The Senate met on Thursday, November 3, 2011 at the Alumni House

Ralph Olliges, Faculty Senate President, Presiding

Members Present: John Aleshunas, Jef Awada, Glen Bauer, Maxine Bauermeister, Mary Bevel, Carla Colletti, Susan Heady, Dan Hellinger, Scott Jensen, John Orr, Stephanie Schroeder, Eileen Solomon, Roy Tamashiro, Keith Welsh, Gwyneth Williams

Approval of Minutes
A motion was made and seconded to approve the October 27th Faculty Senate meeting minutes as amended. With the exception of one abstention, all were in favor; motion carried.

Announcements
The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on November 17th.

Honors Learning Community
Honors by definition is the prerogative of the faculty and deserves wider consideration because it has larger ramifications. The honors learning community was started with the intention of retaining the best students and, in principal, it is a good initiative, but honors are something that is decided by faculty. Honors falls under university wide academic standards under Curriculum Committee mandate and, therefore, falls under Faculty Senate jurisdiction. It was suggested that we invite Sarah Tetley to a Faculty Senate meeting to gather more information and the matter will then be discussed at an upcoming Faculty Senate meeting to decide what direction to follow.

Program Review
Ralph Olliges welcomed Dr. Hellerud, Associate Provost and Dr. Schuster, Provost and Senior Vice President, to the Faculty Senate meeting to speak on program review.

Dr. Schuster began by sharing who has been appointed to the Program Review Committee and gave a timeline for the program review process. The timeline is aggressive as criteria will be developed in the next two months and then go to departments to begin program review. He stated that the program review process is a way of taking inventory of what Webster University is doing and how well we are doing it and then align resources to the areas that may not have them. Dr. Schuster stated that the program review process is not a way to kill programs or to make cuts, as is done at other institutions. This year, Webster University has 200 full-time faculty on the St. Louis campus and there is still a lot of space to grow the full-time faculty and the way to approach this is by identifying how to use our limited and finite resources for the students and how the University will fulfill our mission and values.

Dr. Schuster shared the committee's charge:
- Develop and propose criteria (and a tool or rubric) for evaluation and prioritization of programs
- Collaborate with the Program Review Steering Committee; provide input on program data to be collected and on common narrative questions for departments
- Upon departments' completion of reports, evaluate and prioritize programs based on criteria
- Provide a report with recommendations on programs, which may include expansion, enhancement, consolidation, or elimination, at the conclusion of your review
- Communicate your work and progress to Webster constituents, including your schools, Faculty Assembly, Deans' Council, and the Provost
- Provide best practices and lessons learned from your experience to the Office of the Provost and other academic constituents for future program reviews

Q: Will faculty be involved in the program review process?
A: The program review process cannot be successful without faculty involvement. Program review will take place in the departments, not by technical experts, but by those who care for students.

Dr. Schuster shared that the outcome of the process is to enhance the work that has been done and to extend that to all parts of the institution. Other parts of Webster University will undergo program review as well – Career Development, Financial Aid, Human Resources and Student Services, as well as international sites.

Q: Will the international sites be a separate review?
A: Yes, with a few exceptions as most programs are offered in St. Louis. The program review process is used to engage individuals as a mechanism to bring the Webster community together.

Q: Will departments be doing the bulk of the program review work in the coming spring semester?
A: Yes

Q: For those departments that have substantial numbers of international relations programs, will that department be doing most of that work for international campuses?
A: International relations programs initiated by Webster Groves have an intellectual obligation in this program and obtaining information from other sites will enhance the program review, but it is up to the department to assess those needs.

Q: Will one job of the Program Review Committee be to give clear direction to department chairs in Webster Groves that have programs in Europe?
A: Excellent question for the Program Review Committee.

It was mentioned that it is difficult to obtain accurate data and not to rely solely on the data that is generated by CARS. We need to take into account double majors, etc. and it might be useful to have class sizes listed in categories (20-25; 25-30, etc.) rather than just a number. Everyone should be able to see how data was generated. A suggestion was made that the data results be shared with Faculty Senate and the Faculty Assembly in order to provide feedback before the final data report has been completed. Dr. Schuster believes that Faculty Senate and governance should be incorporated into the process.

Q: Cutting may be in order – does that include faculty lines or departments?
A: Departments should not be created or eliminated based on subjective criteria. There is currently not a sufficient number of full-time faculty at Webster. We need to continue to build a case to grow the number of faculty to make Webster University bigger and better.

The statement was made that direction is needed so that working groups will not advocate their own self-interest, but look at overall vision of the University. Lines of communication need to be opened with other departments to create a sense of unity University wide.

Q: With the program review, this will affect the workload of department chairs that are already overloaded. Would it be possible to provide release time for department chairs to complete program review this spring?
A: Dr. Schuster is open to suggestions and he will see what can be done.

Q: Some department chairs have adequate clerical assistance, but some do not. How will that be handled?
A: Dr. Schuster stated that resources will not be spared in order to get the job accomplished.

A statement was made that it is difficult for faculty to not be defensive about their work/programs and remain open minded when there is anxiety about losing their jobs.

Dr. Schuster thanked the Faculty Senate for their input on program review.

Ralph Olliges encouraged everyone to attend the administration's response to the student's delegate's agenda meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting; meeting adjourned at 2:49 p.m.