6-11-2010

Faculty Senate Minutes - June 11, 2010

USM Faculty Senate

The University of Southern Mississippi
Faculty Senate
Minutes for the Meeting of November 6, 2009
216 Thad Cochran Center

Members Present and Represented (by proxy): H. Annulis (by speakerphone), J. Bass, D. Beckett, J. Brannock, D. Bristol (H. Annulis), B. Burgess, J. Burnett, D. Daves, A. Davis, D. Davis, J. Evans, D. Fletcher, B. George, C. Goggin, T. Gould, A. Haley, S. Hauer, N. Howell, S. Howell, M. Klinedinst, T. Lipscomb, D. Lunsford (by speakerphone), M. Lux, C. McCormick, J. McGuire, J. Meyer, C. Meyers, S. Oshrin, R. Pandey, C. Rakocinski (J. Brannock), D. Redalje (A. Davis), T. Rehner (M. Lux), S. Reischman, K. Rushing (S. Oshrin), R. Scurfield (D. Lunsford), J. Shin, J. B. Spencer (M. Klinedinst), D. Tingstrom, T. Welsh, J. Wolfe, A. Young

Member Absent: S. Rouse

1.0   Call to order
Pres. Evans called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm, as contact was made by speakerphone with members on the coast.

2.0   Approval of the agenda
The agenda was approved by voice vote.

3.0   Approval of the minutes
Minutes from the Senate meeting on October 2, 2009 were approved by voice vote.

4.0   Old Business
    4.1   Report on Selection of Responsibility-Centered Management Budget
 Committee members
Faculty Senate President Jeff Evans reported that individual college faculty senate delegations were to pick representatives for the Responsibility-Centered Management Budget Committee. The Faculty Senate had picked Steve Oshrin for their selection last month. Arts and Letters selected the Chair of College Council, who turned out to be David Butler, recently elected. Senators were unsure, however, if he would choose to serve and may need to select another. Rod Posey was selected for the College of Business, Richard Mohn for the College of Education and Psychology, Kathy Yadrick for the College of Health, Bobby Middlebrooks for the College of Science and Technology, and Steve Jackson for the Coast.

    4.2   Proposal for selection and process of the University Strategic Budget
 Committee
The Faculty Senate Executive Committee was asked to formulate a proposal for a new university standing committee to set budget priorities and deal with impending cuts. Pres. Evans noted that after getting input from former Academic Planning Group members (including Sen. Oshrin and Pres. Evans himself), Assoc. Provost Bill Powell, and others, author Robert Dickeson was chosen as supplying a model which could be usefully adapted to USM. Many universities are modeling reduction plans based on what he has suggested, and the one found most impressive by the committee was Indiana State University.

Pres. Evans considered this proposal a recommendation of the faculty senate as asked for by the provost rather than a resolution; therefore hoped to take action at this meeting. The committee has been labeled the University Priorities Committee, and is the same entity referred to as the
"University Strategic Budget Committee" or "Son of APG."

Sen. McGuire reflected upon concerns expressed by Sen. Rehner and others about acting so fast. Sen. Lipscomb noted that in a meeting with the president last month she noted that she is to present an overview of budget cut recommendations by the end of January. There is not a lot of time for this. Sen. Young suggested that given the time frame, the senate could get basic agreement on a draft with details to be

hammered out later. The criteria and weights for judging programs especially need detailed discussion, she noted. Sen. Davis noted that Indiana State went through this process in 12 months, and Bill Powell had suggested Dickeson as a potential guide. Sens. Young and Lipscomb pointed out that many of these budget priorities and cuts were system issues—we should not cut what everyone else is. Sen. Davis noted that the universities studied had gone through the process independently, and Pres. Evans suggested that uniqueness in the state would add to a program's value. Sen. Young suggested the benefits of a system-wide approach could include moving tenured faculty to a program that is being kept somewhere in the state. Sen. Meyers noted that IHL would have to approve program cuts, so they would have a system-wide perspective. Sen. Haley suggested that our recommendations could give the president a framework for negotiating with other universities. How could a budget committee make any decisions if they had to consult with IHL first? Pres. Evans suggested going section by section and discussing it, and senators agreed. Sen. Oshrin moved and Sen. Brannock seconded approving the general draft as a recommendation to the provost, with details to be amended through discussion.

Pres. Evans noted this proposal is a blueprint, not a formal contract for how everything must be done. It is subject to change. The committees, once set up, will have authority to make changes but this proposal provides a guide to get the committees going. He proceeded to overview the proposal, section by section, and senators interjected comments and suggested changes:

Charge to the University Priorities Committee

Examine <u>all areas</u> of the University for potential cost savings and make recommendations to the President and Provost as how to achieve savings. As a part of this charge the committee will determine what the priorities of the university are in moving forward. Priorities are reflected in the funds allocated for degree programs and in funds for non-academic program/services. Programs are defined as any part of the university supported from the university budget.

The proposal is a blueprint for how the University Priorities Committee (UPC) will approach evaluation of all funded areas of the university. As in construction, this blueprint will be subject to slight modifications by the UPC during the course of their work.

Proposed University Priorities Committee Plan

I. The need for a University Priorities Committee

The University of Southern Mississippi is in the midst of current and predicted budget reductions that mean we cannot function as in the past. It is expected that we must absorb about a 12 million dollar budget reduction for the FY 2011 budget (starting July 2010), an additional 13 million reduction for the FY 2012 budget, and perhaps another 10 million dollar reduction by FY 2013. These are all losses in state appropriation to USM and can be reduced to a limited degree by increases in tuition dollars through raising tuition, increased retention, and increased enrollments. Much of the budget reduction for FY 2011 have already been identified yet the next two fiscal years are in question. In the sense that reductions appear to be extended over a long period the university must look beyond quick fixes and instead rely on sound continued planning for what programs are required to meet our educational missions and what level of supporting services are needed for those programs. <u>We need a University Priorities Committee to function in determining what programs and services are essential to the mission of The University of Southern Mississippi.</u>
The Provost requested that Faculty Senate recommend the function and the committee make up of a budget committee. This report responds to that request and names that committee the University Priorities Committee. This committee will have a profound influence on the direction the university will take over the next decade or longer. It is important that the mission of the university is clearly defined, understood by the entire university community, and used as a guiding principle for

all evaluations.

II. Foundation for action.

     A. Academic Planning Group (2009)

     The most recent work at the university in evaluating programs was done by the Academic Planning Group (APG). This group of both academic and non-academic representatives in the 2008-2009 academic year developed a numerical analysis of some attributes of all academic programs in the university. The APG was then expanded to include more representatives in Feb 2009 with a new function of determining how to handle budget cuts for the FY 2010 and 2011. After 2010 cuts were achieved by Colleges, the APG then worked on the cuts for 2011 with a target of about $8 million from the academic side of the university. The APG then was divided into academic APG and non-academic APG. Only the Academic APG continued to meet.

     Deans were asked to rate their college's programs into three groups: A. top 25%, B. middle 50% and C. bottom 25%. The APG then met with each Dean to go over their bottom 25% and view possible savings. Also, support services that were in the budget stream from the Provost were asked to describe their units. This did not produce much savings, so the APG asked the Deans to go back and each present $2 million in cuts in a priority list. Additionally, other academic services were asked to present up to 10% cuts. Each Dean and head of academic services then met with APG to describe their proposed cuts. The APG voted on the list of potential academic cuts. This vote was on a scale of 1 to 5 to put the cuts in rank order. After the ranked list was developed the list was given to President Saunders for final decisions by the Executive Cabinet.

B. Data-based and practical models to facilitate program priority ranking processes.

     Across the nation many universities and colleges are faced with shrinking budgets and are now forced into developing plans for prioritization of programs. Robert Dickeson, a former higher education administrator at several universities and a widely demanded consultant, published *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services* **(1999) to assist universities in reallocation of resources. One successful example of his model can be found at Indiana State University. Most of the work was accomplished within a 12 month period. (http://www.indstate.edu/academicaffairs/program_prioritization.htm).**

Other recent prioritization processes can be found at Minnesota State – Moorhead:
http://www.mnstate.edu/president/speeches/budget_and_planning_presentations/1_15_2009_reviewprogramservice.htm

Washington State University:
http://academic-prioritization.wsu.edu/index.html

University of Maine:
http://www.umaine.edu/achievingsustainability/process-and-timetable/

University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire:
https://www.uwec.edu/acadaff/PEEQ/PEEQArchive/PEEQArchive.htm

Pres. Evans mentioned that several models used by other universities had been talked about; some to set budget priorities and some to make reallocations. Indiana State was the closest situation to ours, but they were not under a potential budget cut. They were seeking to reallocate $2 million. Sen. Hauer asked what the meaning of "productivity" was in this context. Pres. Evans said that would be up to the committee to define. Sen. Young suggested that whatever the make-up of the committee, back-and-forth communication with the groups they represent would be essential, as we will need "our" definition of productivity, not a given individuals'.

Key points of this process include:

1. **Identifying responsible leadership in a shared leadership model (pg. 27 Dickeson).**
2. **Reaffirming the institutional mission: mission statements typically lack clarity to articulate to internal and external audiences understanding about the institution, its purposes, or its future (pg. 29-42 Dickeson).**
3. **Define what constitutes a program (not departments and not just degree programs)**
4. **Select appropriate criteria, design additional data formats, decide relative weights for each criteria, provide supportive data, make institution-wide perspective judgments.** Alternative scenarios that allow the university to meet budget challenges should be investigated, Sen. Klinedinst suggested.

      Dickeson suggests criteria of: <u>history, development and expectations of the program; external demand for the program; internal demand for the program; quality program outcomes; size, scope, and productivity of the program; revenue and other resources generated by the program; costs and other expenses associate with the program; impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program; opportunity analysis of the program.</u> (pg. 55-58 Dickeson):

1. **Use judgments of faculty leadership to drive program ratings (pg. 88 Dickeson). All participants operate from the same mission statement, program criteria and weights.**
2. **Conduct an open process with equitable representation of stakeholders linking program review with planning and budgeting (pg. 95 Dickeson).**

How open would this process really be?   Sen. Davis noted that existing governance committees should be continually informed. "Not just informed," said Sen. Young. Sen. Davis noted that shared leadership was presumed in this process; that everybody is both kept informed and is participating through dialogue in the process.

1. **Implement program decisions based on data: enrichment or expansion of programs rating a high level of quality (quality of inputs and processes and costs/other expenses); addition of new programs (habit of successful organizations – pre-emerging or synergistic areas); reduction of programs; consolidation or restructuring programs; elimination of programs (legal considerations); accreditation issues (pg. 107-110 Dickeson); humane dimensions of reallocation (pg. 110-113 Dickeson).**
2. **Reduce the number of specialized services and administrative responsibilities (pg. 44 Dickeson; pg. 127, Outsourcing Practices in Higher Education; pg. 137, Criteria for Measuring Administrative Programs).**

C. Currently available program assessment data.

At The University of Southern Mississippi all degree programs and non-academic units conduct annual assessments and submit reports to the University Assessment Committee that can be used for evaluating programs. Additionally, each academic unit is subject to rotating program review by both Academic and Graduate Councils. Results and data from these evaluations can be used, in addition to new data, to prepare program reports that will be required from all programs to address criteria determined by the Academic or Non-academic Priorities Committees.

Pres. Evans noted that existing data and assessments were often not gathered to justify programs, but to determine how to improve them. Thus, new reports would be needed from each program using existing assessments along with new combinations of data to justify the program.

III. Inclusion of all stakeholders

    1. **Faculty, staff, and students.**

        Stakeholders directly affected by academic and non-academic program prioritization are the faculty who make up the majority of the University's budget, the staff of both academic and non-academic programs, and the students who pursue their education. As in other comprehensive research universities, we believe that the faculty should be the major driver of the academic-related priority committee with all stakeholders involved at differing points along the process. (Dickeson, pg. 50).

    1. **Informed stakeholders.**

        The prioritization process should be open. This means description of the process should be widely published, that minutes of meetings should be posted in a timely manner, that observers to the process be allowed as long as it is not disruptive to their proceedings, that a web hotline be established for frequently asked questions, and that local media outlets be informed of our intentions and progress in prioritization (Dickeson, pg. 96). The local community, state, and region are affected by the prioritization process in terms of program availability and potential loss of employees. It is important that these stakeholders are kept informed.

Sen. Hauer asked how one could have an honest discussion of cutting a program when it could be in the newspaper the next day. Pres. Evans suggested the "open process" does not mean having cameras or reporters there, but observers from the university community—perhaps deans, AAPG, or faculty senate executive officers. Sen. Beckett pointed out that publicizing deliberations to campus would be like publicizing it to the news media anyway. Sen. Davis suggested the updates be framed as we are trying to make programs better, and take on the challenge of shrinking budgets, rather than focusing on programs to be cut. It is hard to recruit and talk positive about programs publicized as in the bottom tier or "on a hit list." Sen. Haley suggested that we need to know responses to programs that are endangered before a decision is made on them, so stakeholders like students, faculty, and community members can act. The idea of community members rising up to defend a program was idealistic, yet others pointed out that this is a public university.

IV. Committees for ongoing program review and budget recommendations.

    A. University Priorities Committee (UPC)

        The UPC will include two subcommittees, the Academic Priorities subcommittee and the Non-academic Priorities subcommittee. The University Priorities Committee chair will be selected from one of the Academic Priorities subcommittee co-chairs. The University through the Provost and/or President's office will provide support for these committees in terms of secretarial assistance, potential release time for committee chairs and members, and other resources, as needed.

Sen. Klinedinst noted that release time would be needed for faculty deeply involved in such a time consuming task. He suggested **a faculty member with accounting expertise granted release time for participation** would be most useful. Sen. Davis noted that APG was only reviewing programs presented by deans as "worthy" of being cut; this process would focus on <u>all</u> programs and equalize the assessment further.

The subcommittees will meet together monthly as the University Priorities Committee to monitor progress towards meeting their timelines and reaching their concluding recommendations (Dickeson, pg. 133). After each subcommittee obtains a draft of their separate recommendations, they will present them to the entire UPC. Each subcommittee will then consider potential modification of their recommendations. The UPC will then come together to prepare a joint recommendation report for potential implementation by the Executive Cabinet.

Sen. Oshrin suggested that one member of the UPC be a liaison with the RCM Committee, as the priorities suggested could have implications for the operating budget model, and vice versa. Pres. Evans agreed.

B. Academic programs – Academic Priorities subcommittee (AP).

The AP will be composed of no more than 15 voting members. The committee will include the following representatives of stakeholders:

Co-chairs The AP committee will be chaired by co-chairs, one selected by the Provost and one selected by the AP committee.

Representative Faculty Groups – Faculty Senate, Academic Council, Graduate Council, University Research Council, Gulf Coast faculty Council, and Council of Chairs each choose one representative to the committee for a total of 6 representatives.

Library Faculty Representative – one representative selected by library faculty.

Staff Council – the Staff Council will select one representative to the committee.

Student Representatives – one undergraduate and one graduate student representative selected by their respective student government associations.

Sen. Beckett asked if the students had done anything worthwhile on similar committees, like the APG. Sen. Oshrin said they had given some good ideas about the potential impact of cuts on students that faculty had not thought of. Sen. Haley suggested that we should not distrust our students—if we distrust them and cannot prepare them for such a task, what are we doing here? Sen. Burnett suggested that the students could sit on the committee to advise and give feedback, but not vote. Sen. D. Davis asked if students would be willing to take on such a time-consuming task to actually vote on issues. Sen. A. Davis suggested taking a long term view—perhaps in the current time crunch they not be given a vote, but simply allowed to observe. Perhaps in the future they could vote. Sen. Gould noted that there are problems with students voting on potentially taking people's jobs away. Sen. Welsh moved that the two student representatives should be ex-officio without vote, and Sen. Burnett seconded. Much discussion followed about how concerned or ambitious students would be, and the concern with which they would carry out this function. "We should trust our students. This is their place, too," said Sen. Hauer. The motion failed, 17-18-1.

Sen. Burnett moved to give the students one vote on the committee, even if two student representatives were on the committee. After a second, and some brief discussion, the motion failed 7-27-2.

Provost Choices - two representatives selected by the Provost, one appointed as co-chair of the committee, providing external resources and support for program prioritization processes (Co-chair release time).

Program Representation – up to three faculty representatives chosen by Faculty Senate Executive committee in consultation with College representatives to the Senate to achieve approximately equal representation among the five colleges.

Ex-officio - The committee will include one ex-officio non-voting representative from the Budget Office and one from Institutional Research.

Pres. Evans noted that, after looking over this proposal and responding via email, several deans felt marginalized. Perhaps they should be more involved. Much discussion followed, including the irony of having two student representatives and no dean. Yet, the deans would have crucial input later as they would also rank all programs and make suggestions for why certain programs should be cut. The APG had one dean as a voting member, and some saw that as unfair. This should be a faculty-driven process, others noted. The committee should also be kept small so to have more chance of getting anything done. The committee will certainly call on deans for information. If we have good deans, we should be able to trust them—we might be throwing away a crucial resource to not have them on the committee. All deans act as CEOs of their own college, and thus are self interested. (Yet, so will be all representatives on the committee.)   Perhaps all deans should be on the committee, or none. Deans will rate programs, too, so in a sense each dean will be the equal of the AP subcommittee. Sen. Lipscomb moved that **the six deans should be ex-officio nonvoting members of the AP subcommittee**. After Sen. Lux second, and limited further discussion, this motion passed on a voice vote.

>   **Observers - Additionally, observers will be invited as follows:**
>   **- A Faculty Senate Executive Committee member**
> **- If no AAUP representative is a voting member, then AAUP will be granted representation through observer status.**
> **- Other groups can petition the AP for observer status and if approved by the   committee can observe the meetings.**

Sen. Oshrin noted that observers must agree to respect the confidentiality of meetings, as there will be huge pressures on members that could hamper discussion if everything said will be in a public venue. Sen. McCormick noted the supreme complexity of the proposed process, and suggested that we are overrating our power in making these kinds of decisions. Pres. Evans suggested that he was open to another way of doing it, but what would that be?

>   **C. Non-academic programs – Non-academic Priorities subcommittee (NP).**

The NP will be composed of no more than 15 voting members. The committee will potentially include the following representatives of stakeholders with a combination of administrators and staff from Non-degree granting units:

Committee Chair – appointed by the President

President Choices - two representatives selected by the President, one of whom will chair the committee,

Staff Council – staff council will choose a representative for this committee,

Representative Non-Academic Groups – The NP committee chair, in consultation with President Saunders and the AP committee co-chairs, will select representatives from Non-academic units not answering to the Provost, such as Student Affairs, Admissions and Financial Aid, First Year Experience, Security, Entertainment and Athletics, Conference Center, Counseling, Custodial, Facilities, Human Resources, Legal Services, Physical Plant, Printing and Publishing, Student Financial Services, Student Health Services, Technology Services, Business Services, Career Services, Residence Life, Advancement, Sponsored Program Administration, Recreation/Payne Center, and other non-degree granting units.

One question was how we could know who should be on this subcommittee; Staff Council Rep. Dianne Coleman pointed out that staff members represent both academic and nonacademic areas of the university.

Student Representatives – one undergraduate and one graduate student representative selected by their respective student government associations.

Faculty Representative – one non-voting representative selected by the Academic Priority subcommittee.
Questions arose as to why the faculty representative would not vote on the NP while a staff representative would vote on the AP. Sen. Tingstrom moved that **the Faculty Representative should have a vote on the NP subcommittee**; Sen. Lipscomb seconded. This passed on a voice vote.

At this point, the meeting was interrupted with a short recess followed by the scheduled guest speakers. Later, Pres. Evans suggested approval of the proposal sections I – IV with incorporation of changes discussed during the meeting. Sen. McGuire questioned the need for such a complicated process. As a department chair, he could tell what numbers the IHL board and others would be considering in rating programs. A 10-page report from each program seems like a tremendous amount of work. Departments like English and Biology know they will not be cut, so why have everyone involved in such a long drawn-out process? Identify the programs identified as threatened, and then let them defend themselves. Sen. Daves noted that IHL is looking at universities and programs using inappropriate data in terms of number of majors or number of credit hours. Sen. McCormick noted that they are not considering research dollars and overhead brought in by departments with less teaching hours.

Assoc. Prov. Bill Powell reported that the official numbers used for such calculations are generated by USM's office of Institutional Research, and any who see flaws in those numbers should notify IR. We also know that 58% of college students attend college within a two hour drive and 76% within a four hour drive of home. Only 24 percent will be more than 250 miles away. They will not go to Oxford to study in a particular program, for the most part. So talk of cutting duplicated programs is overrated in terms of potential savings.
http://chronicle.com/article/What-Colleges-Dont-Know-About/48487/?key=TGhzd19qbyEebXVjKCZFeicDbXwqKBp8bHVAZygabVpU

Sen. A. Davis stressed that the idea was for equitable input from all programs, not just from deans about what programs could be cut. Sen. Klinedinst suggested that overall this is a good plan, and the major alternative is to simply pass such decisions to the administration. We need an institution-wide perspective, he said, and should put "sacred cows" on the table like scholarships from state allocations, student payments directed to athletics as well as programs involving staff and faculty. Sen. A. Davis noted that all recipients of university dollars are programs, and thus they would be included. Sen. Haley noted that changes involving a liaison with the RCM budget committee, faculty release time and expertise (especially in accounting), and for media relations limiting the complete openness of meetings be incorporated into the sense of the document approved. Sen. Young suggested **a vote approving Parts I – IV, including those changes.** Motion seconded, and passed 30 – 1. Sen. Lux moved **tentative approval of the full document pending discussion of the rest at a special called meeting.** This motion was seconded and passed 23 – 11. The faculty senate plans a special called meeting for this purpose on November 13, 2009.

V. Program evaluation process.

A. **Program Definition - any unit receiving budgetary support.**

Programs will be defined and identified by the University Priorities Committee in consultation with the Provost, Vice-President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Research, CFO, and Deans. This definition will allow the committee to identify what will be rated. Dickeson defines programs as any unit receiving budgetary support.

As a further example, Indiana State University describes academic programs as any academic program requiring six or more semester hours, including the following:

- **Majors**
- **Minors requiring six or more hours not offered with a major**
- **Certificates requiring six or more hours not offered with a major**
- **Masters' degrees, with the exception of master's degrees that are embedded within a doctoral program**
- **Specialist's degrees**
- **Doctoral degrees.**

B. **University Mission Statements need clarification for use as criteria**

The UPC will meet to review university mission statements to clarify which sections of the mission statements are appropriate for use as criteria for program evaluation. The UPC may need to elaborate on the meaning of the university mission statements to provide guidance to units writing reports for program rating. They may seek assistance for this from the President, Provost, Faculty Senate Direction committee, Strategic Enrollment Planning Committee and others. This task alone could take a year so the committee must set limits on the time spent on this task.

C. **Confirming criteria and weights for program ratings.**

Each Priorities subcommittee will confirm criteria used in program evaluation. The Academic Priorities (AP) subcommittee will seek evaluation criteria from Academic Council, Graduate Council, Faculty Senate's University Direction Committee, and the five College Deans following the committee's review of criteria suggested in listed Section II.B.4 (10 academic) and III.A (13 non-academic) (Dickeson, pg. 50) and found in other University prioritization process (Indiana State University, Minnesota State-Moorhead, Maine, Washington State). The Non-Academic Priorities (NP) subcommittee will also examine the criteria used by Dickeson for non-academic programs (Dickeson, pg. 50) and view other university prioritization criteria and develop its set of criteria for evaluation.

The AP subcommittee will determine weights to apply to each criteria, seeking advice from Academic and Graduate Councils, Senate's University Direction Committee, and Deans prior to a decision on weights. As an example, Indiana State's relative weights include the following:

- **Mission = 9**
- **Demand = 18**
- **Quality = 27**
- **Productivity = 27**
- **Potential = 9**
- **Additional = 5**

The NP subcommittee will develop its weights to apply to each criteria in consultation with Vice-Presidents and the CFO.

D. Programs will prepare reports requested by Priorities subcommittees for rating the programs.

    1. The Priorities subcommittees will request that each program submit a 10-page (maximum) Program Prioritization Report to answer a set of criteria determined by the Priorities subcommittees. The subcommittees will give guidance as to what type data should be included and what questions should be answered in the 10 page prioritization report. As an example see Indiana State's Feb 1, 2006 Prioritization Report. Programs will prepare the reports with data from existing resources such as Institutional Research, departmental records, and external sources for committee review.

2. The subcommittees should request an additional action plan from each program that details how the program will function over the next 3 years with (a) a 5% increase in budget, (b) no budget change, (c) a 5% budget reduction, and (d) a 10% budget reduction. The action plan should be of enough detail to see what and how budgetary items will be modified. The action plan may be needed by the committee to identify additional savings beyond that found by program reviews.

E. Program rating by Priorities subcommittees, Deans, and College committees.

1. The University Priorities Committee will review programs through its two subcommittees; the Academic Priorities Committee and the Non-academic Priorities Committee. Both committees will function separately in rating their respective programs and compiling the results of ratings
2. For academic programs, the Program Prioritization Report for each program will then be rated on a scale of 1-10 by three different groups – the Academic Priorities subcommittee, the Dean of each college, and a college committee of representative faculty from each college. The Deans and college committees will only rate their college. These ratings will be collected and each criteria will be multiplied by their weighting factor to get a combined rating for each program and an overall score as the sum of the criteria times weight scores for each criteria. The college committees could be college curriculum committees if these are representative faculty or it could be College Advisory Committees (CAC's) which are representative faculty groups or they may need to be formed in some colleges.
3. For non-academic programs, their Program Prioritization Reports will be rated by the Non-academic Priorities committee.
4. A final report by the University Priorities Committee will include a prioritized ranking of each program including budget recommendations.

    F. Analysis of program ratings for program ranking.

    1. The AP subcommittee will rank all academic programs, using approved criteria and weightings, within the following quintiles:
Upper 20 Percent: Candidates for enrichment
Next 20 Percent: Retained at higher level of support
Next 20 Percent: Retained at neutral level of support
Next 20 Percent: Retained at lower level of support
Lowest 20 Percent: Candidates for reduction, phasing out, consolidation

    2. The NP subcommittee will rank non-academic administrative programs following guidelines provided by Dickeson (pg. 137-138). Units will be ranked for reduction in the following by the following percentages of reduction in staff or non-personnel resources: 10%, 20%, 30%, 50%, and 75%. Units may also be ranked for phasing out, consolidation, or elimination

    3. The UPC will review rankings provided by the subcommittees, providing an overall ranking for academic (quintile) and non-academic (percentile) programs

    4. The rankings will be published to all university stakeholders.

G. The stakeholders can make recommendations to the subcommittee after initial rankings are published

For academic programs, colleges can make recommendation to the AP subcommittee through their Dean suggesting such actions like program consolidation, reorganization, suspension, or elimination. Similarly for non-academic programs, units can make similar recommendations to the NP subcommittee.

H. Program appeals process to be determined by the UPC

The UPC must decide when program appeals will occur. Will it be before recommendations are sent to the Provost and President? Will it be after? Will appeals be done by the UPC, an administrative group, or other?

I. The UPC prepares recommendations for the Provost and President

The UPC subcommittees will review the rankings, program reports, program action plans, and recommendations from colleges or non-academic units and will make recommendations as to program enhancement, reorganization, reduction, suspension, or elimination. It is possible that the UPC will conduct hearings on the published recommendations and receive input and suggestions for improving and refining ratings and recommendations from Colleges or Deans . The recommendations will include costs of program enhancement or money savings from program reduction or elimination.

VI. Provost and Vice President analysis.

The Provost and Vice Presidents will review rankings provided by the University Priorities Committee rendering independent judgments on a comparative basis. These rankings will be published campus-wide using the approved criteria and weightings along the quintiles or percentages identified. Additionally the Provost and Vice Presidents will recommend efficiencies that may be gained by cooperative and collaborative efforts within the institution.

VII. Administrative Actions – suggestions to consider

A. President and Executive Cabinet Evaluates UPC recommendations.

During the Final Analysis Stage the President and Executive Cabinet will render their judgment of the UPC's recommendations. A consultant may also review the recommendations and render an independent, third-party judgment on a comparative basis for all programs of the University.
B. UPC consulted again
After the Executive cabinet reviews the UPC recommendations they will communicate their intentions for action to the UPC. The UPC will be given an opportunity to voice possible refinement of the recommendations.
C. Using multiple templates
During an Integration and Synthesis Stage the President and UPC will integrate and synthesize the results of the program prioritization process with those relevant portions of past strategic plans, including Strategic Enrollment Plan, and other relevant information available. All recommendations from the President and the UPC will conform to MS IHL approved statements of role, scope, mission, vision, goals, and values. This synthesized report will constitute the Master Strategic Plan of the University and will be forwarded to the MS IHL for approval.
During the Final Decision Stage the MS IHL will review the Master Strategic Plan and will approve the final plan and implementation schedule.

D. Final Recommendations to Joint Faculty Senate, Academic Council, Graduate Council for advice.

As the three elected representative faculty governance bodies, the Faculty Senate, Academic Council and Graduate Council will be consulted before any recommendation is taken to the IHL board. All these bodies are advisory and this would be the last opportunity for the bodies to advise the President and Provost about proposed actions.

VIII. Ongoing Renewal of Program Prioritization

The UPC will continue into the next years with continued analysis of program priorities. The UPC will determine the mechanism for program updating and replacing committee members. All data generated in the development of the program prioritization process will be electronically stored and periodically updated for use in maintaining an ongoing database for continuing program analysis.

IX Timeline

November 2009 – Committees formed, Mission statement clarified
December 2009 - Determine criteria and weights for evaluations
January 2009 – Report guidelines published to units
February 2010 – Units complete and submit 10 page reports and action plans
March 2010 –
    1. College faculty committees, Deans and the Academic Priorities Committee rate academic programs;
    2. Non-academic Priorities subcommittee rate non-academic programs/services
April 2010 – program rating and quintile/percentage publication and appellate process begins
May 2010 – Appeal process
June 2010 – UPC recommendations submitted to Provost and President
July 2010 - Executive Cabinet submits recommendations to Joint Faculty Senate, Academic Council, Graduate Council
August 2010- Programs notified of any final programmatic changes.

5.0   New Business
    5.1   Proposal for Terms of Service for Department Chairs
The Provost sparked discussion of this proposal earlier in the year, and during his remarks went over the proposal, noting that it provides for evaluation of all chairs three years after initial appointment, and at five-year intervals thereafter. It does not set term limits, but simply allows both departments and chairs an accepted venue for making a change. The deans would initiate this but the actual process would be flexible depending on department and individual preferences. Faculty would be asked, in some way, "Do you want your department chair to continue to serve?" Department chairs would also be asked "Do you want to continue to serve?" It sets fixed terms for one to commit to serving as department chair, rather than serving indefinitely. A rotation would be set up so that all chairs are not being evaluated in the same year. Sen. Meyers asked about the situation where the chair is pleasing the faculty but not the dean. The Provost noted that to do a good job a chair has to please both. Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs should consider the proposal and, if approved, it should be added to the faculty handbook.

6.0   Forum Speaker: Jennifer Payne, USM Centennial Celebration
Following a short recess, Jennifer Payne addressed the senate about USM Centennial events. Planning got underway shortly after Dr. Saunders arrived in 2007. Starting in January, many events will be tied into the centennial anniversary of USM's legislative founding, although classes did not begin until two years later. Key goals are to increase knowledge about the university and its history among all constituents, and to focus on 5 key areas:
         Academics, Arts, Athletics, History and Traditions, and Founder's Day.

Ms. Payne is working with a committee that includes 17 faculty members, and she thanked all for their contributions of time. Key academic events include six lectures in Hattiesburg (3 in spring, 3 in fall) and two on the Coast (one in spring and fall). She has partnered with Dr. Louis Kyriakoudes in History to organize oral history roundtables—historical sessions about how various programs have developed over the past 100 years. In the fall there will be a civil rights retrospective and a centennial arts gala.

"The Big Event" is planned for April 10; a single day of service that started at Texas A & M University and now involves at least 32 institutions. The goal is to have the largest community service day ever for the university. Faculty who teach service learning courses will want to tie in to this.

A major event will be Spring 2010 Commencement. One university-wide ceremony is planned for Saturday, May 15 at 9 am. A very prominent speaker is sought, and graduates will be part of a special centennial observance.

She has received a small operating budget, supplemented by corporate sponsorships and private donations. Colleges have also helped and celebrations are "piggybacking" on annual events. Some dates are still tentative. Sen. Hauer noted that he served on the centennial committee and Ms. Payne had done an extraordinary job. Details on events and attempts to keep lines of communication open are at http://edudev.usm.edu/centennial/

Items 7.0 and 8.0 were deferred to a later special called meeting.

9.0   Remarks from the administration
9.1   Provost Lyman

The Provost commended the proposal for the University Priorities Committee, saying the President wanted a quick launch on this to have it in operation fast. His major hesitation was having two votes for students and none for deans. Sen. McCormick asked why have deans participate in a faculty-driven process? They had tremendous impact on what was presented to APG. Good deans will represent their colleges. The committee may need their information, but where do we draw the line? Prov. Lyman noted that deans have a wider college-range view than most faculty members, plus they have more needed information that could help the committee. They will need to be talked to at some point, and perhaps the ex-officio method will work for that.
Sen. McCormick also wondered how we could recruit students or faculty if a program is "on the bump list." New programs would need a grace period; some centers have three years to show they can make it, Prov. Lyman noted. This process is intended to identify potential enhancements, too, for good programs. This is meant to be a permanent committee, going on into the future and allocating funding in good times. The UPC proposal is a tremendous first step in improving from the APG process.

Prov. Lyman noted the IHL will get much more hard-nosed about programs not producing enough graduates to justify their existence. A pro-forma defense of them will not be enough anymore. There will be an effort to close duplicated programs around the state, and a danger is the stereotype held by some with USM as the education university, Ole Miss the humanities, and State the Agriculture and Tech university. When IHL board members met and visited here we could show them how well developed we

are in business, sciences, and arts as areas of strength. Two thirds of our graduate programs are ranked better than or equivalent to the best Ole Miss and State can offer. So they need to hear from us.

Questions have been raised about the qualification statements or accepted procedures for hiring associate or assistant deans. Prov. Lyman looked into this, and no, there are no accepted procedures for hiring them as defined by rank, tenure status, or years of experience. Part of the issue is that until recently on the Gulf Coast such assistants were termed coordinators. These positions were redesignated Associate Deans, with no changes in personnel except that Tom Lansford was newly appointed. Sen. Hauer noted that he could tell us what an associate dean was—a mouse trying to grow up to be a rat.

Prov. Lyman responded to questions about reserved parking policy. A new Special Event Parking policy, implemented Sept. 15, asks for three days notice and deals with a lack of personnel to staff parking areas. Ticket-writers have been taken away to do these events, and the situation is worsening. For 1 -10 slots and no parking attendant, there is no cost. For 11 – 25 slots with no attendant, $25. For 26 – 50 slots with attendant, $50. Over 200 slots with attendant will be $250. The policy came from Dr. Joe Paul, Vice President for Student Affairs, and was approved by the parking committee in the Spring. Sen. Oshrin noted that he had no recollection of the parking committee voting on that, and some programs cannot easily afford such fees for special events. If organizations campus-wide will be instituting fees to recoup money there must be some centralized clearinghouse or limits to these.

Part of the decision to have one commencement in Hattiesburg this May involved the Coast Coliseum already being booked for that weekend, Dr. Lyman said. The Executive Cabinet discussed the issue and thought one large commencement in Hattiesburg at the Rock with a strong keynote speaker would be appropriate. This will not allow all names to be read, so if colleges or departments want to have smaller supplemental ceremonies this well be fine. Certainly venues and logistics must be considered. Jennifer Payne noted that research was underway with universities that regularly do this—parking, shuttle systems, and potential venues and times for other events were being considered. In the event of rain, the Provost noted, the solution would be "ponchos." Perhaps each college could have a smaller ceremony with names read in the Coliseum; these need not take long. Sen. Annulis from the coast noted that they realized this decision had been made but that a unique coastal ceremony could still happen. A press release on the schedule for commencement is needed as soon as possible.

Prov. Lyman mentioned that IHL staff is seeking input for a policy the board is considering that would have any student transferring with an A. A. degree from any Mississippi community college (with at least a 2.0 GPA) to a university be considered finished with all general education core requirements. This will likely be discussed at the November IHL board meeting. Prov. Lyman said the process for considering this was just beginning, so there is no idea when this policy might be in effect.

10.0   Adjournment
Following discussion of a special senate meeting in one week to take up matters left undone, moved and seconded, Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:23 pm.

_____   _____
Respectfully Submitted,   Approved by
John Meyer   Jeff Evans
Secretary for Faculty Senate   President of Faculty Senate