Berry, Brady

Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

Upon proper motion and second, the minutes of the December 1999 meeting were approved.

Report from President Maxwell and President Spencer:

President Spencer welcomed the senators and the over 100 guests to the meeting and requested and received consent from the body for open participation from the guests. He then turned to President Maxwell for the opening presentation.

President Maxwell made two main points in his opening remarks:

- 1) nothing has yet been decided concerning the process of Academic Review
- 2) the review will be of all academic and non-academic programs.

Last week for two days, Dr Robert Dickeson, a nationally known consultant was on campus speaking on the topic of process for an Academic Review. He authored the book *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services* which multiple copies of are now on campus and soon to be on reserve at Cowles Library. Two fundamental assumptions have come forward, which are 1) Drake is over-programmed for our resources and 2) an institution does not grow its way out of this type of situation.

An operational definition of a program as presented by Dr Dickeson states that a program consumes resources. He noted that in a review of IPEDS Completions report for a three-year period there were 74 programs, which graduated four or fewer students.

President Maxwell put the Review situation into an immediate context. The Board of Governors approved three years ago a five-year plans, which was, based on some assumptions that have not been realized. Next week at the winter regular session of the Board, President Maxwell will ask the Board for permission to set aside some parts of that plan and draw up to 8% from the quasi-endowment to help fund the University.

During the past week, four documents were sent to the faculty as electronic enclosures. These were reviewed with the group including:

- a) Four Goals for Academic Program Review
- b) 14 Desired Outcomes of Process/Indicator of Success
- c) Proposed Criteria for Program Evaluation and
- d) Operational Mission Statement.

Also presented was an overhead of an organizational chart of the Review Process.

The purpose of the Review will be to strengthen the University and our confidence in the University. There must be University community inclusion and engagement to make the

product of the process work. The **Academic Program Review Steering Committee** (APRSC) will be made up of faculty who will design the process, assign weights to the evaluation criteria and manage and design the communication process for the Review. There are two fundamental differences in the operations of the Academic Review and the Non-Academic Review. The Academic Review will be based on priority setting and the Non-Academic Review will be an examination of "are we doing the right things with the right people in the right ways".

Senator Hariman asked if that meant non non-academic programs would not be cut. President Maxwell indicated that if savings or efficiency changes were found, these would be implemented immediately. Senator Stratton asked if once cuts are made whether the savings will go towards the University debt or into the programs. President Maxwell replied that he hoped the funds would be placed in both directions.

A sample timetable was offered:

- By Feb 15 Steering Committee (APRSC) set
- By May 12 Departments and Colleges will have their priorities set and submitted to the Deans
- By Aug 1 Analysis of University wide priorities completed
- By Nov 1 President Maxwell receives the recommendations
- By Jan 2001 Board of Governors receives the recommendations

The Operational Mission Statement received some comments but was not examined paragraph by paragraph. Senator Hariman reminded the group that an operational statement does not do the work for us but does provide direction as an additive to the current mission statement. Senator Petersen was concerned that the statement should be more Drake specific. Senator Torgerson raised the concern that the relationship between the professional areas and the liberal arts was not more clearly expressed. Senator Strentz wondered if the document highlighted the heightened sense of faculty service enough. Senator McCrickard expressed a concern with the usage of knowledge and learning in the piece and how some programs are directed towards one more than another.

The selection of the APRSC members and the Review and Priorities Advisory Committee (RPAC) members was discussed. The selection factors discussion included: whether or not there should be elections, how to select or elect the nominees, how many faculty and non-faculty to select, and whether proportionate representation should be a consideration for one committee or both.

Senator Walker noted that the Steering Committee would be process oriented whereas the Priorities Committee will serve in an advisory capacity. Senator Strentz reminded the group that each unit/college would have to determine what is the lowest priority and highest priority in their unit/college. President Maxwell stressed that the process has stages and judgments must be made at each stage.

President Spencer closed the discussion noting the Executive Committee will meet next week following the Board of Governors meeting. Once the Board gives approval to the five-year plan revision, the Academic Review will proceed. President Spencer requested for any and all faculty to provide additional input to the Executive Committee by next week.

President Maxwell informed the assembly that the consultant was pleased to find the faculty he met interested and ready to proceed with the Review Process.

Senator Hariman moved and several seconded **Motion 00-05:**

Faculty Senate endorses the Academic Review Process as outlined by President Maxwell.

The motion was accepted by unanimous vote.

Unfinished Business: None presented.

New Business: None presented

On proper motion and second the meeting closed at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by Nancy Geiger, Secretary