



Faculty Senate 2016–2017

MINUTES: February 15, 2017

Whirlpool Room, Chan Shun Hall

6:00-8:00 pm

J. Ledesma, Chair; K. Bailey, recording secretary

Present: S. Badenas, K. Bailey, A. Baltazar, S. Brown-Fraser, A. Coria-Navia, D. Davis, D. Fortin, C. Gane, B. Gibson, K. Hall, K. Koudele, J. Ledesma, J. Lim, G. Lovhoiden, S. Moncrieff, T. Newkirk, N. Nosworthy, R. Perez-Schulz, C. Sigua, J. Sigvartsen, A. Solis, L. Weldon, R. Zdor, C. Arthur

Regrets/absent: S. Bell, L. Ruhupatty, B. Sedlacek, M. Ullom, D. Village, A. Luxton

Guests and Visitors: C. Swanson, R. Trecartin

Votes & Actions taken (numbers [n] represent items on original agenda)

[2] Minutes of January 18, 2017 Senate Meeting. MOTION: Move to approve minutes as presented (D. Davis).

Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[5/6] Report & Discussion: Academic Program Improvement and Prioritization

C. Arthur, J. Ledesma

Report: Provost Arthur presented the context and procedures for a comprehensive review and prioritization of academic programs. He began by presenting some data: Just focusing on lecture classes, we offer a lecture class for about every 5 students. Around 14% of lecture classes have enrollment below 10. We offer a degree for every 17 students. Much larger schools have the same number as or even fewer majors than we offer. Provost Arthur then described academic prioritization as a process of aligning resources to programs/courses that helps to support decision making and growth and avoids just cutting across the board during financial difficulties.

Provost Arthur is working from a set of three guiding principle (assumptions):

1. Andrews University shall not define the productive valued exemplary faculty simply in terms of credits generated.
2. Andrews University shall not define the academically healthy or financially healthy program or department simply in terms of new revenue contribution to margin.
3. Andrews shall not allow data to 'make decisions' nor have a 'red line' that places programs or departments that do not meet that line in an automatic adverse situation. Instead, Andrews University shall use this analysis to engage in conversations about what the data mean, how we can use the data to ensure more efficiency and how we can use the data to align resources to programs and program prioritization.

The Provost presented a process involving reporting on the Academic and Financial Health of a program using four criteria: program contribution to mission, program quality, program demand, and program net revenue. Financial Health reporting will compared to benchmarked disciplinary norms. Part of the financial report will be a report from BKD that analyzes net contribution to revenue at faculty, department, and school levels.

Faculty raised a number of questions about the intricacy of the analysis needed and possible problems with tying financial numbers to only the credit generated portion of load. The Provost noted that this was the reason for contracting with BKD, which has experience in this type of analysis. He also agreed that credit generated was an insufficient measure of load, and that is important to put a broader set of components of faculty load into the system as we do not currently have a good picture of what anyone's load really is.

The Senate asked what the role of the faculty would be in Academic Program Improvement and Prioritization. The Provost responded that his office will provide faculty with data and will ask faculty to wrestle with that data during planning. The Dean's Council will the make sense of all of the reports.

Faculty also had some questions about the overall financial position of the university, and the Provost was transparent about our current position.

Discussion: The Senate discussed the role that Senators might play in this process. Several options were considered: the Senate Executive Committee could review, an ad hoc committee could review, or the full senate could review the documents. A number of Senators noted that knowledgeable faculty need to be involved. Senators also noted that there will be a lot of data to process, that the data will be sensitive, and that faculty will need to see Senate involvement because this process could be perceived as threatening. The Provost clarified that he does not expect a large number of cuts to result from this, but that the purpose of this process is to make better decisions. The Provost also requested that the Senate review process involve Senators (as Senators are elected representatives of the faculty and should be able to handle sensitive data and discussions appropriately). The Senators then discussed whether the academic deans might be able to meet with faculty representatives to process the reports together, rather than processing separately.

MOTION: "That the Faculty Senate select six Senators, ideally one from each school, to discuss the results of the Academic Program Improvement and Prioritization reports at a meeting with the academic deans." (K. Koudele). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

Discussion: The Senate will select the specific Senators following spring elections.

Senate Discussion & Announcements

[1] Worship & Prayer

D. Fortin

2017 is an important year for Protestants. Steps to Christ was published in 1892 (125 years ago)—the new AU Press annotated edition is an Adventist contribution to the discussion of salvation this year. Steps to Christ was the first Adventist book Fortin read. In the chapter on sanctification (growing up in Christ; p. 70), Ellen G. White suggests a prayer to be recited every morning:

Consecrate yourself to God in the morning; make this your very first work. Let your prayer be, "Take me, O Lord, as wholly Thine. I lay all my plans at Thy feet. Use me today in Thy service. Abide with me, and let all my work be wrought in Thee."

This is a prayer of dedication, which is what sanctification is. Our work as professors is an extension of what God does. It is important to consecrate ourselves to God every day so that God can use us.

[3a] Committee Report: Undergraduate Council

K. Koudele

Report: The Undergraduate Council has passed a working implementation for the Michigan Transfer Agreement endorsement on transcripts. This should resolve the issues surrounding Andrews University becoming a MTA receiving institution.

[3h] Committee Report: Unified Framework of Outcomes Steering Committee

Report: A representative of the Senate Executive Committee (K. Bailey) met with the CAS team (K. Mattingly, R. Root, R. J. Bailey) that has been spearheading the AU UFO initiative. We have developed a plan for putting together a Steering Committee, a full set of 40 participants, and setting up a May retreat. The retreat will be May 15-19. It will run from 8:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. with a working lunch. We will work on the undergraduate outcomes this year, given our time constraints.

[3i] Committee Report: Annual (January) Report Revision

Report: The January Report Revision committee has met four times and plans to meet two more before returning a draft report to the Senate Executive Committee on March 7. The committee is taking into account the strategic plans of the university, other initiatives (such as APIP and UFO), and a need for faculty and chairs to better discuss workload, rank and tenure preparation, and strategic plans.

[3bdefgh] Graduate Council, Academic Operations Council, Strategic Planning Task Force, Graduate Faith & Integration, Race Relations: no report

[4] Report: Senate Executive Communication with Provost

J. Ledesma

Report: Senate Officers receive a number of concerns from faculty that are really administrative issues. In our communication with the Provost about some of these issues, the Senate Officers met with the Provost at his

request to go over shared concerns. He proposed that the Senate Officers meet periodically with the Provost to share plans, goals, and current concerns, and the Senate Officers agreed. Meetings will likely be twice a semester.

[7] Report: Textbook information and Bookstore Update

J. Ledesma, C. Swanson

Report: Some concerns were raised to the Senate Officers about faculty meeting deadlines for textbooks. Cindy Swanson was invited to brief the Senate on current bookstore practices and the reasons for textbook request due dates. The discussion emphasized working together for the students' benefit.

The dates are always tied to particular weeks—the dates will change (always the Friday of the week), but the weeks do not: Summer adoptions due 1st week in March; Fall adoptions due 3rd week in April; Spring adoptions due 2nd week in September. Textbook dates are so early in order to allow for buyback, which saves both bookstore and students money. The early dates also allow courses to be put into the system earlier, which increases the likelihood that the bookstore will be able to obtain used books from the central processing location.

The bookstore meets the Federal requirements to provide students with the ISBN of books for the university—so book adoptions need to be provided to the bookstore to meet the Federal law. Per the Course Syllabus Components document created by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (July 20, 2015), faculty should not put ISBNs in the syllabus, as those numbers can change, and the bookstore needs to be the sole record of ISBNs to avoid confusion.

The bookstore will price match, but only to specific sites, and on specific kinds of materials. Faculty might be able to help students understand this. Faculty had a few questions about procedures—the bookstore is working to get clear answers.

The Senate made a statement of thanks to Cindy Swanson for helping with difficult transitions over the past few years, and especially her commitment to helping faculty.

[8] Report: FitThumb and Wellness Initiatives

K. Koudele

Report: The survey of employees concerning FitThumb is currently underway and is a condition for health insurance cost reduction. The email came from HR and the survey needs to be completed this month.

[8] Report: Senate Communication Survey

K. Bailey

Report: Two-thirds of respondents reported that the Senate has met their needs; three-quarters know how to contact the Senate. The best method of communication requested is direct emails to faculty. Faculty know less about our ad hoc committees, but in all areas, there is not enough communication about what the Senate has done. Senators were provided with the text of comments about ways the Senate can improve. We will discuss which of those to prioritize in March.

[10] Senate and HLC Accreditation

J. Ledesma

Report: The HLC will visit from March 13-14. There will be a joint meeting of the Faculty Senate and the General Faculty at 3:30 p.m. on the 13th.

Next Faculty Senate meeting: March 15, 2017 at 6:00 pm in the Whirlpool Room, Chan Shun Hall.