Faculty Senate
2023–2024
MINUTES: April 17, 2024
Location: Whirlpool Room
Time: 6:00-8:00 pm
K. Hall, Chair; J. Lim, Recording Secretary


Staff Senate Representative: M. Umana

Guests [5]: A. Coria-Navia, D. Murray, J. Taylor, C. Troy

Votes & Actions taken (numbers [n] represent items on original agenda)
[2] Minutes of Prior Faculty Senate Meeting (K. Hall)
MOTION: VOTE passed [13 yes]. To approve the minutes as presented with corrections.

Council reports were received as follows:

- Undergraduate Council (March 4, 2024). Curriculum changes approved. Process to allow for quick admission of students meeting a threshold. Discussion of quorum on undergraduate admissions.
- Academic Operations and Policy Council (March 11, 2024). Attendance. 5 year calendar adjustments. Bridge to Success is rebranding to Andrews Gateway.

VOTE to accept the council reports passed [13 yes].
Senate Discussion & Announcements

[1] **Worship & Prayer** (K. Hall). The song *Submission*. Chorus: Not what I wish to be, Nor where I wish to go, For who am I that I should choose my way? The Lord shall choose for me, 'Tis better far, I know, So let him bid me go, or stay.


Presidential Search Committee Taskforce has been looking at the process for selecting representatives. Staff senate recommended an additional staff person. Faculty senate officers suggested one staff in a major leadership role and one front line staff. For Staff and Faculty Senates to select their representatives. These recommendations went back to Staff senate. Will keep Faculty Senate informed as this effort progresses.

[6] **Classroom Observation Policy** (K. Hall). An update that the policy has been updated with the language requested from the earlier discussion - the wording about clear and confidential communication. Next it will be sent to the Provost.

[7] **Presentation regarding the Program Prioritization.**

Program Prioritization Timeline:

- **Wednesday, April 3, 2024:** Deans will send the quantitative data needed for the program prioritization and an explanation of the written expectations to their department chairs.
- **Monday April 29:** The last day for departments to submit the written three-page analysis for each of their academic programs to their respective deans. Deans will review and submit the analysis to the provost.
- **Monday April 29 to Wednesday May 15:** The Review Committee will review each academic program and submit their recommendation to the Provost.
- **Late May:** Administration will review recommendations from the Review Committee.
- **Early June:** Board review

Data Provided (input by Criteria Committee)
- Financial Margin Data
  - Course Economics – (a five-year look)
  - Program Economics – (a five-year look)
  - Program Credits Generated – (a five-year look)
- Program Enrollment - a five-year look
- Program Course Efficiencies
  - Credits for the Degree
  - Credits Required vs Credits Offered in an Academic Year

Financial Margin Data
- Course Economics – (a five-year look)
  - Tuition (that touched a student account) based on course enrollments irrespective of major/program/degree
  - Includes income from students from other majors
- Program Economics – (a five-year look)
  - Tuition (which touched a student account) generated by each student enrolled in a major/program/degree
  - Includes all the income generated by that student even if some of the cost is in a different department
- Program Credits Generated – (a five-year look)

Screenshots shared of what the data looks like.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Tuition Choice</th>
<th>Cost Choice</th>
<th>Margin Choice</th>
<th>Margin %</th>
<th>Average Class Size</th>
<th>Number of Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>409,667</td>
<td>237,053</td>
<td>172,614</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>197,891</td>
<td>132,861</td>
<td>65,030</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198,861</td>
<td>169,846</td>
<td>29,015</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>916,591</td>
<td>567,431</td>
<td>349,160</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36,924</td>
<td>27,786</td>
<td>9,138</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167,022</td>
<td>366,162</td>
<td>(199,141)</td>
<td>-119%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,120,553</td>
<td>853,270</td>
<td>267,284</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The narrative components include Reputation, Mission, and Reflection.

Contribution to Reputation
How does this program contribute to the reputation of Andrews? Such as:
- Program nationally and denominationally recognized
- Graduates’ notable accomplishments
- Graduates employed in areas of influence
- Faculty scholars and recognized experts

Narrative Components: Contribution to Mission
How does this program contribute to the mission of Andrews? Such as:
Seek Knowledge (evidence might include)
- Students who have gone on to graduate school.
- Faculty/students recognized as scholars.
- Program produces scholars/thinkers.

Affirm Faith
- Faculty/program/graduates known for engaging the church in deep thought.
- Faculty/program/graduates contribute to Adventist thought.
- Faculty/program/graduates known as a resource for the church.

Change the World
- Employed in Influential Positions: Major Organizations
- Employed in Influential Positions: Within the Church
- Influential leadership position in the church

Narrative Components: Reflection
A reflection on the quantitative data provided. The reflection should be for each degree major. A degree major with concentrations/emphases would do one written analysis that references the concentrations/emphases.
- How would you evaluate the program’s growth?
- How would you evaluate the program stability?
- What one investment would have the greatest impact on the program?
- What is one barrier you would want removed from the program?
- What are the consequences if we do not provide more resources?

**Narrative Component: Categories**

Based on the data provided I provided and your responses to the reputation, mission, and reflection items, where in the following metrics would you place the academic program?

- a) Thriving – program significantly contributes to the financial margin and makes an exemplary case that it contributes to reputation and mission.
- b) Surviving – program has strong contributions to financial margin and makes a strong case that it contributes to reputation and mission.
- c) In Distress – the program has little or marginal contributions to financial margin and has weak evidence of its contribution to reputation and mission.

**Program Prioritization Review Committee Members (April 29-May 15)**

- Christon Arthur – Chair
- Alayne Thorpe – Associate Provost Graduate Education
- Amy Rosenthal – Associate Provost Undergraduate Education
- Carmelita Troy – CoP
- Anthony Bosman – CAS
- Stephanie Carpenter – CAS
- Shawna McNelly – CHHS
- William Scott – CHHS
- Carole Wolford-Hunt – CEIS
- Wagner Khun – SEM

**Data Consultants**

- Valencia Mawuntu
- Deanna Childress

**Review Categories & Thresholds**

Based on the data analysis from the department, we will place each academic program in one of the following categories:

1. **Thriving** – the program significantly contributes to the financial margin (70% or higher margin and/or at least $300,000 margin) and makes an exemplary case that it contributes to reputation and mission.

2. **Surviving** – the program has strong contributions to financial margin (40%-69% margin and/or $100,000 – $299,000 margin) and makes a strong case that it contributes to reputation and mission.
3. In Distress – the program has little/marginal contributions to financial margin (less than 40% margin and/or less than $100,000 margin) and has weak evidence of its contribution to reputation and mission.

Examples are missing things like local community engagement. Question about if there should be a template for the report; there isn’t one, but making sure the headings are there. Will the rubric be available? Not known yet when. What about administrative efficiencies? Academic Support and Services are going through a prioritization process as well. Acknowledgement that it’s really hard. Prayer together.