



Bradley University Senate
Eight Regular Meeting of the 2018-2019 Senate

=
3:10 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., May 8, 2019

Student Center Marty Theatre



MISSION:

Bradley University empowers students for immediate and sustained success in their personal and professional endeavors by combining professional preparation, liberal arts and sciences and co-curricular experiences. Alongside our dedication to students, we embrace the generation, application and interpretation of knowledge.

Agenda

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Announcements**
- III. Approval of Minutes ([See Attachment 1](#))**
- IV. Reports from Administrators**
 - A. Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost Zakahi
- V. Report from Student Body President Megan Brezka**
- VI. Consent Agenda (see [Attachments 2](#))**
- VII. Motion to adopt Evaluation Process for Associate Provost for Research/Dean of the Graduate School: 1st Senator Timm, 2nd Senator Nanyes (see [Attachments 3](#))**
- VIII. Addition of a Standing Committee on International Initiatives to the University Senate (see [Attachment 4](#)) Placed at Article 4 # 19 P 31**
- IX. Senate Committees' Annual Reports (see [Attachment 5](#))**
- X. Approval of the ARB membership**
 1. Ross Fink
 2. Phil Horvath
 3. Jana Hunzicker
 4. David Olds
 5. B.J. Lawrence
 6. Sara Netzley
 7. K. Krishnamoorthi
 8. Jing Wang
 9. Mark Gobeyn
 10. Kevin Swafford
 11. Anne Hollis.
 12. Jobie Skaggs
 13. Rob Prescott
- XI. President Roberts and Senator Gandhi Report on the financial state of the University**
- XII. The impact of Program Prioritization on the University (see [Attachments 6](#) and [7](#))**
- XIII. New Business**
- XIV. Adjournment**



Bradley University Senate

Special Meeting of the 2018-2019 Senate

Student Center Marty Theatre



MISSION:

Bradley University empowers students for immediate and sustained success in their personal and professional endeavors by combining professional preparation, liberal arts and sciences and co-curricular experiences. Alongside our dedication to students, we embrace the generation, application and interpretation of knowledge.

Agenda

- I.** Call to Order
- II.** Election of Senate Officers
- III.** Confirmation of Senate Committee Memberships
- IV.** Adjournment



Bradley University Senate

Special Meeting of the 2018-2019 Senate

Student Center Marty Theatre



MISSION:

Bradley University empowers students for immediate and sustained success in their personal and professional endeavors by combining professional preparation, liberal arts and sciences and co-curricular experiences. Alongside our dedication to students, we embrace the generation, application and interpretation of knowledge.

Agenda

- I.** Call to Order
- II.** Election of Senate Officers
- III.** Confirmation of Senate Committee Memberships
- IV.** Adjournment



**Bradley University Senate
Seventh Regular Meeting of the 2018-2019 Senate**

Minutes

3:10 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., April 18, 2019

Student Center Ballroom A/B



MISSION:

Bradley University empowers students for immediate and sustained success in their personal and professional endeavors by combining professional preparation, liberal arts and sciences and co-curricular experiences. Alongside our dedication to students, we embrace the generation, application and interpretation of knowledge.

Agenda

- I. **Call to Order** at 3:11
- II. **Announcements**
- III. **Approval of Minutes** (See [Attachment 1](#))
 - Motion:** Senator Blair
 - Discussion: None
 - Motion carries.**
- IV. **Reports from Administrators**
 - A. President Roberts
 - **Financial:** enrollment is about the same as 3 weeks ago. At May meeting final deposits will be in.
 - **Building:** is on schedule.
 - **Speech team:** national champs. Out of 79 championships, BU has won 42 = 53%
 - **NASA competition:** May 4 is public day, but you have to register.
 - **WCBU agreement:** signed on Wednesday. Bradley retains the license and the station's transmitter facility will remain in East Peoria with the studios moved to the campus of ISU. Some reporters will remain in Peoria. All will be the same from the listener perspective. The Jobst tower isn't used by the station, leased to cell phone service providers.
 - **Year-end report:** Pratima Gandhi and he will give a report on financials after the senate meeting on May 8. It will be open to whoever wants to attend.
 - No Questions
 - B. Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost Zakahi
 - **Assistant Provost Linda Pizzuti:** will retire effective May 31. Thank you for teaching him about Bradley. Call for thanks from the body and a round of applause.
 - **The work of all is appreciated.** He is aware of stress and anxiety due to EMBO and financials. But admin is trying to make the institution work better to retain, help students get success, and graduate. Please continue to help with recruitment.
 - **Computer Refresh Program** for next fiscal year means we are not taking computer orders this year. A new program to allow for updates for all (fac + support + admin).
 - Be thoughtful about spending as the year ends. Please avoid purchases to spend down. He promises: WE WILL NOT REDUCE ACCOUNTS DUE TO AMOUNTS NOT SPENT AT THE END OF THE YEAR. Thoughtful spending is understood.
 - **Campus climate for underrepresented groups** at Bradley. At a recent event students who were getting credit for attending were disrespectful and social media comments after were racist. You don't have to accept, but must respect others' positions. The University should be a place where ideas can be heard.
 - Question: Were these comments not sexist as well?
 - Answer: He saw some comments but not others, sexist wouldn't surprise him, but he didn't see those.

V. Report from Student Body President Mikki Tran

- Last general assembly passed a 4-year degree plan agreement.
- Megan Brezka is new student body president.

**VI. Consent Agenda (See [Attachment 2](#))
Approved**

VII. Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School Selection and Evaluation Process (see [Attachments 3](#))

Senate President Fakheri: there has been no model for evaluation of the Dean of the Graduate School, so this is modeled after the Dean's review process.

Motion to adopt Evaluation Process for Associate Provost for Research/Dean of the Graduate School: 1st Senator Timm, 2nd Senator Nanyes

Discussion: Differences from Dean's evaluation include who will be polled for the review.

Vote will be held in the next meeting because this is a handbook change.

VIII. Academic Rights of Non-tenure Track Faculty in accord with suggested revisions to the Handbook from the Contractual Arrangement Committee. (See [Attachment 4](#))

Senate President Fakheri notes that the language proposed provides recommendations on rights for full-time non-tenure track faculty

Motion to adopt: 1st Senator Smith, 2nd Senator Banning

Discussion to clarify motion: This language is suggested due to differences across the University among the rights granted to full-time non-tenure-track (hereafter in this document FTNTT) faculty. This new language is meant to guarantee the right to participate in curriculum development. FTNTT may also participate in other departmental shared governance proceedings, including, but not limited to, the hiring of faculty and staff, and the election of chairs, if enfranchised by 2/3 of their department's tenure-track and tenured faculty.

Further Comments and questions focused on defining the term "Full-time":

- Reference to Handbook Page 10 which already allows FTNTT faculty to participate in Senate and suggestion to strike a sentence from the motion.
- Observation that benefits allotted to Full-time faculty are clear and effectively define this group.
- Observation that a challenge to defining FTNTT might include instances when an employee is cumulatively full-time but split over 2 colleges, so neither college would say they are full time.
- Discussion of definition of how term "In-residence" was created to replace "temporary".

Point of order: Senator Timm noted that an amendment is needed to strike out language from the main motion.

Motion to strike out language: 1st Senator Frazier, 2nd Senator Nanyes.

Discussion on motion to strike out language included:

- Clarification from Contractual Arrangements committee member Senator McQuade: Contractual Arrangements was tasked with examining this issue and

has found that there are FTNTT faculty that are not given the same rights as Full-Time Tenure and Tenure-track faculty despite handbook. Due to diverse treatment the committee wants to investigate offering rights to this population.

- Questions included: whether there are any forms of governance that are not governed by the Handbook; whether FTNTT, hired to teach, need permission to do service; inquiry about whether enfranchisement would be granted to a person or to a position; whether rights granted might be different for individuals within a college.
- Comments included: College of Business expects service of FTNTT, while the Math department does not; concern about curriculum being skewed by FTNTT without terminal degrees; observation that wording in Handbook doesn't seem to reflect what all departments do, or how they use FTNTT faculty; observation that some FTNTT have interest and experience to develop curriculum; caution that all individuals of the same rank/class must have the same rights; review of Handbook suggests that most voting rights in the University only require "full-time" status without regard to tenure status; concern that this would put FTNTT faculty at risk to politics; concern that enfranchising should come with protections.

Motion to refer the motion and sub-motion to committee: Senator Roberts.

Motion to send matter back to committee carries.

IX. Provost Evaluation Committee Membership

The Faculty Committee members will be proposed by the Senate Executive Committee from tenured faculty with one year of service or more; the committee will include at least one member with experience and expertise in qualitative and quantitative evaluation processes. The committee composition is to be approved by the Senate. The President may appoint a member to the committee.

Jim Courtad LAS
Kara Wolfe EHS
Tony Adams CFA
Eden Blair BUS
Marty Morris EGT

Motion to approve this committee for Provost Evaluation.

1st Senator Tayyeri

Motion carries.

X. Old Business

Revisions to the Handbook due to the Move of Honorary Degrees Committee to Regulations and Degree Requirements Sub-Committee

Motion - Adopt suggested Handbook Language Changes in [Attachment 5](#) (vote in the April meeting)

Discussion:

Clarification from Matt O'Brien as chair of Regulations Committee of Sub C and R indicated that Sub C and R feels that the merging of the committees [in March meeting, motion was approved to merge Honorary Degrees Committee into the Sub C and R Committee; current motion is to supply needed language to modify Handbook in response to this merger] is not desirable.

Motion: To unmerge the Honorary Degrees Committee -- Senator O'Brien.

Parliamentarian: you can't undo a motion approved by Senate within the same session (year) of Senate.

Motion: To postpone the current vote on Handbook language till December meeting of 2019 – Senator O'Brien; 2nd Senator Goitien

Point of order: this Senate cannot control scheduling this vote in the next session.

Motion Withdrawn.

Motion: To table this motion – Senator O'Brien; 2nd Senator Goitien.

Point of Order inquiry: what happens when things are tabled?

Parliamentarian -- You have to have a motion to bring it back which means that essentially the motion is dead.

Discussion included these questions and comments: question about whether there a risk that the committee will be lost and question about status of the posthumous degree

Clarifications were offered: Senator O'Brien suggested there is a distinction between academic and honorary degrees. So those processes should remain separate by not blurring honorary degrees into the academic function of Regulations committee. In addition, there is no perceived risk to waiting on this decision. Other comments included confusion, later clarified about the status of the posthumous degree deciding body.

Motion to table: carries.

XI. New Business

XII. Adjournment at 4:10

1st Senator Nanyes. Approved. 4:10

N. B.: program prioritization discussion forum was not part of Senate meeting.

2018-2019 Bradley University Senate
April 18, 2019 , 10th Regular Meeting
Senators please initial

Akers	Lex	Dean, CCET	<i>LA</i>	Greene	Michael	CLAS		O'Brien	Kevin	FCB	<i>K.O.</i>
Bacon	Amy	CLAS	<i>AB</i>	Hatfield	Patty	FCB	<i>PH</i>	Podlasek	Bob	CCET	<i>BP</i>
Bailey	Bill	FCB	<i>BB</i>	Heuser	Jake	VP Adv.	<i>JH</i>	Rommel	Megan	CLAS	
Bakken	Jeffrey	Dean, Grd.	<i>JB</i>	Huberman	Jeffery	Dean, SCCFA	<i>JH</i>	Roberts	Gary	President	<i>X</i>
Ball	Justin	VP Enro. Mgt.		Jones	Chris	Dean, CLAS	<i>OG</i>	Roos	Kelly	CCET	
Banning	Stephen	SCCFA, Senate VP	<i>SB</i>	Kelley	Andrew	CLAS	<i>AR</i>	Sattler	Joan	Dean, CEHS	<i>JS</i>
Bertram	Stacie	CEHS	<i>SB</i>	Kelly	Joe	CEHS	<i>JK</i>	Shastry	Prashad	CCET	
Blair	Eden	FCB	<i>SB</i>	Kerr	Stephen	FCB		Smith	Dan	SCCFA	<i>DS</i>
Borton	Rachael	CEHS		Kimberlin	Kevin	CLAS	<i>TK</i>	Stern	Travis	SCCFA	<i>TWS</i>
Bosma	Wayne	CLAS		Kindler	Andy	Registrar	<i>AK</i>	Stover	Naomi	CLAS	<i>NS</i>
Brammeier	Heather	SCCFA	<i>HB</i>	Krishnamoorthi	K.	CCET		Tayyari	Fred	CCET	<i>FT</i>
Bukowski	Jeanie	CLAS	<i>JB</i>	Kuester	Deitra	CEHS	<i>DK</i>	Thomas	Nathan	VP Stu.	<i>NT</i>
Capie	Kevin	SCCFA	<i>KC</i>	Liu	Jianbo	CLAS		Timm	Mathew	PPUS	<i>MT</i>
Carty	Tom	CLAS		Lu	Yufeng	CCET	<i>YL</i>	Tran	Mikki	Student Body President	<i>MT</i>
Courtad	James	CLAS	<i>JC</i>	Lukowiak	Twila	CEHS	<i>JL</i>	Vick	Lori	CEHS	<i>LV</i>
Drake	Teresa	CEHS, Senate EC	<i>TD</i>	Malinowski	Olek	Editor, Handbook	<i>AO</i>	Wang	Jing	CCET	<i>JW</i>
Dzapo	Kyle	SCCFA	<i>KD</i>	Matisa	Daniel	SCCFA		Wang	Grace	SCCFA	
Elbella	Abdalla	CCET	<i>AE</i>	McAsey	Mike	Parliamentarian	<i>MA</i>	Webster	Allen	FCB	
Erickson	Deb	CEHS	<i>ED</i>	McQuade	Kristi	CLAS	<i>EM</i>	Wiley	Bret	SCCFA	<i>BE</i>
Fakheri	Ahmad	CCET, Senate President	<i>AF</i>	Muncy	Jim	FCB	<i>JM</i>	Williams	Chris	CLAS	
Frazier	Meg	Lib	<i>MF</i>	Nanyes	Ollie	CLAS	<i>OM</i>	Zakahi	Walter	SVPA & Provost	<i>WZ</i>
Galik	Barbara	Dir. Lib	<i>GB</i>	Newton	Lee	CLAS				Graduate	
Glassmeyer	Danielle	CLAS, Senate Secretary	<i>GD</i>	Nielsen	John	CLAS	<i>JN</i>	Brezka	Megan	Undergraduate	<i>MB</i>
Goitein	Bernie	FCB, Senate EC	<i>BG</i>	Nugent	Patty	CEHS	<i>PN</i>			Undergraduate	
Gorman	Zach	AP IRT	<i>ZG</i>	O'Brien	Matthew	Dean, FCB	<i>MO</i>				

Program prioritization post-Senate Forum
April 18, 2019

USPC Program Prioritization

N.B. What follows are notes adapted from audio recording, not official minutes of this meeting.

Meeting began at 4:15 pm.

Q. In preamble of the document, what is a “program”? Not a department?

A. Some units (departments, institutes, etc.) have one program, some have a number of programs; eg Communications has 6 majors and some minors so multiple programs. There’s a q and a document that will be shared.

Q. Focus on academic and non-academic programs vs units, programs etc. What are we evaluating? academic programs and the programs that support them? Or is it truly *all* units of the university.

A. This is academic units. A similar timeline and analysis for non-academic units will roll out one year from now. A charge and committee will be formed by Nathan Thomas and non-academic folks will form a committee and begin the process. Per President Roberts, athletics will not be included.

Q. Question of 120 vs 124 hours in relation to elective hours. Making sure it’s not just requirements that will be counted.

A. Centrality to mission covers the question of contributions to other units. For example, Bio is key to Nursing offerings. A committee led by Matt O’Brien is looking into a university standard of 120 hours requirement to graduate.

Q. Page 2. Reference to BCC, Honors, etc. are grouped together. Why?

A. Hadn’t noticed BCC was in this and hadn’t imagined that it would be part of the prioritization process.

Q. Concern about Digital Measures as core of the process. It’s unreliable and problematic. Examples include the open-ended dates. It is self-report and so not accurate. Faculty don’t use it, churn in department staff means gaps in reporting.

A. It has been much improved. The new output is much stronger. It’s our part of our HLC assurance argument, the only repository we have that creates continuity and allows diversity. Encourage all to use it, but missing faculty data from firing etc. causes problems with HLC.

Q. Service aspect is not represented in this document.

A. That’s been brought up, for instance advising.

Q. How were percentages/weights assigned for sections?

A. Re: Program demand. Provost insists this has to be most heavily weighted of the criteria. We need it to get students here. Uses metaphor of “Stars and chorus.” All can be successful, if there are enough programs to draw folks to campus. (Demand # came down 5% from original proposal).

Q. Does the model account for retention for students that wash out of “demand” programs and need a vital healthy program to turn to?

A. Financial metric is grounded in student credit hours that are produced, so finances are direct function of what each student pays. English generates their numbers due to large number of credit hour production due to BCC. Engineering generates their numbers due to lots of majors. There are programs that are “discovery programs.” He believes it will preserve those programs.

Note: Each seat’s value will be calculated. A student athlete counts as zero in your classroom, a 60 % discount student will be counted as producing 40% revenue. Almost every student will be “worth” a different amount.

Q. Will the consultant be able to share program demand info from other schools?

A. They will look at all markets we largely draw from...Illinois all states touching Illinois and Minnesota. They’ll identify those students searches online for info. Market analysis for programs we have, and programs we should be considering. Will look at regional demand for Face to face.

Q. We need to look at enhancing effectiveness of the BCC.

A. This may not be the process for that. The BCC will exist in some form. HLC requires general education. Provost speaks about defending the Liberal arts and broad training from those opposed to it.

Q. Students will be credited differently in the same class due to the revenue. Discount rate due to Honors section that is theoretically filled with scholarship students; punishment to those programs that draw really bright students. There’s not a clear mechanism (promised in earlier iterations of this process) for rewarding those value added and high impact classroom commitments.

A. There is a section that provides this under Unit Quality. 1 piece of this assessment is BCC assessment. Committee wants to value and give credit to those HI practices. This will be better articulated in the final document. Provost: Multiplier was removed until the rubric is finished to adjust the final weight. And the narrative can address this.

Follow-up Q: this is clearly a numbers driven process in which quantitative is already privilege over qualitative. And those programs that will need to rely more on narrative will tend to have their value buried. This is mentioned in the face of an administration that repeatedly asserts that they do not understand how to evaluate qualitative content and assessments.

A. 1.3 multiplier was in the original and will be restored. Trying to build more to do justice to the qualitative. Innovative teaching, and other issues can be counted as High Impact practices. We are tapping into the skills of faculty to assess qualitative content.

Q. Courses and programs that attracts a lot of athletes will now be penalized.

A. Financial metric is 15%. Understands the concern. Balancing competing interests. This metric is important in understanding what's happening financially across the university. For example, right now we may be able to give less money to nursing. Scholarships create the same issue. (NB from this notetaker: this makes NO sense: if a department or college has worked hard to bring in outside money and they elect to PAY FOR a student to be at Bradley, this is not "lost revenue." Instead, those dollars move OUT OF the department's control and INTO the revenue stream. They are new income that has been generated via market exposure and is now Bradley's to spend. The "units" don't get to point at a student and say, let them sit there at a discount." To say that such scholarships are lost revenue is shell game accounting).

Q. How will we measure the quality of faculty scholarship?

A. In business, they have a wide range of scholarship but this committee can't provide assurances about the quality of research/departmental productivity.

A. Right now, they are just counting publications. This is an area where the committee feels that collection of data needs to start and then see how it plays out. There are areas where the data collected will not be used right now. But this is an area that needs work.

Q. Do you plan to test this on model departments? What kinds of differentiation is possible?

A. 2 departments have been tested. We'll get data in about 4-6 weeks from Gray. Numeric data is working fine. But we haven't yet asked for Chairs to write content to test rubrics.

Q. What is the protection against the numbers coming back and the admin doing stuff before the process is fully vetted so we can see flaws in how the reporting is working?

A. Documents will be turned in in October. The committee will attempt to put programs in quintile buckets. The Deans and provosts will see if the buckets make sense. EG 1200 nursing students. If nursing is in the bottom bucket we've got a problem. [NB from this notetaker: so admin already knows how they want this to turn out?]

Q Every program is boiled down to one number. How?

A. Numeric data for each key driver. Then there's narrative as well. There is apparently a BCG (?) process that is helpful for multi-factor analysis.

Q. Service??

A. The rubric will be adjusted.

Q. Overhead. What is my overhead? Administration and Athletics are in overhead?

A. They will take 40% of the revenue produced and describe that as overhead.

A. Revenue is from SCH production. E.G. 30 students generate a known amount of revenue. They take 40 % of that.

Q. So we can tell exactly how much each seat is worth in a class, but we can't differentiate the overhead rate for nursing vs English, for example?

A. It's too complex. He gets the frustration.

Q. Are salaries in this?

A. Salaries are counted separately.

Q. What's the rationale for taking the Athletics off the table? Question about Sports Comm (cut off by Provost's reply)

A. Refer back the president.

Q. When a program serves a lot of athletes, there will be lots of discount.

A. That will account for differences in revenue, but he notes that not all athletes are 100%.

Q. Student fees for labs – are they included in income?

A. Yes.

Q. Increases to fees were blocked.

A. That's been changed. 1.5 million in fees. [NB The answer here didn't make sense. To this notetaker.] Students are harmed by fees.

Q. Discount rate which includes scholarships, is a penalty that disincentivizes departments to attract the best students, when those departments should be rewarded.

Q1. Music scholarship issue plays into this same concern.

A. It's a financial metric that helps to understand the financial bottom line. In another area they will put the multiplier on the WI for instance.

A2. Committee has wrestled with this. Unit financial viability is only set at 15%.

Q. It's under program demand TOO as well as Financial.

A. We should not be counting this in 2 places, so they will look.

Q. Unit quality is focused on faculty. Quality of students is not tracked.

A. Quality of students is counted in that retention rate and scores will be higher, employment will be higher. There are counter measures that counterbalance the impact of discount rate.

Q. To what extent are we constrained by financial obligations. Looking ahead at constructions etc.

A. Have to pay off loans before we can build. Nursing is moving to campustown when Business moves out. He said it's 7-10 years before we can build. But the purpose of this process is to move money around so we can invest in high demand programs. Aramark contract extension includes building a new facility. WE have no other constructions

Q. Patterns of discount rate: are discounts even across gender and diversity lines?

A. 95% based on academics without an eye toward demographics. Institutional Research could do that but there is no current analysis of who gets academic scholarships by demographics.

Q. Programs that attract more women or underrepresented student will be cut or weakened. If programs that seat those individuals end up with less revenue won't we fly in the face of and undermine our diversity issues.?

A. No reason to think that at this point. We have challenges with retaining students of color due to financials (and lack of welcome).

Q. How does the process work?

A. This will become an annual exercise. But the effort will lessen over time. Data is provided, and even the narratives will become easier over time. This will replace an annual report. Gray—every year? Or every 3 years. It's 25K to do it.

Q. When the rubric is set...Who will review the documentation and awarding points?

A. For first round Strategic Planning and other experts, especially for qualitative component.

Q. What about the program prioritization for non-academic?

A. Hesitates to have faculty involved in this non-academic function.

Q. Handbook says faculty involvement in all Strategic planning.

Note: the preponderance of Answers were provided by the Provost. Occasionally supporting commentary was provided by Assistant Provost and a Strategic Planning Committee member who has been working on this rubric and process.

<u>ID</u>	<u>Document</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Description</u>
177758	Concentration Addition	Bradley Andersh	CHM Chemistry-Chemical Engineering (CHM-CE)
176999	Concentration Modification	Bradley Andersh	CHM Chemistry High School Education (9-12) Concentration (CHM-T)
174725	Core Curriculum Addition	Souhail Elhouar	C E CON 498 Senior Project
175188	Core Curriculum Addition	Melvy Portocarrero	WLC WLS 321 Peninsular Spanish Civilization and Culture
177398	Core Curriculum Addition	David Abzug	CFA I M 459 Computer Game Capstone Project
178036	Core Curriculum Addition	Heather Brammeier	ART ART 317 Color: Perception and Practice
178045	Core Curriculum Addition	Heather Brammeier	ART ART 410 Advanced Painting II
178103	Core Curriculum Addition	Betty Jane Lawrence	CFA CFA 361 Media in Entertainment
178285	Core Curriculum Addition	Teresa Drake	FCS FCS 311 Evaluation and Research Methods
178444	Core Curriculum Addition	Steven Tippett	P T H S 230 Measurement in Physical Activity
178447	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 301 Novice Teaching Experiences in Music Classrooms K-8
178448	Core Curriculum Addition	Steven Tippett	P T HS 300 Experiential Learning in Healthcare
178455	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 302 Novice Teaching Experience in High School Music
178456	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 303 Novice Teaching Experience in K-12 Classrooms
178477	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 304 Early Childhood Novice Teaching Experience
178478	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 305 Novice Teaching Experience in a LBSI Setting
178479	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 306 Novice Teaching Experience Grades 1-6
178480	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 307 Novice Teaching Experience in Grades 5-8
178481	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 308 Novice Teaching Experience in the High School
178525	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 491 Student Teaching 5-8
178526	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 493 Student Teaching For Music K-12

Consent agenda.xlsx

178527	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 496 Student Teaching in LBS I
178528	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 497 Student Teaching in Early Childhood
178529	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 498 Student Teaching 1-6
178530	Core Curriculum Addition	Patricia Nugent	ETE ETE 499 Student Teaching in the High School
179247	Core Curriculum Addition	Cindy Brubaker	NUR NUR 410 Adult Health IV: Nursing Care of the Patient with Multi-System Challenges (T)
179441	Core Curriculum Addition	Steven Dolins	CS CIS 459 Computer Game Capstone Project
179469	Core Curriculum Addition	Travis Stern	THE THE 336 History of Theatre & Drama I
179470	Core Curriculum Addition	Travis Stern	THE THE 337 History of Theatre and Drama II
179471	Core Curriculum Addition	Travis Stern	THE THE 338 History of Theatre & Drama III
180581	Core Curriculum Addition	Portia Adams	SOC S W 351 Social Work Practice I
168725	Course Addition	Jose Lozano	PHY PHY 130 University Physics I for Scientists
174225	Course Addition	Jose Lozano	PHY PHY 460 Advanced Electricity and Magnetism
174508	Course Addition	Jose Lozano	PHY PHY 381 Quantum Physics Laboratory
177093	Course Addition	Dawn Roberts	PSY PSY 319 Positive Psychology
177925	Course Addition	Rachel Webb	GRD GRD 650 Program Completion
177982	Course Addition	Mathew Timm	MTH MTH 410 Numerical Methods I
177983	Course Addition	Mathew Timm	MTH MTH 411 Numerical Methods II
178198	Course Addition	Amanda Newell	FCS FCS 507 Nutrition Counseling and Assessment
178199	Course Addition	Amanda Newell	FCS FCS 514 Food Security and Food Systems
178445	Course Addition	Steven Tippett	P T HS 300 Experiential Learning in Healthcare
178731	Course Addition	Aleksander Malinows	E E ECE 445 Power Electronics Fundamentals
178732	Course Addition	Aleksander Malinows	E E ECE 545 Power Electronics Fundamentals
178733	Course Addition	Aleksander Malinows	E E ECE 446 Power Laboratory
178734	Course Addition	Aleksander Malinows	E E ECE 546 Power Laboratory
178735	Course Addition	Aleksander Malinows	E E ECE 468 Introduction to Mechatronics
178736	Course Addition	Aleksander Malinows	E E ECE 568 Introduction to Mechatronics
179671	Course Addition	Julie Reyer	EGT EGT 101 Introduction to Engineering & Technology
174278	Course Deletion	Jose Lozano	PHY PHY 306 Electromagnetic Waves
174282	Course Deletion	Jose Lozano	PHY PHY 350 Advanced Physics Experiments

174423	Course Deletion	Jose Lozano	PHY PHY 361 Electronics
178152	Course Deletion	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 825 DNP Practice Seminar III
178194	Course Deletion	Amanda Newell	FCS FCS 603 Advanced Nutrition Metabolism
178195	Course Deletion	Amanda Newell	FCS FCS 608 Nutrition Counseling
178983	Course Deletion	Mark Brown	BUS BUS 500 MBA Tools
174357	Course Modification	Jose Lozano	PHY PHY 201 University Physics II [Changes:Desc]
178073	Course Modification	Jenny Tripses	ENC ENC 585 Understanding Schools: A Primer for Non-Teachers [Changes:Desc]
178074	Course Modification	Jenny Tripses	ENC ENC 586 Counseling Diverse Populations [Changes:Desc]
178075	Course Modification	Jenny Tripses	ENC ENC 625 Principles of Group Counseling [Changes:Desc]
178076	Course Modification	Jenny Tripses	ENC ENC 640 Clinical Supervision [Changes:Desc]
178099	Course Modification	Jenny Tripses	ENC ENC 653 Professional School Counseling K-8 [Changes:Desc]
178100	Course Modification	Jenny Tripses	ENC ENC 606 Interpersonal Behavior & Organizational Leadership [Changes:Desc]
178102	Course Modification	Jenny Tripses	ENC ENC 669 Special Education Law [Changes:Desc]
178128	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 510 Legal and Ethical Issues in Healthcare [Changes:PreReq]
178129	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 600 Advanced Health Assessment [Changes:PreReq]
178130	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 615 Health Informatics [Changes:PreReq]
178131	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 625 DNP Practice Seminar I [Changes:PreReq]
178132	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 630 Nursing Administration I (Theory) [Changes:PreReq]
178133	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 631 Nursing Administration I (Practicum) [Changes:PreReq]
178134	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 632 Nursing Administration II (Theory) [Changes:PreReq]

178135	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 639 Healthcare Clinical Practicum I [Changes:PreReq]
178136	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 640 Healthcare Policy [Changes:PreReq]
178137	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 642 Principles of FNP Practice II: Acute/Chronic [Changes:PreReq]
178138	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 651 Advanced Pharmacology I [Changes:PreReq]
178139	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 652 Advanced Pharmacology II [Changes:PreReq]
178140	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 660 Seminar in Nursing Education [Changes:PreReq]
178141	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 661 Nursing Education Practicum I [Changes:PreReq]
178142	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 662 Nursing Education Practicum II [Changes:PreReq]
178143	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 690 Professional Aspects of Advanced Nursing Practice [Changes:PreReq]
178144	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 697 Capstone Project in Nursing [Changes:PreReq]
178145	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 700 Theoretical Foundations of Nursing Science [Changes:PreReq]
178146	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 720 Methods in Evidence Based Practice [Changes:PreReq]
178147	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 725 DNP Practice Seminar II [Changes:PreReq]
178148	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 826 DNP Practice Seminar III-A [Changes:PreReq]
178149	Course Modification	Rachel Borton	NUR NUR 827 DNP Practice Seminar III -B [Changes:PreReq]
178200	Course Modification	Amanda Newell	FCS FCS 510 Topics in Global Wellness [Changes:Number,PreReq]

178201	Course Modification	Amanda Newell	FCS FCS 606 Nutrition and Wellness [Changes:Desc]
178203	Course Modification	Amanda Newell	FCS FCS 609 Advanced Medical Nutrition Therapy [Changes:PreReq]
178204	Course Modification	Amanda Newell	FCS FCS 698 Supervised Practice [Changes:Hours]
178206	Course Modification	Amanda Newell	FCS FCS 699 Thesis Research [Changes:PreReq]
178276	Course Modification	Matt McGowan	ETL MIS 572 Information Systems Management [Changes:Hours,PreReq]
178379	Course Modification	Sherri Morris	BIO BIO 301 Biotechnology and Society [Changes:PreReq]
178383	Course Modification	Sherri Morris	BIO GES 300 Oceanography the Human Perspective [Changes:PreReq]
178442	Course Modification	Steven Tippett	P T H S 230 Measurement in Physical Activity [Changes:Desc,PreReq]
178889	Course Modification	Jannett Highfill	FIN Q M 364 Decision Support Systems [Changes:Desc,PreReq]
180126	Course Modification	JungWoon Yoo	IME IME 412 Design and Analysis of Experiments [Changes:PreReq]
175424	Major Addition	Jean Grant	ETE High School Education
176018	Major Modification	Jose Lozano	PHY Physics Education
177856	Major Modification	Mathew Timm	MTH Mathematics Major
177875	Major Modification	Jose Lozano	PHY Physics
177972	Major Modification	Mathew Timm	MTH Mathematics Education Major (9-12)
178437	Major Modification	Steven Tippett	P T Health Science
179308	Major Modification	Gary Will	ART Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree with a Major in Studio Art
179580	Major Modification	Melissa Peterson	P T Kinesiology and Health Science
177886	Minor Modification	Jose Lozano	PHY Physics
177973	Minor Modification	Mathew Timm	MTH Mathematics Minor
178122	Program Modification	Mark Brown	BUS Masters of Business Administration
178183	Program Modification	Amanda Newell	FCS Dietetic Internship Master of Science Program

Add starting at the end of Page 147 Revision 2.16 – December 5, 2018

E. Selection of the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School

The search shall be initiated by the Provost of the University. The faculty component of the search committee shall number at least one more than half the voting membership of the search committee, and shall be selected according to a procedure devised by the Executive Committee of the University Senate and approved by the University Senate. In addition to faculty members of the search committee, one Dean of Colleges, chosen by the Deans of Colleges, shall be a voting member.

Add starting at the end of Page 154 Revision 2.16 – December 5, 2018

G. Procedures for the Third Year Evaluation of the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School Conducted by the Faculty Committee

- a. The evaluation of the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School shall be completed by a Faculty Committee before the end of Dean's third full academic year in office, and again before the end of each subsequent third anniversary year.
- b. All deliberations of the committee are confidential. The charge of the committee is to collect and analyze information about how the Dean's performance is perceived by:

- Chairs of the departments that have graduate programs
- Graduate Faculty
- Graduate coordinators
- Director of Research and Sponsored Programs
- Graduate school staff
- Graduate students
- Faculty who submitted a grant during the evaluation period

and to convey this information to the Provost, and ultimately to the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School.

- c. The Faculty Committee members will be proposed by the Senate Executive Committee from graduate faculty with one year of service or more; the committee will include at least one member with experience and expertise in qualitative and quantitative evaluation processes. The committee composition is to be approved by the Senate. The Provost may appoint an additional member to the committee.
- d. The Faculty Committee elects its chairperson from among its members.
- e. The formation of the committee should be completed by the end of the September of Dean's third full academic year in office. The questionnaire is then distributed no later than the end of October of the Dean's third full academic year and is due back in two weeks

The memo that accompanies the questionnaire shall state that the completed questionnaires are to be submitted directly to the committee and that the committee will read the responses, analyze them, and forward them in aggregate, along with their analysis, to the Provost as part of its final report. The memo shall also state that the Provost will forward the report, including the analysis and the aggregate responses, to the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School.

- f. The Chair of the Faculty Committee shall present to the Provost a written final report summarizing the committee's findings, including the analysis and the aggregate responses. The report shall substantiate its conclusions in a way that is consistent with Part e above.
- g. The Provost may request more detailed substantiation of specific conclusions. The committee shall comply to the extent consistent with Part f above.
- h. After reviewing the Faculty Committee's report and discussing it with the Faculty Committee, the Provost shall forward the report, including the analysis and the aggregate responses, to the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School.
- i. The Provost shall discuss the committee's report with the Dean.
- j. In evaluating the Dean, the Provost shall use the committee's report and may use information from additional sources such as other Deans, outside advisory groups, and student groups.

Sample cover letter for the questionnaire used in the third year evaluation of the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School _____

Introductory Remarks

This survey questionnaire is being submitted to those specified in the Handbook for the evaluation of the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. It is designed to collect information about how the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School is perceived by the faculty of the University.

Do not include your name in responses to this questionnaire. Your anonymity as a respondent shall be protected at all times.

Please fill it out survey no later than October 15, 20 __.

Your individual response, together with all of the other faculty responses, will be read and analyzed by the Faculty Committee. The Faculty Committee will forward aggregate information about the individual responses and analysis of those responses to the Provost as part of its final report. The Provost will discuss the report, including the completed questionnaires and the analysis, with the Faculty Committee.

Then the Provost will forward the report, including aggregate information about the individual responses and the analysis, to the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. The Provost will discuss the report with the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School and use it, along with information from other sources, in evaluating him/her.

The Faculty Committee invites you to submit additional, confidential, signed comments on the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. Signed comments must be submitted under separate cover. Please submit your signed comments, if any, to a member of the Faculty Committee. The names and campus addresses of the five members of the Faculty Committee are:

Name	Campus Address
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.

5.

5.

6.

6.

Annual Faculty Assessment of the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School

Academic Year:

In the left-hand column record your degree of familiarity with the Associate Provost's performance in the specified area, where 0 is No Knowledge and 5 is First-Hand Knowledge

In the right-hand columns record your assessment of the Provost's performance by checking the appropriate box.

Knowledge 0 to 5	ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP	Outstanding	Above Expectation	Satisfactory	Below Expectation	Unsatis- factory
	1. Fosters an environment or culture that stimulates excellence in graduate programs					
	2. Fosters an environment or culture that stimulates scholarship and pursuit of external funding					
	3. Fosters a supportive environment or culture for faculty					
	4. Fosters a supportive environment or culture for graduate students					
	5. Communicates effectively with graduate students					
	6. Advocates for the Graduate School					
	7. Effectively promotes the academic programs of the University locally, nationally, and internationally.					

Please comment on his/her Leadership:

Knowledge 0 to 5	ASSESSMENT OF GOVERNANCE	Outstanding	Above Expectation	Satisfactory	Below Expectation	Unsatis- factory
		8. Allocating resources appropriately				
	9. Uses the committee and shared governance structure of the University					
	10. Personnel selection and hiring					
	11. Holding meetings with faculty with appropriate frequency					

Please comment on Governance:

QUESTIONS ON THE PROVOST'S PERFORMANCE

What are the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School strengths?

How can the Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School's performance be improved?

QUESTIONS ON THE STATE OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

Is the academic state of the Graduate school developing in an appropriate direction and at an appropriate rate? If so, why? If not, why not?

What are the most important academic challenges facing the Graduate School?

Other comments you may wish to make about the Provost and the academic state of the University:

March 31, 2019

From: Members of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Initiatives

To: Senate President Ahmad Fakheri, Members of the Senate Executive Committee, and Senate Members

Subject: Addition of a Standing Committee on International Initiatives to the University Senate

Colleagues,

We propose that to the following section of the Faculty Handbook:

ARTICLE V – COMMITTEES, 1. Standing Committees of the University Senate

The following be added:

Standing Committee on International Initiatives

1. The Standing Committee on International Initiatives shall:

a. Support and enhance an informed and internationalized curriculum, opportunities to participate in global learning, and international academic experiences.

In order to accomplish the foregoing objectives, the committee shall:

- 1) Oversee campus internationalization, including global initiatives in curriculum design, campus programming intended to increase global awareness, faculty and student development, and cross-cultural competency;
- 2) Enhance education abroad opportunities, including semester- and year-long study abroad; Interim Programs Abroad; and short-term international experiences, including internships, service learning, and other experiential learning abroad;
- 3) Evaluate international academic partnership agreements;
- 4) Support international student and scholar services;
- 5) Identify mechanisms that can provide stable funding for international initiatives, including development strategies within the colleges and across the University;

6) Partner with other associated areas within the University that have a direct or indirect bearing on campus internationalization, education abroad, international student and scholar services, and the integration of global learning and cross-cultural competency into the University's curriculum, programs, and academic community; and partner with organizations representing an international campus-community constituency, such as Peoria Area Friends of International Students (PAFIS) and Peoria Area World Affairs Council (PAWAC).

b) To facilitate the implementation of initiatives relevant to internationalization and global learning in current University Strategic Plan, and to play a crucial role in developing initiatives for future University Strategic Plans.

2. The Committee on International Initiatives shall consist of the following:

a) Faculty or staff members appointed by the Dean of the respective Colleges for staggered three-year terms:

- 1) One member from the College of Business;
- 2) One member from the College of Communications and Fine Arts;
- 3) One member from the College of Education and Health Sciences;
- 4) One member from the College of Engineering and Technology;
- 5) One member from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

b) Faculty or staff members appointed by the department chairs or directors of those academic programs with explicitly internationalized/globalized curriculum for three-year terms:

- 1) One member from International Business;
- 2) One member from the Institute of International Studies;
- 3) One member from World Languages and Cultures.

c) Ex-officio members:

- 1) The Director of Education Abroad;
- 2) The Director of the Office of International Student and Scholar Services;
- 3) The Senior Associate Director of Admissions and International Coordinator;
- 4) The Executive Director of Diversity and Inclusion;

5) The Executive Director for the Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning (CTEL).

d) Other committee member:

1) One faculty or staff member appointed by the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

e) The Chairperson will be elected from the committee membership.



**Report from the University Senate to the Board of Trustees
May 2019**

- During 2018-19 Academic year, the University Senate approved motions to:
 1. clarify Faculty Joint Appointments
 2. restructure the Academic Review Board (ARB), bringing it under the purview of the Senate
 3. make the Handbook language consistent with the University's Non-Discrimination Policy
 4. rename the Committee on Affirmative Action to Committee on Equity and Diversity
 5. revise the Handbook due to the Change of Affirmative Action Committee to Diversity and Equity Committee
 6. eliminate Retirement Advisory Committee and move its functions to Contractual Arrangements Committee
 7. move of Honorary Degrees Committee to Regulations and Degree Requirements Sub-Committee
 8. modify Provost Evaluation Process
 9. establish Handbook language for Selection and Evaluation of Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School
 10. form an Ad-Hoc committee to examine and make recommendations on the University tenure and promotion processes and criteria
 11. add representation to the following Board of Trustees' sub-committees
 - Board of Trustees Student Affairs Committee shall include a student member appointed by the Student Senate to a two-year term
 - Board of Trustees Academic Planning Committee shall include a faculty member appointed by the Senate Executive Committee to a two-year term
 - Board of Trustees Building Infrastructure Strategic Plan Special Committee shall include a faculty member appointed by the Senate Executive Committee to a two-year term
 - Board of Trustees Finance & Property Committee shall include a faculty member appointed by the Senate Executive Committee to a two-year term

- The University Senate discussed motions dealing with the:
 - Academic Rights of Non-tenure Track Faculty
 - Changes to the charge of The Committee on University Resources

- The Strategic Planning Committee worked on developing the program prioritization process
- The interim Consensual Relationship Policy was shared with the Senate
- The Senate approved the following curricular changes

Course Modification	91
Core Curriculum Addition	47
Course Addition	41
Major Modification	21
Course Deletion	19
Concentration Modification	7
Minor Modification	4
Concentration Addition	2
Program Deletion	1
Major Addition	1



Date: April 29, 2019

To: Ahmad Fakhri
President, University Senate

RE: Admissions and Retention Committee Report of Activities, 2018-19

The Admissions and Retention Committee met several times throughout the 2018-19 academic year. The committee discussed and acted on various topics pertaining to both admission policies and retention issues as summarized below:

Retention Issues:

Upon discussion with the Senate President, a Spring 2018 proposal concerning suggested changes in the Exit Interview form for students leaving Bradley early was sent directly to Senate Exec in Fall 2018 for review (the proposed form had originally been sent to the Associate Provost's Office & Student Support Services).

Also, it was agreed that retention issues need much more analysis beyond viewing the exit interview information. Perhaps combine this information with SSC data collected on the exiting students as well as the high schools/community colleges they attended. If this is already being done, then it should be provided to the Committee annually for its own discussion & analysis.

The Committee met with both the Interim Associate Provost & the Director of the Academic Success Center in December. Much of the discussion focused on how ARC can help in reaching the retention and admission related objectives set forth in the University Strategic Plan. Some specific points from the discussion worth noting for the Senate members & University are:

5% of students are flagged as "high risk" with a graduation rate of 16-17%. Moderate risk students graduate at a 55% rate. We need to develop more programs and involve high achieving students to help improve graduate rates of these "at risk" students.

For nontraditional students, to help with their success, Bradley offers various outreach programs, Sakai workshops, campus activities, but these are generally not well attended.

A discussion of why do students "really" leave pointed to behavioral issues and not just academic issues. How can we create a "relationship" with the student? The better the relationship, the more willing the student will be at addressing any academic issues with an instructor, advisor, counselor, etc... SSC (Navigate) is trying to help faculty & students with creating more of a one-on-one relationship and keeping better in touch with students.

Upon discussion of some preliminary results from both a self-study and an external review of the EHS 120 program, the following was proposed this Spring by ARC. Senate Exec determined that this should be sent to the C&R Committee for review:



EHS 120
Proposed Recommendation to University Senate
Admission & Retention Committee
April 1, 2019

While ARC recognizes that the final decision for any changes in the content of EHS 120 lies with the Vice President of Student Affairs, the following are recommendations we would like the V.P.'s Office to consider (as well as the academic community). As a committee of the University Senate, we are submitting these recommendations to Senate Exec for possible discussion and support. These recommendations are based on ARC's discussion of the current EHS 120 structure and on-going evaluation of the course through the University's Assessment Committee's Program Review process. Both the self-study and external review teams have just completed their reports. Our recommendations are primarily based on the following preliminary findings:

- 1) A study of 2012-14 freshmen Bradley students found a 4-14% higher retention rate per year for students taking EHS 120 versus those not taking the course.
- 2) Currently there is no set of common course objectives. The mission statement for EHS 120 is "to help students transition into college and from their 1st to 2nd year" and should be reviewed.

ARC understands that Student Affairs is currently evaluating the findings from both the self-study and external review; however, we believe this information, along with the urgency in addressing retention issues at Bradley, warrant the following recommendations:

- 1) All incoming freshmen be required to enroll in EHS 120
- 2) EHS 120 should have common elements in every section dealing with both transition and academic issues that the Vice President of Student Affairs has identified as helping the student advance and succeed at Bradley University.

The Committee recognizes that item #1 requires an evaluation of resources by the appropriate units and must be approved by University Senate and its appropriate subcommittees. Using the 4-14% higher retention rate figures for students taking EHS 120 and approximately 200-300 students opting out of EHS 120 each year, this could translate to retaining between 8 to 42 additional students each year. While other factors may also be involved, the Committee believes these numbers are significant enough that the University should consider requiring EHS 120 for all incoming freshmen (with minimal exceptions).

Admission Process/Policies:

Undergraduate:

It was suggested that Admission's enrollment criteria policies should be provided to the Senate every academic year including the fact that these criteria originate from the specific major's Colleges & Department. It was noted that the Office of Admission communicates with the Deans and Liaisons to create the suggested baseline requirements for the underlying majors. Each individual major's faculty would need to discuss their inquiries, suggestions or recommendations with the Deans/Liaisons prior to the finalization any changes in the criteria



each recruitment cycle (Early August). The actual documents are kept unavailable to the public or our competitors.

Also, the following information was provided by the Office of Admission concerning changes in strategy for recruiting Fall 2019 students after some unexpected results in the incoming Fall 2018 enrollment numbers (Note: The statement below was provided on March 4. Enrollment expectations have since been lowered to 1080 by the Office of Admission):

The incoming freshman class for Fall 2018 was designed to be smaller at the request of the President's Council and the resource needs that arose from the larger incoming class for Fall 2017. Enrollment Management was given a priority to reduce the number of admits and enrollments in the lowest admission profile (most specifically 17-20 ACT scores because of their perceived retention risk), reduce the size of certain programs that had finite resources for their students, and the discount rate was made a high priority. We learned that in this competitive of a marketplace, we do not have the ability to restrict our academic profile and discount rate while realistically enrolling a class of 1100.

For the incoming freshman class of Fall 2019, we have been charged with enrolling a class of 1100, with a slightly greater discretion in using the discount rate and selectively admitting students with 18-20 ACT scores (and SAT equivalents) to put ourselves in the best position possible to achieve the headcount goal. While we are operating on a budget that has not been increased to accommodate expanding initiatives and rising required business costs, we continue to work to use all of our resources as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Graduate:

To attract quality graduate students and maintain sustainable enrollment, Bradley needs a competitive assistantship stipend. Given this lack of competitive stipends, should we consider some teaching assistantships for potential grad students to be instructors for certain courses? Will the savings from hiring a full or part-time instructor allow for more funds to substantially increase assistantship stipends (& increase demand for Bradley grad programs)? Or, is the argument that "not one Bradley class is taught by a graduate student" too effective of a recruiting tool compared to the financial benefits of having some true TA's lead certain courses?

ARC meeting minutes have been submitted to the Senate Exec President and can be provided upon request.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vince Showers'.

Vince Showers, Chair

2017-18 ARC Members: Mike Gavic, Ken Harding, Melissa Peterson, Vince Showers, Erich Stabenau, Fred Tayyari, David Trillizio, & David Vroman



29 April 2019

To: Senate Executive Committee
From: Senate Elections Committee
Re: Annual Report for the Committee for 2018-19

Committee Members:

Eden Blair
Heather Brammeier
Teresa Drake
Andy Kelley (Chair)

Dear Senators and Senate Executive Committee Members,

The Senate Elections Committee is currently conducting elections for seats on various University Senate committees. The elections will conclude before the final Senate meetings of the 2018-19 academic year. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A L Kelley', with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Andy Kelley (Chair, Senate Elections Committee)



26 April 2019

TO: Prof. Ahmad Fakhri, Bradley University Senate President

FROM: Prof. Kelly Roos, Faculty Grievance Committee Chairperson

RE: 2018-2019 Faculty Grievance Committee Report

One faculty grievance was submitted to the committee during the reporting period. The committee did not deem it necessary to conduct a formal hearing, but spent much time and effort during the latter part of the Fall semester to bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion for both of the parties involved. A recommendation, based on the committee's findings, was submitted by the committee to the Provost.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Kelly R. Roos'.

Kelly Roos



Memorandum

From: Craig Curtis, Chair, University Senate Committee on Tenure, Promotion, & Dismissal

To: Ahmad Fakheri, President, University Senate

Date: 4/30/19

Re: Standing committee report for academic year 2018-2019

The University Senate Committee on Tenure, Promotion, & Dismissal did not hear any appeals this academic year. Our activities were directed at two projects.

The first, revision of the handbook procedures for hearing appeals from denials of tenure or promotion, was a continuation of the effort from last academic year. A subcommittee consisting of Mat Timm, Craig Curtis, and Melissa Peterson was formed. The tabled proposal from last year was carefully analyzed, feedback was sought from the University Counsel and the University President. Several iterations of the proposal have been drafted. The current state of the effort is that a draft proposal is being circulated among the membership of the entire committee for approval. It is hoped that this review will result in a final proposal to be considered by the Senate in the fall of 2019. That proposal will consist of the actual proposed changes to the handbook language as well as a statement of intent.

The second task was the creation of a handbook policy on dismissal. Currently, no procedure exists for the university to initiate a dismissal proceeding, nor are there any clearly state criteria to justify dismissal of a tenured member of the faculty. A subcommittee consisting of Tanya Marcum, Josh Dickhaus, Larry Xue, and Jackie Hogan was formed to draft a proposal. The subcommittee consulted with University Counsel and a draft proposal was created and circulated to the entire committee. Feedback was provided. Currently, the subcommittee is processing the feedback from the rest of the committee. This is a delicate task and it is hoped that, at some time during the coming year, a set of procedures and a set of decision criteria will be submitted to the University Senate for its consideration.



To: Ahmad Fakheri, President of the University Senate

From: Committee on Contractual Arrangements (Kristi McQuade, Chair; Brad Andersh; Elena Gabor; Pratima Gandhi; Tanya Marcum)

Re: Annual Report (2018-19 academic year)

Date: April 30, 2019

The following activities were performed by the Committee on Contractual Arrangements during this past academic year.

1. Revise Committee Charge - Complete

In the Fourth Regular Meeting (February 21, 2019), the Senate voted to eliminate the Retirement Advisory Committee, move its function to the Contractual Arrangements Committee, and increase the membership of the Contractual Arrangements Committee by one by appointing an individual from Human Resources. In response to this change, the Contractual Arrangements Committee drafted updated handbook language that was approved in the Fifth Regular Meeting (March 28, 2019).

2. Review and Revise Full-time, Non-tenure Track Faculty Service Policy – In progress

At the request of the Senate Executive Committee, our committee reviewed the handbook for policies related to whether service is permitted, encouraged, or required for non-tenure track faculty. The committee found that the current version of the handbook includes almost no language on this subject. We drafted a proposal to revise the language (and also clean up some organizational flaws). The proposal, presented at the Sixth Regular Meeting (April 18, 2019) generated a significant amount of debate on the senate floor. The committee plans to carefully consider this feedback with the intention of bringing a revised proposal to the Senate during 2019-2020 academic year.

3. Review and Revise Consensual Relationship Policy – In progress

The Committee was tasked with the job of reviewing and revising the University's interim policy on consensual relationships. We have made significant progress in this regard, but to complete the task, we will need to continue our work during the 2019-2019 academic year.

University Strategic Planning Committee
Program Prioritization
March 20, 2019
Draft

Program Prioritization Preamble

Mission Affirmation

The mission of Bradley University is: “empower students for immediate and sustained success in their personal and professional endeavors by combining professional preparation, liberal arts and sciences, and co-curricular experiences. Alongside our dedication to students, we embrace the generation, application, and interpretation of knowledge.”

Universities and careers are changing at rapid rates such that success in either environment requires continuous monitoring of the academic programs we offer that empower our students, and continuous attention to the alignment of resources within academic and academic support units that are relevant at any given point in time. Without it, programs (both academic and support) may suffer from benign neglect. Sometimes, this neglect presents itself as a failure to reach the program’s full potential. Other times, the adequately-resourced program becomes obsolete due to the lack of pressure to evolve to meet the current demands of our students.

Definition and Goals

At Bradley University, **Program Prioritization** is defined as: An iterative decision-making tool that assists in the allocation of university resources. Inherent to this process is the attempt to establish indices of program quality and demand, unit centrality to mission, and unit efficiency. Ideally, these measures can usefully inform resource allocation across both academic and non-academic units of the university.

At Bradley, the initiation of this process has been called for by the Board of Trustees and senior administration, and is a stated goal of the current strategic plan. Fortunately, Bradley University has secured healthy student enrollments over the past few years and is in a reasonably healthy financial position compared to the recent past. Thus, program prioritization is anticipated to proceed at a time when program cuts or unit disinvestments are not the key objective. Yet, it is undeniable that higher education faces economic, cultural, technological and political forces that are disruptive to historical planning processes. Given that new revenue sources are likely to remain scarce, stewardship of Bradley’s mission and legacy, in tandem with our commitment to continuous improvement, obligates our community to initiate a prioritization process that empowers the best use of existing resources and emboldens us to confront unseen challenges.

The ultimate **goal** of program prioritization is captured in its definition: Our objective is to support decision-making that allocates resources that will maximize the immediate and sustained success of our students, both now and well into the future. As a consequence, this process seeks to provide assurances that each unit at Bradley has resources (e.g., faculty, staff, equipment, facilities, and funds) appropriate to the delivery of programs of high quality and demand.

At the onset, this goal poses a variety of questions that are difficult to answer: What is a program? How do we attempt to define program quality? How do we compare academic to non-academic units? What is the appropriate ratio of part-time to full-time faculty? What is the appropriate number of required courses or faculty relative to the number of majors? How do we define centrality to mission? The list goes on. Importantly, the answers to these questions represent a portfolio of secondary goals.

Importantly, our ability to achieve these goals will increase over time. Therefore:

- In the *short* term, we aspire to: **UNDERSTAND** the nature of the key drivers of program success and the resources needed to adequately sustain the units that administer them.

- This allows us to proactively **DEFINE** a successful program in the *medium* term, providing even more powerful tools for decision making about current and potential programs. In this way, unit leaders and all contributors to Bradley’s mission achieve enhanced personal clarity on how to best allocate time and resources.
- Over the *long term*, we aim to become even more efficient as we **EXECUTE** resource allocation decisions. Specifically, we anticipate decreasing our decision cycle-time and increasing our ability to continually monitor our resource allocations.

Values

Given the scale and complexity of this project, it is essential that key values will inform the process. These values include:

1. **Continuous Improvement.** Consistent with Bradley’s commitment to excellence, this process will be iterative, evolving over time to better capture indices of our high quality programs and efficient and effective units.
2. **Transparency and Inclusion.** The development of measures will be informed by continuous feedback resulting from engagement of all constituencies of the University, and the outcomes of the process will be shared in meaningful ways.
3. **Community.** At the heart of Bradley is the realization of shared ownership in and oversight of the health and legacy of the institution. Program prioritization should advance a sense of fairness and shared mission.

A fundamental challenge in developing a Program Prioritization process at Bradley is to determine the appropriate level of analysis, i.e., defining a program. Indeed, as Bradley has matured, schools, institutes and centers have been developed without a clear definition of how they are distinct. For practical purposes, our definition of an academic program begins with that which is listed in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs. This provides clarity in terms of degree-granting programs, including minors, majors, concentrations and graduate degrees/certificates, most of which are housed within discrete academic units or departments. However, there remain questions about how to prioritize programs that are not inherently linked to degree status (e.g., Academic Exploration, Study Abroad) or are broadly distributed across units (e.g., Honor’s Program, BCC, Global Scholars). Hopefully, a clearer conceptualization of how programs are defined will be one key outcome of this process.

In addition, as Program Prioritization seeks to ensure optimal resourcing of units and departments, it becomes clear that while some key questions are best focused at the program level (for example, demand for programs, retention), other questions are best addressed by evaluating unit/department level metrics (e.g., faculty productivity, congruence with mission). As a consequence, we have attempted to achieve clarity on these important distinctions.

Ideally, the outcome of Program Prioritization is that each program can be given a score that reflects its standing in meeting an array of key drivers of success. Needless to say, this is no small task and will almost certainly require multiple iterations in order to arrive at a process that is accessible, transparent and just. In addition, the answer to each question may require a composite of multiple data points, may represent a combination of qualitative and quantitative data, or may simply require a clearly articulated narrative from each unit or program. Finally, not all questions are as critical to Bradley’s success as others, and thus there is an attempt to differentially weight the impact of each question.

Statement on the Process for non-academic units

Following a similar process to the one used for the Academic Units, criteria will be established during Summer 2019 for non-academic units. As academic units begin their review in Fall 2019, non-academic unit reviews will begin in Fall 2020.

Working List of Key Drivers

While subject to feedback from the campus community, the list of drivers and the associated questions below represent the structure of Program Prioritization. The discussions so far have provided some guidance in terms of data to be made available to units and information to be provided by units. Please note that in some instances the unit of analysis is the **Program**, and in other instances the **Unit** is the level of analysis.

Key Driver	Questions to be addressed	Metrics/Evidence	Data Sources
Program Demand (30%)	What is the demand for the program?	See attached Score Card from Gray Associates. The analysis completed by Gray Associates will provide metrics and data for Program Demand.	
	Is there evidence that this program is attractive to prospective students?		
	Is there evidence of strong enrollment in the program?		
	Is there evidence that there is anticipated demand for students enrolling in this program?		
	What is the average discount rate per student in the program?	Average Discount Rate per student in each program within the unit.	Provided by Provost Office and Enrollment Management
Unit Quality (25%)	Does each program within the unit provide evidence of clearly defined and measureable learning objectives?	Narrative (no more than 250 Words <i>per program</i>) Describe how the department uses evidence-based curriculum change (provide examples). Attach: Learning Objectives and Curricular Alignment Assessment Plan	CARTA, program handbooks, syllabi, student catalogue, accreditation self-study, academic program evaluation. Program handbooks, accreditation self-study, academic program evaluation, <i>annual report</i> .
	Does the unit have a strategic plan and a history of being responsive to the plan?	Narrative (500 Words): <i>Provide evidence of alignment</i> with the University and College Strategic Plan. Attach the Unit strategic plan	Department Chair, Dean's Office This will not be an evaluative item for the first year, but will need to articulate process moving forward.
	Does curriculum include High Impact Practices and/or Graduate courses?	Report percent of total SCH devoted to High-Impact Practices &/or Graduate courses? <i>If narrative limit to 500 Words.</i> Describe High Impact Practices included in the curriculum using the AAC&U definition &/or the 6 practices defined for the Bradley Core Curriculum EL Tags.	Institutional Data
Unit Quality, continued	Does unit provide evidence of a comprehensive teaching improvement plan?	Narrative (500 words) How is teaching evaluated? What approaches does the unit use to improve pedagogy?	Dean's Office

		Describe faculty participation in professional development around pedagogy, including CTEL or other pedagogical conferences (provide frequencies). Describe faculty use of innovative pedagogies (List the types of innovative pedagogies). What pedagogical innovations have you made as a result of learning assessment?	Digital Measures
	Are alumni satisfied with the experience they received from the unit?	Periodic Alumni Survey <i>This item will be considered for future inclusion. We need to develop a coordinated response institution-wide. Including this as a component of APR or accreditation may be an option.</i>	Academic Program Review/Accreditation Self-Study
	Does the unit receive specialized accreditation?	Describe specialized accreditation(s) for your programs?	List specialized accreditations. Provide <i>state/national</i> exam and pass rates for accredited programs. For programs that do not maintain specialized accreditation, describe rationale
Centrality to Mission (15%)	How does the unit support student success while at Bradley University and after graduation? Are graduates gainfully employed	Report retention and graduation rates at the program level and university level. %graduates employed/attending graduate school Narrative (250 Words): Efforts to improve retention of majors &/or other students unit is serving	Institutional Data
	What is the unit's role in professional preparation/liberal arts education/co-curricular activities? ?	BCC course enrollment SCH* SCH required by other programs* Convergence activities aligned with the committee definition <i>This item will be considered for future inclusion.</i> *NOTE: enrollment, sch hours, etc. may only be counted once (no double dipping or overlap). A course would either be counted as BCC or as required by other programs, but not both. Report contact hours for co-curricular and zero credit hour activities 500 word narrative: Explain why the program has an important role to play in the university's portfolio.	Institutional Data Digital Measures Reports
	Does the unit contribute to the generation, application, and interpretation of knowledge?	Provide data (3-year count) on scholarly output and creative production of the unit** (e.g., books, book chapters, articles in peer-reviewed journals, presentations and national/international conferences, creative production)	Digital Measures Reports

		<p>Identify external grant funding over the last 3 years.</p> <p>Identify data on “impact,” if available.</p> <p>**Must be grounded in professional/discipline knowledge</p>	
Unit Efficiency and Productivity (15%)	<p>How productive is the unit with regard to SCH/FTE?</p> <p>What is the expected unit course load and release time?</p> <p>How are the SCH generated in terms of faculty appointment?</p>	<p>Report: Total SCH/FTE Faculty</p> <p>% SCH generated by T/TT Faculty % SCH generated by NTT Faculty %SCH generated by Part-time/adjunct Faculty</p>	<p>Institutional Data Unit data Provost, Deans, Chairs, work together to provide course release information.</p>
	<p>Does the unit have support staffing appropriate to its needs?</p>	<p>Report SCH/FTE support staff who are NOT teaching. FTE Faculty/Staff Majors/Staff SCH/Staff</p> <p>Report unit’s overhead share of staff allocated to the Dean’s Office</p>	<p>Institutional Data</p>
	<p>What evidence exists that the unit is optimizing curricular resources?</p>	<p>Report average class size/average class capacity (10 year average)</p> <p>Attach 4-year degree program plan (undergrad) in standard format that ensures BCC compliance.</p> <p>Attach degree completion plan for graduate students</p>	<p>Institutional Data Digital Measures Unit Data Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogue</p>
	<p>What is the relationship between Faculty contact hours and SCHs in the unit?</p>	<p>Contact hours/ SCH SCH dedicated to labs, internships, clinicals across disciplines (e.g., arts, engineering, health care, etc). <i>Units must submit logic/rational for contact hour activities.</i></p>	<p>Unit data</p>
	<p>What constraints to productivity or efficiency does this unit face (these could be factors that ensure quality but might limit productivity)?</p>	<p>Suggested considerations: Specialized accreditations, Team teaching, interdisciplinary courses, Individualized courses, student research, or heavy amounts of individual student assessments, nature of research in the discipline, course that require extra contact hour (some EL, labs), physical/technological constraints.</p>	<p>Unit narrative (250 words)</p>
Unit Financial Viability (15%)	<p>What is the current financial picture of the unit?</p>	<p>SCH by unit cost</p>	<p>SCH x \$value</p>

DRAFT

**Response to Proposed Program Prioritization Plan
Sociology, Criminology & Social Work
4/24/19**

The Department commends the Strategic Planning Committee for beginning its March 29th, 2019 draft of the Program Prioritization plan with an affirmation of Bradley's Mission: to "empower students for immediate and sustained success in their personal and professional endeavors by combining professional preparation, liberal arts and sciences, and co-curricular experiences." We agree that this mission must be at the core of the Program Prioritization process.

It appears, however, that the structure of the review process as set out in the March 29th document does not align with the University's mission in a number of significant and highly problematic ways.

1. First and foremost, the "**weighting**" of "Key Drivers" (Program Demand, Unit Quality, Centrality to Mission, Unit Efficiency, and Financial Viability) drastically undervalues the University's core mission as it is stated above (to "empower students for immediate and sustained success in their personal and professional endeavors by combining professional preparation, liberal arts and sciences, and co-curricular experiences.") For instance, market factors (under "Program Demand") that are largely beyond the control of academic units are weighted at 30%, and the unit's self-assessment procedures are weighted at 25% (under "Unit Quality"), while "Centrality to Mission" is weighted at only 15%. It is highly problematic that delivery of the University's core mission should be given so little "weight."
2. Secondly, many of the factors that Gray Associates say they will use to judge "**program demand**" are not equally appropriate for all degree programs. For instance, Gray explains that they will calculate program demand, in part, on internet "**clicks**" and "**inquiries**" about programs. This measure gives tremendous advantage to fields that high school students are more familiar with, either from their educational experiences or from the mass media. Students are therefore much more likely to search for "Nursing" or "Psychology" than for "Sociology" or "Anthropology." Most Sociology programs, including ours, have very few Freshman majors because students are not familiar with the field. As the Academic Program Review team for our department recently noted, "It is common for sociology programs to find that students declare sociology majors late in their undergraduate careers; few students enroll in college knowing that they want to be sociology majors" (Petrovich, et.al 2019). It is not until they take a course for the purposes of general education that they "discover" the field and their interest in it. Gray's measure of "clicks" and "inquiries" will inherently disadvantage our program and others like us, and will not provide the administration with an accurate picture of "demand" for our program.
 - a. Likewise, Gray says they will measure program demand, in part, on **job postings**. They provide examples such as Computer Software Engineer, Nurse, and Physician Assistant. No doubt this measure is useful for fields that prepare students for entry into a limited range of specific vocations. However, this measure inherently disadvantages fields (such as English, Sociology, or History) that prepare students for entry into a broader array of careers. For instance, Sociology majors commonly go on to careers in the law and law enforcement, politics, social services, public administration, non-profit administration, journalism and many other fields, but few of those job openings would list a degree in Sociology as a requirement. Unless Gray uses job listings from all such fields when calculating the "demand" for a Sociology degree, it cannot provide an accurate estimate of market demand.

This “job listings” measure will inherently disadvantage our program and others like us, and will not provide the administration with an accurate picture of “demand” for our program.

- b. A third problem with the way Gray intends to measure program demand is that it appears to be based primarily on demand for specific *majors*. This measure will inherently disadvantage programs like ours that make significant contributions to the BCC and thus serve *all* majors across the campus. As the Academic Program Review team for our program recently noted:

Another challenge facing the department seems to result from administrative decisions that credit departments more heavily for the “production” of majors than for providing them with important courses in the Bradley Core. **It is difficult for the external review members to understand the logic of this decision-making, given that one of the key strengths of a Bradley education is the linking of the liberal arts for professional fields.** In fact, the main **Bradley web pages repeatedly stress the importance of this linkage and the distinctiveness of Bradley in providing an excellent undergraduate education because of it** (Petrovich, et. al 2019).

In a related point, the review team notes that:

It is not clear to us why Bradley gives relatively little “credit” to programs, such as sociology, that produce relatively large numbers of minors. We would encourage the administration to view the “production” of minors in a more favorable light, given that they, too, are essential to a students’ undergraduate experience (Petrovich, et. al 2019).

3. Furthermore, the Program Prioritization plan indicates that departments will be judged, in part, on “retention” rates (by which we assume is meant retention of majors). This is currently calculated as the percentage of those in a major in the Fall of their Freshmen year who are still in that major in the Fall of their Sophomore year. Using this measure disadvantages fields (such as the natural and health sciences or Social Work) which may start out with large numbers of Freshmen but lose some who discover that they would be better suited to other fields. It also unfairly disadvantages fields that have very few (or no) Freshman majors due to high school students’ lack of familiarity with the fields. In order to be fair, retention should be measured as the percentage of *all* of the majors in a program (not just Freshmen) in one year who are still majors the following year.

We also believe the administration would do well to acknowledge that the transfer of students from one major to another on campus is still **retention of the student as a Bradley student. There is no reason to have departments competing for majors, if our common goal is to make sure each student finds their passion and ends up where they are best suited!** Moreover, if the number and variety of majors on campus were to be reduced, many of those students might end up transferring to another institution altogether. One of the key features that distinguished Bradley in the higher education marketplace is our size—small enough to provide a personalized educational experience, but large enough to offer the same range of choices students would find at large state schools (some of our main market competitors). In our view, it would be short-sighted and self-defeating for the administration to consider downsizing or eliminating academic programs based on measures such as number of majors produced.

Indeed, if the administration truly wishes to have an objective measure of each unit's "value" to the University, it must ensure that it is comparing "**apples with apples**," and not, for instance, making overly simplistic comparisons between more vocationally-oriented fields with large numbers of majors and liberal arts, communications or other fields that provide students with the broader skills and perspectives that will allow them to be successful in a larger range of careers. Therefore, if the administration wishes to calculate a single "score" for each program, it should develop a formula to make comparisons between very different programs more meaningful. For instance, if a program delivered 810 SCHs of Bradley Core classes in a given year, and a major in that program is 30 credit hours, we might calculate that the program has, in effect, served the equivalent of 27 majors. Likewise, if the program has major requirements of 30 credit hours and minor requirements of 15 credit hours, every minor might be calculated as one-half of a major. (So a program with 60 minors is serving the equivalent of 30 additional majors.) Alternatively, the administration could simply compare the SCH per FTE for each program. Using any or all of these calculations would provide the administration with more meaningful comparisons between very different kinds of programs.

4. We have additional concerns about the calculation of "**Financial Viability**" for each program. The only explanation of this calculation in the March 29th document is "SCH x \$value" (which appears to be a calculation of revenue generated by each unit through teaching). However, calculations of "financial viability" must also include factors such as the salary costs, ancillary operating costs of each unit (including, for instance, lab, equipment and facilities costs), as well as additional revenue generated by the unit (for instance through grant monies). Any meaningful comparison of the "financial viability" of programs across the University must consider the full range of expenses incurred by programs, because the reality is that some programs are (necessarily) much more expensive to deliver. Not to consider all program costs would give the appearance of an evaluation process that is biased in favor of more resource-intensive programs.
5. Another significant problem with the proposed Program Prioritization plan is that its measures of "**Unit Quality**" appear to inherently advantage accredited programs and programs that use the kind of rubric-based assessments commonly required of accredited programs. Calling for such evidence of "unit quality," fails to account for the fact that many units engage in reflective, qualitative and iterative assessments that are more appropriate for their disciplines than the kinds of metrics that are used in more vocationally-oriented programs. The request for short (250-word) "narratives" detailing each program's "evidenced-based curriculum change," "curricular alignment" and "assessment plan" is premised on the problematic assumption that there is a single, "best" way for all disciplines to evaluate the efficacy of their curricula. And the fact that certain programs may also attach the extensive additional documentation at their disposal (for instance accreditation self-studies with data stretching back many years) will disadvantage programs that do not have such materials to submit because such assessments are not within their disciplinary norms.
6. There are also three broader issues with the Program Prioritization plan as set out in the March 29th document:
 - a. The first is that as the criteria now stand, there is a distinct lack of incentive (and indeed significant disincentive) for interdisciplinary collaboration, since all rewards and punishments accrue to "degree-granting programs" (as program is defined in the document). It is not clear, for example, how efforts to develop new interdisciplinary courses taught by faculty from multiple disciplines will figure into the calculus, or how cross-disciplinary research collaborations or experiential projects or independent concentrations will be rewarded. Nor, indeed, is it clear why anyone would spend their time on these kinds

- of activities at all, if it does not immediately translate into increased “program demand” (since that has by far the most weight). Without some way to significantly incentivize these kinds of activities, the Program Prioritization plan simply reinforces disciplinary silos, and, indeed encourages unhealthy competition rather than cooperation and collaboration between disciplines. This outcome – and in fact the entire logic of program prioritization – is at cross purposes with the administration’s recent push toward “convergence” (fruitful interdisciplinary collaboration). We need to be *pulling together* to face the challenges ahead and ensuring that our students get the best possible education, not be constantly worrying about whether we’re going to land in the bottom quintile or whether another program has a higher score than we do.
- b. Second, the University’s strategic plan affirms Bradley’s commitment to **diversity and equity**, and we commend the administration for taking a variety of steps to better attract and serve an increasingly diverse student population. However, as a recent article in *Academe* points out, when institutions of higher learning cut and downsize academic programs based on measures of “efficiency,” this most often results in “cuts in the programs historically responsive to the demands of women, LGBTQ communities, and communities of color for representation in the university” (Buff 2018). We call on the administration to carefully consider how best to employ institutional resources to attract, retain and serve an increasingly diverse student body, and how to avoid making cuts that undermine Bradley’s attractiveness to these students. Even from a purely economic standpoint, demographic shifts make these groups crucial to Bradley’s financial future.
- c. A third, and quite serious, problem with the current Program Prioritization plan is that many of the “**data sources**” it identifies are deeply flawed. For instance, official institutional data is often inaccurate. In our combined department with five course codes in use (SOC, SW, CJS, CRM and ANT), one or more of those course codes is often (we assume inadvertently) left out of our SCH, major, and minor calculations. Likewise, in the Career Center calculations of job placement rates for each major, SOC majors are routinely left out of the figures entirely, because many SOC majors have Sociology as a “second” major. In the Digital Measures system, despite our concerted attempts to ensure that all faculty data is up-to-date, when we run Digital Measures reports, many measures of faculty productivity are left out (perhaps due to problems with date-ranges or other seemingly minor data entry issues), and some superfluous material is included (for instance listing countless course sections with “zero” enrolled students under a faculty member’s teaching load, or listing the same item—like committee service, or publications in various stages of completion—multiple times). For an outside firm unfamiliar with the “quirks” of our Digital Measures system, relying on this data will likely provide them with under-counts or over-counts of faculty activities. In short, many of the data sources that appear to be central to the administration’s cost-benefit analysis are unreliable. Therefore, for the faculty to have any confidence in the administration’s calculations, all data summaries should be given to departments to review and correct, if necessary, *before* they are used in any calculations by Gray or the administration itself. Even that is not a solution, however, because of the inordinant amount of time it takes for each Chair/administrator to review and correct their own unit’s data, and because there would then be no guarantee that all of them would be using the same standards/calculations to do so.

7. Finally, there is one central, overarching problem with the Program Prioritization plan, as articulated in the March 29th document: **the intent of this undertaking**. While the March 29th document states that “program cuts or unit disinvestments are not the key objective,” the structure of the process (discussed above) suggests that the **downsizing or elimination** of less vocationally-oriented programs is the true goal of this process. The fact that the administration originally pledged to review non-academic units as well as academic programs, but faculty were recently informed at a Program Prioritization forum that athletics (and perhaps other non-academic programs) will NOT undergo this kind of cost-benefit analysis, adds to the appearance that the Program Prioritization process is primarily aimed at eliminating or disinvesting in certain types of academic programs – programs whose value may not be immediately apparent to incoming students or to their parents if their primary concern is vocational training, but which are nevertheless critical to delivering a broad-based liberal arts education and to the maintenance of a democratic populace.

It is important to note that Gray Associates explicitly state that their “Program Evaluation System” (PES) will assist Bradley’s administrators in determining when to “**start, stop or grow programs**,” and “**where to invest and where to cut**” (emphasis added). Gray also claims that their system will allow administrators to reduce the time it takes to make such crucial resourcing decisions “**from months to days (or even minutes)**” (Gray 2018). It is *highly* problematic that decisions affecting the livelihoods of faculty across the University and the fate of whole disciplines at the University may now be made “in minutes” based upon potentially inappropriate and unreliable measures.

We call on the administration to correct the flaws in the current draft (as detailed above) and to be transparent and forthright with faculty regarding the true goals and potential outcomes of the Program Prioritization process.

Sources Cited

Buff, Rachel Ida (2018) “Austerity is Class Warfare: The Social Wage and the Assault on Diversity,” *Academe*, Nov/Dec. Available <https://www.aaup.org/article/austerity-class-war#.XMCpJDBKh0w>.

Gray Associates (2018) *Program Evaluation System Proposal for Annual Subscription*. Dated October 25, 2018.

Petrovich, James, Theresa A. Severance, Mary Senter, Molly Cluskey, and Charles Bukowski (2019) “Review Team Report: Bradley University Academic Program Review, Department of Sociology, Criminology and Social Work.” Dated April 11, 2019.