Minutes of November 3, 2004


Others Attending: Lauren Adamson (for Susan Kelley), Ron Colarusso, Bill Fritz, Charlene Hurt, Beth Jones, Steve Kaminshine, Robert Moore, Tim Renick, Edgar Torbert

The minutes of October 20 were approved.

FY05 Budget Update

Dr. Henry announced that the revenue shortfall for FY05 would be worse than previously projected with revenues $2.8M below budget for summer and fall, and likely to be $4M short for the whole year. He advised this was cause for caution rather than panic. [Corrected back to $2.2M on November 10] Dr. Moore asked about implications for the previously discussed plan to cover the shortfall. Dr. Henry replied that the 2/3% take-back from vice presidential and dean units would still be in force with the rest covered centrally. He cautioned that there could be further reductions of up to $1.3M, if the supplemental state budget failed to include (1) $9.4M in offset funds for the canceled Merial Research Facility project at the University of Georgia, and (2) the $3.9M adjustment proposed by Governor Perdue for the overall University System reduction. For this reason he urged setting aside 1% rather than only 2/3%.

Academic Program Evaluation

Dr. Henry opened discussion of the process for academic program evaluation with reference to two documents distributed with the call for the meeting, “Process for academic program evaluation, October 2004” and “Senate Review of Proposals for the Deactivation & Termination of Academic Programs”. Dr. Renick distributed a revised version of second document (dated November 2, 2004) with some clarifying language. [For the remainder of these minutes, the first document is called the DG document and the second the APACE document.]

Dr. Alberto stated encouragement regarding the overlap already existing between the DG and APACE documents. He summarized the objectives of APACE to be: (1) to make the process regular rather than ad hoc, and (2) to parallel the process for approving new programs. Dr. Henry concurred that there was much agreement between the documents. Dr. Renick pointed out that the process described in the APACE document would fit well as the third stage of the process outlined in the DG document.

Dr. Huss asked about location of the across-the-portfolio review in the APACE document. Dr. Alberto answered this was covered in item #3 (Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council review) of the APACE document.

Dr. Huss questioned generating recommendations prior to the across-the-portfolio review. Dr. Alberto responded that the three-member teams would determine how well the programs stacked up against the indicators. Dr. Renick added that the three-member teams would report their
findings (as opposed to making recommendations) and the Undergraduate Council or the Graduate Council would then make any recommendations to APACE.

Dr. Kaminshine expressed concern about assuring uniformity with reference to the three-member teams reviewing the vice presidential area budgets last year. He stated his preference for reports as informational rather than recommendations, which could have a life of their own.

Dr. Adamson asked for clarification of where the APACE document merged with the DG document. She asked if the APACE document process would start after FACP recommended deactivating a program since the APACE document by title and content specifically addressed the deactivation of programs. Dr. Henry added that the programs on the list generated at the second stage of the DG document process might be reorganized or downsized instead of deactivated.

Dr. Renick pointed out that while the APACE document originated in response to the need for quick action this year, it also addressed the void of having no policy for deactivation of programs in general. Dr. Alberto acknowledged that it would not be good for morale if a number of programs on the list were more likely headed for reorganization and downsizing, but appeared targeted for deactivation by inclusion on the list.

Ms. Hurt questioned whether the APACE document process could be completed in less than six months. Dr. Alberto assured the timelines could be worked out.

Dr. Adamson commented that if program review resulted in a recommendation for a new degree program, such recommendations went to APACE. She observed that having a parallel process for deactivations would be appropriate, but warned that it would be unhealthy to announce programs were going through deactivation review. Dr. Alberto responded that perhaps the APACE document process could be titled differently.

Dr. Alberto asked if there was the suggestion that the recommendation would go to APACE after FACP had acted. Dr. Henry replied that if FACP cut off funding, the program would be effectively deactivated. Dr. Huss added that a program could be effectively deactivated in the college by not admitting students. He pointed out that the Board of Regents had enrollment-based triggers leading to inactive status. Dr. Renick responded that the Board of Regents policy did not equate to unilateral deactivation. Dr. Henry explained that Board of Regents comprehensive program review
generated a list of programs not generating a minimum average of graduates or majors over each three-year period. Dr. Hudson added that the Board of Regents did not give instructions to terminate programs on that basis.

Dr. Henry suggested splitting the APACE document process and merging with the DG document process as follows: (1) DG and provost develop list of programs to be evaluated and send to APACE by January 28; (2) APACE develops strengths and weaknesses reports and sends them to DG and FACP; and (3) recommendations from DG and FACP to deactivate programs are sent to APACE for input back to FACP.

Dr. Adamson stated this approach would address her concern about programs facing only reorganization or downsizing being subjected to the deactivation process. Dr. Alberto affirmed that programs selected to undergo reorganization rather than deactivation would not be returned to APACE for further consideration. Dr. Colarusso asked for clarification of who would make the final decision on deactivations. Dr. Alberto answered that the provost would make the final decision.

Dr. Henry noted 17 programs had been deactivated in the last 5 years. He cited the example of the MA in Mathematics, which was deemed unnecessary by both the department and the college, with the MS program continuing. He suggested having a means to expedite reviews in such cases. Dr. Colarusso agreed citing the need to cut off admissions in a timely way and to avoid unnecessary committee work.

Dr. Alberto suggested incorporating a two-track approach in the APACE document process, one for contentious cases and another for all others. Dr. Henry suggested programs proposed for deactivation be placed on the agenda of APACE for determination of which of the two routes they would take.

Dr. Huss commented that he did not see the APACE review protecting the interests of students in colleges other than the one where the evaluated program resides, since those students were only concerned with individual courses rather than the program in its entirety.

Ms. Hurt asked for clarification of the composition of the three-member teams with respect to ensuring expertise if limited to senators only. Dr. Hudson replied that all Senate committees were allowed to include non-senators on subcommittees. Dr. Renick pointed out that the APACE document specified senators, but this could be changed to allow one at-large member for this purpose.

Ms. Hurt urged that the paragraph on data be more precise. Dr. Alberto responded that problems with data would be cycled back.

Mr. Simpson asked about the impact on faculty for deactivated programs. Dr. Henry replied that tenured faculty would be reassigned and non-tenured faculty non-renewed as necessary. Dr. Adamson cited the example of faculty relocated after the closing of the Learning Support Program/Developmental Studies.

Dr. Moore noted there had not been discussion of the expectations for the deans in listing programs in the quadrants on quality and centrality. Dr. Henry reminded these were quadrants, not
quartiles, and that consensus had been reached in Deans Group. Dr. Colarusso stated objection to the approach. Dr. Adamson voiced appreciation for the guidance afforded by definitions for the variables.

Dr. Hudson stated his pleasure with the very productive discussion in this meeting.

Prepared by Edgar Torbert
Approved on November 10, 2004