Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
November 9, 2017, 3:00 P.M. GBB 123

Call to Order   
Chair Bowman called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.   
Registrar Hickman called roll.   
  
**Members Present:** A. Alger, B. Allred, A. Ametsbichler, J. Angle, D. Beck, A. Belcourt, M. Boller, M. Bowman, J. Bunch, A. Chatterjee, S. Clouse, D. Coffin, G. Collins, Z. Cooper, T. Crawford, A. Delaney, A. Elliott, D. Erickson, L. Fern, E. Gagliardi, S. Gordon, K. Griggs, B. Halfpap, B. Harrison, M. Horejsi, J. Hunt, G. Larson, D. Lurie, T. Manuel, H. Martens, M. Musick, A. Nack, H. Naughton, L. Nichols, D. Patterson, J. Pavilack, S. Phillips, G. Quintero, S. Ross, A. Ratto-Parks, Y. Reimer, A. Sondag, M. Semanoff, S. Strohl, J. Thomsen, E. Uchimoto, N. Vonessen, A. Ware  
 **Members Excused:** S. Certel, N. Greymorning, U. Kamp, M. Maneta, M. Monsos, M. Pershouse, S. Schwarze, A. Szalda-Petree

**Members Absent:** J. Banville, S. Bitar, S. Caro, J. Carter, Y. Cho, G. Collins, N. Dawson, M. Hamon, J. Laskin, J. Millspaugh, J. Sears

**Ex-Officio Present:** President Stearns,Interim Provost Edmond,Associate Provost Lindsay

**Guest:** G. Weix,

**Minutes:** The minutes from October 12th were approved.

## Public Comment

* Student Ross Best commented at the last meeting about the failures of the University to provide constitutional and statutory requirements of open meetings and access to documents. The Missoulian recently highlighted more illustrations of the problem. He indicates President Sterns takes a “hands off, pass the bucket” approach as do committees and similar groups on campus that often operate outside the law. President Stearns confirms that even the President’s Cabinet does not keep minutes of meetings required by Montana’s Open Meetings Law. She does not plan to change this. The Commissioner’s Office continues to ignore the statutory duty of the Regents to provide coordinated rules for public participation throughout the Montana University System, and even denies that public comments are required at Cabinet meetings. The administration pledges transparency yet plays games with access to program prioritization documents.   
    
  He is disappointed to hear that the Faculty Senate Chair indicates these issues are outside the Senate’s charge. In looking closer at the Senate’s rules, he notices that most of the Senate’s business involves academic issues, but the Articles of Faculty Organization and the UFA Bargaining Agreement clearly establish the Senate’s power and duty to make recommendations to the President and the Regents in matters of critical concern to the welfare and administration of the university. Chronic widespread lack of open government touches every aspect of the University. It is a matter of critical concern to the welfare and administration of the university. He believes the Senate should exercise its discretion to insist the administration make a commitment to open government on this campus. The basic problem is that the university system’s lawyers appear to be under the impression that advisory committees are not subject to the Open Meeting Law, but that is not what the law states or what the Montana Supreme Court has said. There is no basis in the law for this interpretation. Therefore, it is important that faculty, students, and the university community be aware of the situation. The most straightforward way for the Senate to become involved in addressing this issue is to consider a resolution to encourage the administration to comply with the law. He will see what he can do in the next month to work with faculty senate members to get such a resolution before the Senate. Thank you

## Communications

* President Sheila Stearns  
    
  It was exciting to see the story of Helena’s new Mayor Wilmot Collins in national newspapers today. He was a refuge from Liberia and his son is one of UM’s engaged students. The President introduced Bliss, who is a member of ASUM. The President asked him to tell some of his father’s story. His mother was an exchange student to Helena High School. She was married when the civil war broke out and used her Helena exchange connection to migrate to Helena. is HHis father has always been an active member of the community and passionate about helping people. His father instilled the values of being involved and taking advantage of opportunity in both his children. President Stearns asked that he congratulate his father for us. “As Montanans, we are proud.”

Planning for UM’s budget has been on hold given the state’s budget situation. A special legislative session has now been announced. The Governor is proposing to cover the deficit in thirds with 1) transfers, 2) revenue generation, and 3) cuts. This summer we were concerned that the cuts would be up to 10% or $45 million for the University System. Now the proposal is in the $4-5 million range, of which UM would absorbed approximately a third. We still don’t know what this will mean for   
  
A transition team reviewed some of our operational processes last spring. Then Vice President Reid resigned and Rosi Keller became the Interim Vice President for Administration and Finance. She was Chair of the transition team. Thus, action on the transition team recommendations was put on hold. However, one recommendation was to determine other ways other than increasing enrollment that UM could reduce the structural deficit. It will take 2-3 years to get the budget aligned with more healthy levels. This is the goal.   
  
We are talking with friends and skeptics at the legislature about our needs. She spoke with the Helena Rotary and the President’s Advisory Council. The Legislators are hearing from other impacted services, but not much from education. It is hard for them to be an advocate when they are not hearing from people who value education. She asked that the faculty help get the word out.

Senators were reminded not be use university resources to lobby in accordance with [university policy](http://www.umt.edu/policies/browse/personnel/election-and-public-policy). Email communications to Legislators should be from your personal accounts.   
  
Senator Coffin: It’s about personal relationships. Try to find people who know the legislators. People that support the university love to hear from you, because it reinforces their support. The Governor’s website has a search function to find representatives.   
  
He sent a resolution to ECOS requesting the Faculty Senate include advocacy to its mission. If ECOS does not bring it to the floor of the Senate, it may be circulated for senators to sign.

* Interim Provost Beverly Edmond  
  Deferred her time to the APASP discussion.
* UM Foundation Director Cindy Williams   
  Chair Bowman invited Director Williams because there seems to be confusion regarding the Foundation, fundraising, and how fundraising priorities are made.   
    
  Director Williams has been on campus for eleven years. She was asked in June to lead the Foundation by the Board of Trustees.   
    
  The Foundation’s mission is to increase philanthropic support and to ensure UM’s excellence affordability and access. It is a private, independent 501.C3, so our employees are not university employees. The Foundation works under an operating agreement that is reviewed and approved by the Board of Regents every two years. It defines the foundation’s responsibilities to the University and the University’s relationship to the foundation and how fundraising occurs at the University’s direction.   
    
  The Foundation is governed by a volunteer Board of Trustees. Its core functions are fundraising and, managing private funds and endowments ($180 million) for the University. Each fund is targeted to support specific things, such as scholarships, programs or endowed faculty positions. Last year the Foundation raised $70.6 million. The $84 million figure announced this summer included $14 million given directly to the university to support the medical residency program from the three regional hospitals. The foundation distributed $21 million to campus last fiscal year.

Fundraising is reported by the standards set by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education. This includes pledges, which donors may choose to pay over a 2-5 year period, and deferred commitments that will come to the University upon the donor’s death. Total cash received from donors last fiscal year was just over $30 million, but some of this was intended for endowment. The foundation makes annual payments to the university in perpetuity from the endowments. Some of the cash is intended to be spent over a short period of time, and is held at the Foundation until programs are ready to spend it.   
  
The Foundation is primarily a self- supporting organization. In the operating agreement there is a fee ($550,000) for service. The majority of operating funds is from fees assessed on gifts. Gifts that are not scholarships are assessed at 6%. Scholarship are not assessed a fee. The endowment is also assessed an annual fee.  
  
Slides showed the growth in fundraising and how priorities for fundraising are made. The major growth has been in gifts of $1 million or more. The university has many goals, only a small percentage will be funded through private support. As outlined in the operating agreement, the fundraising priorities are provided by the University President. Around 2013-14 then President Engstrom and Provost Brown convened a meeting with the Academic Deans and other campus leaders to discuss priorities for private support. Through 18 months of deliberation, they defined an objective for the foundation. The Foundation is still working on these priorities. It is the intersection of the donors interest and the University’s priorities where giving occurs. From time-to-time, a potential donor may have an interest in something that is not a priority. Recently an Alum expressed interest in funding a symposium focused on Native American education. In this type of situation, the foundation communicates the offer to the appropriate university program. In this case, Dean Comer and the Native American Studies Chair were receptive and the planning is underway.

Another diagram showed donor development. The foundation starts by identifying potential donors, and then engaging them to build a trust-based relationship. Then they work to identify their philanthropic passions and attempt to match these with the priorities of the institution. The Development Officer help potential donors become involved with programs and answer their questions so they can make a decision about contributing. The foundation also helps organize events around gifts to help people celebrate the joy of giving.   
  
The Foundation would like to know how it could communicate better with faculty. The Foundation would love to interact better with the faculty. The Foundation is working with ASUM to improve interaction with students. Braden is their liaison. Before the news is announced, the Foundation will meet with Braden to find out what students will want to know. The Foundation is working to customize communications in a way that meets students’ needs and would like to do the same with Faculty.

* Associate Dean Jenny McNulty - Community Giving Campaign  
  She thanked the Senate for having her and for those that have already participated in the campaign.   
  Last year the title of the campaign was Charitable Giving campaign. It was changed to emphasize that this is about our community. This is an opportunity for UM employees to give back to the community. All the agencies are local. The Committee is made up of faculty and staff and reports to the President’s Office. The Campaign has been successful in raising funds but does not have a large percentage of employees participate and participation is decreasing. The Committee hopes to increase participation. The campaign is through the month of November.   
    
  The fees are quite minimal because there is a Committee that does the work. There is a small fee for printing that is distributed among the agencies and there is a transaction fee for using a credit card that is typical.
* ASUM President Braden Fritzgerald and Vice President Brenna Love  
  ASUM recently passed two resolutions. The first is a resolution supporting UM Allies program. ASUM encourages all staff and faculty members to participate in the training and to create a safe and inclusive environment. The sentiment behind this is that we can always do better.   
    
  Students will be going to Helena on Tuesday to Lobby for decreased cuts to the MUS System and support for the Governor’s proposal. Faculty may receive a request from the ASUM President to excuse students from class. Both ASUM and the Montana Associated Students passed resolutions urging no cuts to higher education and urging revenue enhancements for the state. ASUM is also asking students to write to their legislators and write op-eds for their local newspapers.

ASUM has added a standing APASP public comment agenda item to all its meetings. Please direct students who are concerned to ASUM. Students can email to [asum.student@mso.umt.edu](mailto:asum.student@mso.umt.edu) to provide feedback on APASP. These comments will be taken into consideration. Faculty can help relay this message to students. ASUM appreciates faculty directing students to them. .

* UFA President Paul Haber  
  Time yielded to APASP discussion
* NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative Dusten Hollist and Associate Athletics Director Jean Gee - [Intercollegiate Athletics Report](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/Intercollegiate_Athletics_Report2016_2017.docx)   
  By mandate from the President’s Office, Intercollegiate Athletics is required to prepare a report and deliver it to the Faculty Senate. The report was information at last month’s meeting. The only update to the report is that the head softball Coach Position has now been filled. The purpose of the report is to give faculty a snapshot of the academic side of student athletes.

### Chair's Report

Chair Bowman provided the following a statement:

Faculty Senate is one branch of a shared governance system. We have a clear directive, and [Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/articles/default.php) that ensure a certain stability that allows our shared governance colleagues – and others – to know what they can expect from us.

That stability is especially important right now. We have so much happening on campus – a new president, provost search, budget concerns, and of course, APASP. Faculty Senate is involved in all of that – and more – in addition to our usual activities of supporting the academic welfare of the University of Montana.

Right now, APASP is front and center at UM – and it should be. It is a complicated process with broad implications, and it requires – and deserves -- our attention. APASP isn’t just one thing – yes, it is a critical look at our academic portfolio, but it also reflects potential losses for members of our community that cannot be quantified or even really understood, individualized as they are. I feel the pain and the fear from our community members.

I recognize the hard work of the APASP Task Force and the staff that have supported the process, and even more – I appreciate and honor their integrity as they engage in a process that cannot be perfect for many reasons, one of which is the reality that no human endeavor is ever perfect. As a community, we will critique that imperfect process. Some will disagree with categories, recommendations, and decisions. Some may feel threatened, insulted, hurt, angry, afraid. But all of us must stay involved and focused on this critical, transformative moment in UM’s history.

Some would say we have arrived at this place because of a lack of strategy, because of reactionary decision-making. I cannot say if that is true or not because I do not have all the facts -- but what I can say is that important decisions should be thoughtful; they should be responsive and not reactionary. And decisions that impact so many lives should be made in collaboration and consultation with broad representation from impacted groups.

The Faculty Senate’s role in any campus issue, including APASP and budget concerns, is not the same as ASUM or the Faculty Unions or Staff Senate or Administration. Shared Governance rightfully involves both some overlap of interests, and a healthy respect for the expertise and responsibilities of partner groups.

APASP is a way for the campus community to have input on important decisions that must be made. Accepting both the need for such a process and the reality that it was happening with or without us, ECOS has been active and engaged throughout this process. We have been critical, we have offered suggestions, we have asked questions, and always we have been mindful of our responsibility to represent the academic welfare of UM in collaboration with our shared governance colleagues and administration.

Today – in our meeting -- we need to give APASP the attention it deserves in our limited time together. My hope is that we can maintain civil discourse, appreciating and honoring diversity of thought and experience, and understanding that a different perspective doesn’t mean lack of anything – it simply means we see things in different ways.

The [Faculty Senate bylaws](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/articles/default.php) include the following.

Section 5.The Senate shall:

1. Debate, discuss, and make recommendations to the President and the Administration concerning all issues that pertain to the academic affairs of the University.
2. Review and recommend the general requirements for admission to The University of Montana-Missoula; recommend, in accordance with regulations of the Board of Regents of Higher Education, the general requirements for graduation, including total credits required, credits required in work outside the department or school of specialization, and such other provisions as shall affect the general education of graduates of the institution; and approve recommendations for specific curricular changes submitted by faculty in the various schools or departments through the Academic Standards and Curriculum Review Committee (ASCRC), Graduate Council, or other appropriate committee.
3. Establish rules and standards for candidates for degrees and for the assignment of honors. Approval of degree candidate lists is the exclusive prerogative of the faculty.
4. Approve and forward to the President the list of names of candidates to be awarded degrees in any given course of study.
5. Approve candidates nominated for honorary degrees.
6. Make all regulations for its own proceedings, consistent with the policies of the Board of Regents of Higher Education.
7. Make recommendations to the President and through him or her to the Board of Regents of Higher Education, regarding matters of critical concern to the welfare and administration of the University.
8. Through appropriate committees, as provided in the collective bargaining agreement in force, consult with the President in matters of policy affecting faculty appointment, tenure, promotion, salary, and termination of service.
9. Delegate authority as appropriate.

## Committee Reports

* ASCRC Chair Doug Coffin   
  + The [PLA Guidelines](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/203.20_PLA-Guidelines11-9-17.docx)  were approved. Students can initiate the request through admissions, their advisor, or department.
  + The [Library Support Resolution](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/LibrarySupportResolution_11-9-17.docx) was unanimously approved. The library is essential; programs depend on a functional library. The resolution asks for a specific budgeting process that treats the library like a utility.
  + ASCRC passed the [Resolution on Student Success](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/ASCRC-student-success-resolution.docx) to make these the theme of ASCRC’s efforts this year.   
      
    The Governor’s budget has $75 million in cuts to programs across the state. Most legislators seem to be honoring that number. Faculty should write requesting that they limit the cuts to the University System. You can call an 800 number at the capitol and leave a message for five Legislators at a time. Senator Coffin sent ECOS a resolution suggesting the Senate amend its bylaws to form a joint efficacy effort with the students and the union. This is not politics, it is civics, and it is bipartisan. We should try to protect our revenue stream.

## New Business

* Discussion of initial [APASP review results /](http://www.umt.edu/apasp/prioritization/default.php)[update from Taskforce](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/APASPupdate11-9-17.docx)  
    
  Chair Bowman asked the APAPS representatives (Professors DeBoer, Haber, Putnam, and Ware) to come to the front to address questions. They were thanked for their work. It is now time to deliberate on the process.  
    
  The reports, comments and scores will be available soon. The Data Office is working with the database to put this information in a format for campus to review. It is critical that the report authors have access to this information so they can provide meaningful feedback to their deans. If this time becomes too short, the Union will advocate extending the timeline.   
    
  Senator Chatterjee, PSCI: Most programs are in the middle. It seems the administration will possibly need to cut programs in the middle to bring the personnel in alignment with our funding. What are the next steps to give the administration specific recommendations given there is disagreement within APASP according to this morning’s Missoulian article?   
    
  The Taskforce hasn’t decided yet. There are differences of opinions among the members. These will be considered in spirited dialog. The Taskforce will focus efforts on the programs identified for substantial modification. The Taskforce is still grappling with how to make recommendations for the programs in the middle category (consider for development or modification). The people most qualified to make recommendations for modification are those in the academic units. The recommendations in the reports are available for the administration.   
    
  The author responses are due on November 29th. The Deans responses are due on the 15th and will be incorporated into the recommendations.   
    
  Senator Coffin, CPBS: If the President’s recommendations include eliminating programs, the Retrenchment process will be triggered in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Section 18.

The UFA sent the *Retrenchment in English* document to provide faculty with an overview of the complicated procedure. This document is not in reference to a process in the English Department, but rather explains the retrenchment process in plain language.   
  
Senator Coffin, CPBS, ASCRC Chair: We could expect that program modifications will be routed through the curriculum change process as well. The Curriculum Committees could consider having a spring deadline in anticipation of this.

It is important that students understand the University is still committed to students completing their programs. Even though there has been a compressed timeline and urgency from the Commissioner to complete APASP. It is not going to resolve structural problems quickly. STUDENTS WILL BE ABLE TO GRADUATE.

Interim Provost Edmond: The clear understanding and commitment of the administration is that the outcome decisions of APAPS will then be subject to every appropriate process (contractual, BOR and UM policies/procedures) associated for implementation. In some cases, a collaborative process will be added for implementation.

Senator Lurie, CHPBS: Faculty are getting mixed messages. Although APASP is reported not to solve the budget issue, cuts are needed immediately because of the budget situation.

Interim Provost Edmond: APASP’s structure was developed to rely on as much objective analysis as possible. From the beginning, the Taskforce questioned how the process aligned with the realities of the fiscal challenges. The APASP Framework notes that the Taskforce is sensitive to the fiscal challenges. The outcome will ultimately help the University address how to prioritize programs to address the fiscal challenge. Some of the recommendations to address fiscal challenges will take years to implement. APASP may also identify things the university can do more efficiently that could result in fiscal savings. President Stearns has implemented other strategies to address the fiscal challenges, such as the staff and contract professional Voluntary Severance Offer (VSO) and the Voluntary Employment Retirement Incentive Program (VERIP).

The administration hopes that APASP will help contribute to the solution of both the short and long term fiscal challenges, but it will not resolve the situation.

Senator Larson asked the Interim Provost to comment on her role in the APAPS process and her assessment of how it went.

Interim Provost Edmond: Her assessment of the process is that it is one of the best processes she personally has been associated with; and she has been involved with two others. This one is the best in terms of thoroughness of the process, challenges and resolution of challenges, and of the ability of Taskforce members to keep in mind the core values. Part of the Charge of APAPS is to take what is learned and incorporate it into the ongoing academic and administrative review process. OCHE and the Board of Regents are now asking every campus in the MUS system to report annually on progress towards prioritization. UM will have to report on how it is performing and using resources as aligned with prioritization.   
  
There will be post analysis in terms of lessons learned. Some of these have already been reported to the BOR Academic Research and Student Affairs (ARSA) Committee on October 26th. These included challenges navigating the data and the importance of stakeholder involvement. The commitment to transparency involved Taskforce members’ ability to participate in open forums. There were technology issues, but the Taskforce attempted to make information available for transparency. The process has had high energy driven by a core commitment to make this the very best process possible.

Senator Beck, NAS: We can’t tell students that they will get the degrees that was in the catalog when they arrived. The Native American Program lost a faculty, who taught a core course, to VERIP and the remaining faculty cannot teach the course.   
  
Interim Provost Edmonds: Curriculum is modified on a regular basis. The focus is on the learning outcomes the faculty have collectively agreed upon a graduate from their program should acquire. The courses designed to provide those learning outcomes may change, but the learning outcomes should be the focus. There are a number of ways students can master learning outcomes. There has to be some acknowledgement that some courses may not be available, but the agreed upon learning outcomes for the discipline should not diminish.

Senator Beck: But it has in our department. The department will need to change the learning outcomes for the program going forward based on the remaining faculty.

Interim Provost Edmond: We will need a discussion about this. She is not familiar with your discipline, but in her field, modifications are made for accreditation and other reasons, while still maintaining the integrity of the degree and essential student learning.   
  
Senator Uchimotto- Physics offered another example, in Physics, you cannot replace Electromagnetic Theory with Quantum Mechanics or vice versa. It is not possible to achieve the standard learning outcomes for a Physics degree if certain classes are not available.

Senator Coffin: The Taskforce has put a lot of work into the process. You could argue that it is too cumbersome to repeat very often. As we go forward and look at how we are going to do this in the future to meet the BOR mandate, he suggests streamlining, and perhaps triage for accredited programs that cannot change much without risking their accreditation.  
  
Senator Ware: In the spring, the Taskforce will talk about how the process might work in the future.

Senator Coffin suggests that the process be folded into existing faculty governance procedures on annual bases. ASCRC spends a lot of time with clerical changes such as title or course number changes. These could be handled by the Registrar’s Office, so the curriculum committees would have time for program review. The Registrar’s Office could provide a summary to the curriculum committees so that an item can be pulled for further discussion as necessary. Maybe the Senate should have this discussion in the spring.

Senator Manuel, Accounting: We also have regular assessment activities taking place. He would hate to see efforts duplicated.  
  
Interim Provost Edmond: Part of this will be alignment with discussions at the Commissioner’s Office and the Board of Regents on system-wide viability. There will be requirements to meet a certain standard for student completion. The campuses will be required to have plans of action in terms of addressing productivity issues.

The process did not meet all the scientific standards of reliability and validity. It is based on a review of qualitative and quantitative data. It included formulas and was designed to be as valid as possible given the individual subjective analysis of reviewers and report authors. In looking at how other campuses have navigated this process, she considers this one of the best. Some institutions simply look at quantitative data.

Senator Ware: There was not enough time to norm the reviewers to establish inter-rater reliability. The Taskforce had to spend additional time discussing where to place programs given the lack of reviewer reliability.

UFA President Haber: One of the debates still to come, is determining recommendations that are sound and defensible given the methodical limitations.

Professor Putnam: The Taskforce reviewed academic units first to try to give them as much time as possible. This same strategy will be used in terms of access to review details. The Taskforce intends to make the dean and author responses available as soon as possible. Hopefully the units will provide input to the deans for them to consider in their responses and the deans and sector heads will share their responses with their units.   
  
Senator Laurie: The compressed timeline is a concern. If it is going to be a deliberative process that will affect multiple aspects of campus, rushing the process calls into question the legitimacy of the process itself. This is not a reflection of the Taskforce members, but should be discussed at the administrative level.   
  
Senator Ware: This is a legitimate criticism. We know that the compressed timeline was a challenge. However, this is not something that should be included in the author responses, which are limited to 500 words. The responses should focus on the details of programs and what can be done.

Senator Gordon confirmed that the author responses are limited to 500 words, but are not limited to specific questions.

Senator Ware: The recommendations will have a preamble that will talk about the challenges with the process.   
  
Professor Putnam: The number in front of the program title in the listing is for tracking purposes only and was assigned according to database entry.

Interim Provost Edmond: It is not possible to extend the timeline. The challenges of the timeline have been acknowledged from the very beginning. The original timeline was pushed back because of faculty contracts. The timeline is driven by knowing we needed to do multiple things to address our fiscal situation. She has experienced trying to respond to multiple requests from deans and other unit heads for resources. The ability to provide any unit with the resources needed to do what they are doing is impossible because the budget is stretched too thin. If not for the funds given by OCHE, we would be in even more dire straits. We cannot sustain another round of across the board cuts, so the decision was made to complete prioritization before we head into planning for fiscal year 2019.

One person on the Taskforce and two other reviewers reviewed each program. Reviews were not changed after discussion. The Author responses will only be reviewed by the President’s Cabinet.

Professor Weix: What was unique about this review is the cost benefit analysis. ASCRC is always told not to consider money. She is curious whether this is a turning point. Will the Senate and Union from now evaluate programs and courses with a cost benefit analysis?

Professor Putnam has prepared several proposals for new programs and has had to explain the cost, so she does not agree that ASCRC or Graduate Council do not consider this.

Senator Coffin, ASCRC Chair: The curriculum committees are concerned about whether the units have appropriate resources to teach courses and sustain programs. As we integrate this into shared governance procedures, we should focus on academic excellence and not use program reviews to decide what programs to cut so we can make our budget.   
  
Professor DeBoer: During this process, we did not find a single program that was not academically viable. When we start streamlining, we need to consider what are the outcomes needed from the process. We were looking for fiscal viability, adequate return on investment and we have never really done this before in his experience.

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.