

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**Thursday, October 11, 2018 at the Alumni House, 1: 30 p.m.**

**I. Attendance:**

K. Corley, G. Glasgow, T. Green, J. Haldeman, S. Jensen, G. Renz, C. Sagovac, H. Singaravelu, L. Teeter, P. Witkowski.

**II. Old Business:**

1. Upon motion by G. Renz, seconded by T. Green, the Senate unanimously approved the minutes of the September 20, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting subject to the removal of the “as she is up for promotion” language in Section III. 3 of the minutes (regarding P. Witkowski).
2. Committee Appointments
  - a. The Senate unanimously approved a motion by G. Renz, seconded by P. Witkowski, to allow *Visiting Professor Daniel Mueller* to become a member of the Faculty Assembly and enjoy all rights thereof.
  - b. The Senate unanimously approved a motion by G. Glasgow, seconded by P. Witkowski, to appoint *Matthew Pickart* as the Leigh Gerding College of Fine Arts representative for a two-year term ending May 2020.
  - c. The Senate unanimously approved a motion by G. Renz, seconded by J. Haldeman, to appoint *Janice Palmer* as an At-Large member on the Finance Advisory Committee for a two-year term ending May 2020.
  - d. The Senate unanimously approved a motion by T. Green, seconded by H. Singaravelu, to appoint *Carole Tucker* as replacement for Ravin Kodikara in his absence for the remainder of the Fall 2018 term as an At-Large member of the Global Citizenship Program Committee. R. Kodikara will return for the Spring 2018 semester.
3. In response to the College of Arts & Science chairs’ letter to the senate (See Attachment B), the Faculty Senate agreed that G. Renz would send an email to them stating that the Senate recognizes their concerns and asking what action, if any, they are requesting of the Senate.

**III. New Business:**

Provost Schuster met with the Faculty Senate to discuss forming an Academic Program Review committee that includes faculty members and administrators. Provost Schuster explained that the Higher Learning Commission told Webster University to institute a system of regular ongoing review of academic programs and tie those reviews to the budgeting and strategic planning processes. Accordingly, he said the university needs to create a standing Academic Program Review committee to begin the process of creating regular academic program review. Once the Academic Program Review committee has been created and its members selected, then committee will then start developing the processes and criteria for academic program review.

After discussion and editing the original proposed Academic Program Review committee language, a majority of the Senate approved a motion by G. Glasgow, seconded by J.

Haldeman, to accept the revised Academic Program Review Committee (see Attachment A). The motion passed 8 votes to 2. Specifically, seven (7) Senators plus the Faculty Senate President, who were present at the meeting, voted in favor of the motion, for eight (8) affirmative votes. Two (2) Senators who were present at the meeting opposed the motion.

Two (2) Senators who were not present at the meeting emailed the Senate stating they opposed the original proposed Academic Program Review, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting. Even if those two votes were counted against the motion, the motion would still have passed 8 votes for and 4 votes against the motion to create an Academic Program Review committee.

After the vote, the Senate agreed that before the next Senate meeting on November 8, 2018, the Senate President and Senators representing schools and colleges would find faculty members from schools and colleges who are interested in serving on the Academic Program Review committee. Then, at the November 8<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate meeting, the Senate will select the five members from the volunteers to represent the different schools and colleges on the Academic Program Review committee.

**Meeting Adjourned: 3: 45 p.m.**

## **Attachment A**

### Revised Proposed Academic Program Review Committee (Senate approved 10/11/18)

#### **I. Function**

The standing Academic Program Review committee will review all for-credit, accredited academic degree and certificate programs once every five years according to a schedule set by the committee. The committee will not review noncredit programs or activities.

#### **II. Membership and Terms**

- A. The voting members of the Academic Program Review committee shall consist of:
  - 1. Eight (8) faculty member who have status or are status-track faculty members and do not have administrative appointments. Five (5) of these faculty members will be appointed by the Faculty Senate with each of them representing a different college or school. The other three (3) faculty members will be appointed by the Provost / Chief Academic Officer / Vice President for Academic Affairs after consulting with the Faculty Senate, one of whom may be a contingent faculty member in the Faculty Assembly.
  - 2. The Vice Provost
  - 3. Two (2) academic deans appointed by the Provost / Chief Academic Officer / Vice President for Academic Affairs.
  - 4. One (1) international campus representative appointed by the Provost / Chief Academic Officer / Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- B. Ex-Officio staff members who cannot vote and will be appointed by the Provost / Chief Academic Officer / Vice President for Academic Affairs from the following areas:
  - 1. Academic Affairs

2. Office of Institutional Effectiveness
3. Finance and Administration
4. Admissions Office

- C. Terms: Other than the Vice Provost, who is always on the committee, the other voting members will serve two year terms, with the terms staggered so that half of the voting members of the committee are appointed each year.

### **III. Procedures**

- A. There will be two (2) committee chairpersons: The Vice Provost will always be a chairperson and there will a faculty chairperson selected from the faculty members on the committee. The faculty members on the committee shall annually select the faculty chairperson before or at the first scheduled committee meeting each academic year. The faculty chairperson must have at least one year of prior service on the committee. The chairpersons are jointly responsible for setting the agenda, scheduling meetings, keeping minutes, and overseeing and coordinating the activities of the committee, although they may distribute the duties between them.
- B. The committee will conduct academic program reviews using formal processes, procedures and criteria that will be jointly developed by the Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate President, and the Provost / Chief Academic Officer / Vice President for Academic Affairs. The formal procedures and criteria will be publicly announced and available for inspection upon request to the committee chairperson(s). These formal processes, procedures and criteria may be modified in the future only with the joint consent of the Faculty Senate and the Provost / Chief Academic Officer / Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- C. A quorum shall be required to conduct the business of the committee at any meeting. A quorum exists if 50% or more of the voting members are present at the time of the vote.
- D. Minutes of meetings will be maintained by the Chairperson(s) and will be available for public review upon request or by publication on a website.
- E. The committee chairpersons may announce public hearings and interviews with individuals and departments affected by the committee's reviews in order to facilitate the committee's deliberations.
- F. At the end of each academic year, the committee will submit a report describing the actions taken or recommended that year to the Faculty Assembly, the Faculty Senate, the academic deans, and the Provost / Chief Academic Officer / Vice President for Academic Affairs. The committee will also review its formal processes, procedures and criteria and recommend any changes deemed necessary to the Faculty Senate and the Provost / Chief Academic Officer / Vice President for Academic Affairs.

### **Attachment B**

September 19, 2018

To the Faculty Senate:

The council of chairs in the College of Arts & Sciences is ready and eager to participate in the upcoming program review. We see this as an opportunity to gain a better understanding of where our university stands in terms of curriculum, budgetary efficiencies, and strategic focus. Because of our commitment to shared governance, the faculty and administration should partner, with both playing active roles in all the stages of the program review process from planning and design through implementation and analysis.

We understand that the administration plans to work with the Senate on developing committees for program review. We strongly encourage a pro-active approach, where the Faculty Senate initially provides a draft framework document outlining process, criteria/measures, and potential actions, along with justification for the framework design. This document can be a starting point for conversations with the administration about additions, modifications, and process. By taking the first step, the Faculty Senate can ensure faculty buy-in for the process and engage with the administration in a cooperative and meaningful way.

Our 2012 program review can be used as a baseline for designing the next phase. That review only covered academic majors at the University. While this is a good starting point, it only gives a snapshot of a part of the University. In order to get a comprehensive view of how our University functions, we must review both academic and non-academic programs. Examples of non-academic programs include Athletics, Study Abroad, Chess Team, Career Planning and Development, Advising, and Dining Services. It will be important to understand how each of these non-academic programs integrates with the academic programs, and how each contributes strategically and/or financially. The model to be recommended by the small program sustainability implementation team can perhaps helpfully supplement the work of 2012.

Our university currently faces complex problems, and we hope that this Program Review can be used in a constructive way to identify strengths and weaknesses, as well as provide direction for growth opportunities and investment.

Thank you,

Mary Lai Preuss and Bruce Umbaugh  
(speaking on behalf of the council of chairs in CAS)