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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Term Expires 2010</th>
<th>Term Expires 2011</th>
<th>Term Expires 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAFES</strong></td>
<td>Kris Hiney</td>
<td>Laine Vignona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wes Chapin</td>
<td>Patricia Berg</td>
<td>Peter Johansson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl Peterson</td>
<td>John Heppen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Willis-Rivera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COEPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hilary Pollack</td>
<td>Michael Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Potts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th Division</strong></td>
<td>Kristie Feist</td>
<td>Valerie Malzacher</td>
<td>Jon Levendoski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kristen Hendrickson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Large</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Parks (Jr)</td>
<td>Dennis Cooper (Sr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Furniss (Sr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terry Brown*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chancellor’s Designee
** Absent
() Substitute

**Call to Order:** David Rainville called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm

**Seating of Substitutes:** Marshall Toman for Kathleen Hunzer, Nan Jordahl for Melissa Wilson.

**Recognition of Invited Guests:**

**Approval of Minutes:** Approval of Minutes of November 19, 2008: Approval of the minutes was moved by John Heppen and seconded by Marshall Toman. The motion passed by a vote of 22 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

**Chairs Report**
I am happy to report that we have made it to the end of another semester. I know for one that it has been one that is filled with lots of activity and accomplishment.

For the last few weeks the Search and Screen Committee charged with finding a new chancellor has been very busy. I know that most of you spent some time with the candidates at Faculty Senate luncheons and the open sessions with faculty and academic staff. All five candidates left UWRF with extremely favorable opinions and they all made it clear that they were very interested in serving as our next chancellor. The Search and Screen Committee met on Monday, December 8, 2008, to discuss the interviews and campus reactions prior to Jim Madsen giving his report to UWS President Kevin Reilly sometime today. The candidates will be interviewing in Madison both with UWS Administrators and Regents on December 17, 2008. The next chancellor is supposed to be announced on Tuesday, December 23, 2008 pending approval of the Board of Regents.

2.5% pay increase for each year of the next biennium recommended by the Board of Regents.

Finally, I will be attending a joint meeting of the UWS faculty representatives and academic staff representatives in Madison, Friday, December 12, 2008.

**Vice Chair’s Report:** none

**Other Reports:**

**Unfinished Business:**

**New Business Consent Agenda:**
Approval of Program Changes from AP&P (Cecelia Bustamante, Chair):

1. Physics Major - Secondary Education - emphasis/option change
2. Physics Major - Applied Option (Liberal Arts) - emphasis/option change
3. Physics Major - Option I (Liberal Arts) - emphasis/option change
4. Physics Major - Option II (Liberal Arts) - emphasis/option change
5. Land Use Planning Major and Minor - Substantial Major and Minor Content Change
6. International Studies Program - Major and Minor - Substantial Major and Minor Content Change

Approval of the consent agenda was moved by Sarah Parks and seconded by Peter Johansson. The motion passed by a vote of 22 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

**New Business:**
1. A motion from the Calendar Committee (Karl Peterson, Chair) to approve the following calendar for the 2011-2012 Academic Year:
UW-River Falls Calendar for 2011-2012

Fall 2011

Registration/advising/development: August 29 – Sep 2, M – F
Labor Day: September 5, Monday
Academic day (no classes): September 6, Tuesday
1st day of classes: September 7, Wednesday
Thanksgiving break: November 23 – 25, W – F
Last day of classes: December 16, Friday
Final exams: December 19 – 23, M – F
Graduation: December 18, Sunday
Final course grades due: Tuesday, January 3

1 week of registration/advising/development
14 weeks of class (14 M, T, W, Th, and F)
1 week of final exams

J-Term 2012

December 27 – January 21  Monday, December 26 is a University Holiday
Monday, January 2 is a University Holiday
Monday, January 6 is Martin Luther King, Jr. Day

Spring 2012

Registration/advising/development: January 17 - 20, T – F
1st day of classes: January 23, Monday
Spring break: March 10 – 16, Sat – F
Last day of classes: May 4, Friday
Final exams: May 7 – 11, M – F
Graduation: May 12, Saturday
Final course grades due: Friday, May 18

1 week of registration/advising/development
14 weeks of class (14 M, T, W, Th, and F)
1 week of final exams

Faculty contract period  August 22, 2011 to May 20, 2012 (39 weeks)

Summer 2012

SS1 May 21 – June 10 (include 1 Saturday)
SS2 June 11 – July 1
SS3 July 2 – July 22 (include 1 Saturday)
SS4 July 23 – Aug 12
A motion to approve this item was made by Peter Johansson and seconded by Terry Ferriss.

Discussion: Karl Peterson moved to amend the motion to correct Martin Luther King, Jr. Day as January 16, not January 6. The amendment was seconded by John Heppen. The amendment passed by a vote of 22 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

The motion as amended passed by a vote of 22 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

2. **First reading** of a motion from the **Athletic Committee** (Brian Huffman, Chair) to redefine the membership and charge of the Athletic Committee. Below is the proposed (Recommended) Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook description (which represents a change in the bylaws) and the current Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook description.

**Section F — Athletic Committee – Recommended**

1. Membership: Four faculty (with equal representation of women and men), the Student Senate Athletic Representative and one additional student from the Student Athletic Advisory Committee (with equal representation of women and men), the Athletic Director, the Senior Woman Athletic Administrator, The Chair of Health and Human Performance, the women’s and men’s Faculty Athletic Representatives (FAR), and the Assistant to the Chancellor for Equity, Compliance, and Affirmative Action.

2. Term of Office: Three years for faculty with one-third being appointed each year. Students should be appointed on an annual basis

3. Duties:

   a. to review and remain current on the policies prescribed by the NCAA and WIAC

   b. to review budgeted funds, statements, gate receipts, and expenditures of the Athletic Department

   c. to promote athletic programs

   d. to recommend policies for the improvement of the athletic programs and facilities of the University

   e. to recommend to the Faculty Senate candidates for appointment as Faculty Athletic Representatives (FARs)

   f. to identify and recommend mitigation of equity issues involving men’s and women’s athletics. This is to include…
i. the allocation of resources

ii. access to programs

iii. faculty/staff composition (with respect to diversity)

g. to review the current sports module

The Athletic Committee in its Nov. 12, 2008 meeting produced a motion to have the Faculty Senate change the section relating to this committee from:

Appendix I

Section F — Athletic Committee

FS 06-07 #46

1. Membership: Four faculty (with equal representation of women and men), the Student Senate Athletic Representative and one additional student from the Student Athletic Advisory Committee (with equal representation of women and men), the Athletic Director, the Senior Woman Athletic Administrator, The Chair of Health and Human Performance, the women’s and men’s Faculty Athletic Representatives (FAR), and the Assistant to the Chancellor for Equity, Compliance, and Affirmative Action.

2. Term of Office: Three years for faculty with one-third being appointed each year. Students should be appointed on an annual basis.

3. Duties:

   a. to review and remain current on the policies prescribed by the NCAA and WIAC

   b. to approve the final recommendations regarding how the money received from the Student Senate is budgeted

   c. to review budgeted funds, statements, gate receipts, and expenditures of the Athletic Department and to review and audit report

   d. to promote athletic programs and develop relations with other institutions

   e. to recommend policies for the improvement of the athletic programs and facilities of the University. Increase involvement in the areas of responsibility in athletic programs

   f. to recommend to the Faculty Senate candidates for appointment as Faculty Athletic Representatives (FARs)
g. to notify all head coaches and the Recreation Leadership Coordinator of forthcoming athletic committee meetings and agenda items

h. to review equity issues involving men’s and women’s athletics

Brian Huffman noted that some of the changes came about because the committee is tasked with approve budgets, etc, which they feel they do not have the authority to do. They removed items they have no authority over as well as items dealing with people on other campuses. They also strengthened the diversity statement. Wes Chapin informed Huffman that the committee can have authority to be involved with budgets if approved by the Chancellor and Faculty Senate.

3. A motion from AP&P (Ceclia Bustamante, Chair) to approve the Academic Program Self Study Tool. This tool is a guide to aid departments when submitting data and information about each program which will be used in the program prioritization as described in OP 2.1 of the Strategic Plan.

**Academic Program Self-Study Tool**

The Academic Program Self-Study Tool provides data and information for each of six criteria (not in priority order). The criteria are:

I. Consistency with University Mission, Vision and Values and UWRF’s Strategic Plan
II. External and Internal Demand
III. Quality – Program Inputs and Outcomes
IV. Productivity, Costs and Efficiency
V. Benchmarking with Peers
VI. Crucial Information Not Addressed by other Criteria

I. Consistency with University Mission, Vision and Values and UWRF’s Strategic Plan

Describe how the activities of the program are consistent with the University Mission, Vision and Values, and UWRF's Strategic Plan. (250 word limit)

1. List up to five core strengths that tie the program into the institution's Mission, Vision and Values, as well as the four operational goals of the strategic plan Operating Paradigm.

II. External and Internal Demand and Potential for Growth

Describe the current external and internal demand for the program, its courses, and its activities. (250 word limit)

1. Is there external demand for graduates of the program? Refer to employment projections based on state information from both Wisconsin and Minnesota provided by Institutional Research.
2. Describe and address internal demand for major courses and service courses (to other departments and general education). The following data needed to address internal demand will be provided by Institutional Research (3-year history):
   i. Number of majors/minors/graduate students in the program.
   ii. Internal and external transfers of majors.
iii. Contribution ratio: Give the number of SCH generated by a program for other programs and the total number of SCH generated by the department (e.g., other majors, other minors, general education, graduate programs, University requirements, secondary education) and the ratio of the two measures.

III. Quality – Program Inputs and Outcomes

Describe activities of the program that lead to high program quality and document how that quality is measured.

1. What steps has the program taken to develop innovative and forward-looking curricula? Give examples of course development by program faculty. (250 word limit)

2. Provide evidence of program teaching effectiveness (3 years of history):
   i. Results described in the program’s annual assessment report (Department to provide).
   ii. Teaching and Advising Awards (Department to provide)
   iii. Student evaluations of teaching (Survey Research Center to provide).

3. Provide evidence of an active and engaged faculty. Faculty professional and scholarly activity data for the past three years may include:
   i. Number of refereed publications
   ii. Number of non-refereed publications by faculty
   iii. Number of juried creative works and performances
   iv. Number of state, regional or national presentations
   v. Number of grants submitted – internal to UWRF and external
   vi. Number and amounts of grants received – internal to UWRF and external
   vii. Other professional, college, and university, or community service activities
   viii. Number of textbooks, reference books, novels, volumes of collected works authored by faculty or edited volumes by faculty
   ix. Number of externally funded contracts and grants received by faculty
   x. Number of professional conference papers and presentations by faculty
   xi. Number of active faculty memberships in professional associations and/or honor societies Number of faculty engaged in faculty development or curriculum development activity as part of their assigned workload
   xii. Average proportion of students over past three years passing licensing, certification, or accreditation examinations related to academic major
   xiii. Number of undergraduate/graduate students formally engaged in research activity with a faculty mentor
   xiv. Number of undergraduate/graduate students engaged in internships or practica under direct faculty supervision
   xv. Number of students who author or co-author with a faculty mentor, a journal article or book chapter
   xvi. Number of students presenting or co-presenting with a faculty mentor, a paper at a professional meeting
   xvii. Service to student organizations

IV. Productivity, Costs and Efficiency

1. The following data will be provided by Institutional Research:
   i. Total FTE
   ii. Total SCH
iii. Total Budget
iv. SCH/FTE
v. Budget/SCH
vi. Budget/SCH of major (undergraduate only)
vii. Budget/SCH of minor (undergraduate only)
viii. Budget/SCH serving other programs
ix. S&E/SCH
x. Actual Credits to Graduation/ Required Credits to Graduate
xi. Advisees per FTE

2. Space and facilities information provided by campus planning and Institutional Research
   i. Lists of space by type
   ii. Laboratory utilization
   iii. Classroom demand equivalent

V. Benchmarking with Peers

1. How does your program compare with peers in terms of cost and productivity? (250 word limit) Data will be provided by Institutional Research.

VI. Crucial Information Not Addressed by other Criteria

1. Auxiliary Services and any other related costs essential to the Academic Program (e.g., Group Decisions Lab, Lab Farms, GIS Lab, Greenhouse, etc.):
   i. S&E Budget
   ii. Personnel, including reassigned time

There may be special considerations that contribute to a program and have not been covered in the points above. This section provides an opportunity for programs to discuss such considerations. (500 word limit)

David Rainville passed the gavel to Vice Chair Kristen Hendrickson as he is a member of AP&P and wanted to speak to this motion.

A motion to approve this item was moved by Dennis Cooper and seconded by Michael Miller.

Discussion: Rainville said he sent out a memo as to the agenda of the Provost Meeting in Madison on Friday. Initially as he saw the agenda, it looked as though program prioritization was being paired with an item to cut low performance programs. The agenda has since been revised, and the two have been separated. Rainville said that many members of AP&P felt as though they were very pressed at the amount of time to get through these items, particularly the Self Study Tool, item number 6. There was a general belief that there was a need to revisit that particular section. A motion to reconsider this item was brought up at the meeting on Monday, however the Executive Committee had placed this motion on the Faculty Senate agenda.

A discussion of the weighting of each section took place.
One senator noted that the Self Study Tool seems nearly identical to program review as it currently exists on this campus. Another senator suggested that instead of approving this tool, the Senate could approve the current program audits to be used as the reference material, then augment that with new data coming from Institutional Research.

A senator stated the time faculty spend on redundant administrative tasks is becoming unreasonable and believed it is premature to prioritize programs given that revamping the national economy may lead to changes in employment projections. However, department’s program review are written for a different purpose than program prioritization. If a department is happy with their program audit, they can take information from it and use it on the Study Tool. However, some programs wrote audits years ago and have vastly changed since then.

Provost Terry Brown explained the difference between a program, department and major. What the university calls a program review, could be a review of a major, a program, or a department as a whole.

Another senator spoke in favor of the motion, saying that prioritization is important and it speaks to necessity to do a fresh review aimed at this specific purpose. He said perhaps programs could reference program audit in the Self Study Tool. He also said it is important that we move forward and not delay this process.

Wes Chapin moved to amend the motion that Number Six, item 1 (including points i and ii) be removed and put into Number Four and added to the list under item 1 as point xii. The motion to amend was seconded by Marshall Toman.

A recess of five minutes was called at 4:26 p.m. The meeting was called back to order at 4:31 p.m.

The amendment passed by a vote of 20 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Chapin moved again to amend the motion so that Number 3, item 3 includes “data will be collected on an FTE basis.” The motion was seconded by Patricia Berg. The amendment passed by a vote of 16 for, 0 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

A senator asked if program reviews include a section about how the program relates to the campus strategic plan. They do not.

Chancellor Connie Foster posed a question to the group. She noted that the study tool is not perfect, but is it good enough to take UWRF where we want to go? Foster described the history that went into formulating program prioritization, and said she believed that the data coming out soon will be very good. She also said that holding off on this plan of action would put a hold on faculty searches because it is not known to whom to give them. Capital planning and enrollment planning are also on hold because of this item. Foster also noted that nothing about this process is going to go behind closed doors, and that this is really about opportunity, what is unique to the university. She also reminded
the group that the university doesn’t want System telling us what to cut, but it should be an internal, shared decision.

A senator said he believes UWRF still prides itself on being a teaching institution, but there is an imbalance on the Self Study Tool that makes it look more focused on research and publishing. Johansson moved that under Number 2, item 4, there should be a recognition of faculty teaching load, including the number of preparations per semester and courses that they teach. The motion to amend was seconded by David Furniss.

Rainville called a recess at 4:56 p.m. and called the room back to order at 4:58 p.m.

The amendment passed by a vote of 19 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

It was asked if there an avenue in this process to put forth new programs. Chancellor Foster replied that the process will free up money to be able to launch new programs. Discussion of this could go in Number 6 of the Study Tool.

John Heppen moved to amend the motion to change in Number 3, “3 years” to “5 years.” The motion was seconded by Patricia Berg. The amendment passed by a vote of 19 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Chapin moved to postpone this motion until a special Faculty Senate meeting can occur not later than the second week of January, and was seconded by Patricia Berg.

Rainville passed the gavel to Hendrickson.

Rainville spoke in favor of the motion to postpone, and said that this item was rushed through AP&P.

Rainville took back the gavel from Hendrickson.

Doug Johnson said that AP&P did not have as much time as they would have liked, but it was discussed at three separate meetings, and it might not be perfect even with further discussion.

The motion to postpone failed by a vote of 5 for, 14 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Chapin moved to amend Number 3 and weight it so that the item 1 is at 25 points, 2 is at 50 points, and 3 is at 25 points, in order to emphasize the teaching aspect of this institution. The motion to amend was seconded by Jennifer Willis-Rivera.

The amendment failed by a vote of 8 for, 9 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Rainville called the question on the original motion. The motion passed by a vote of 18 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
The entire motion as amended appears below.

A motion from AP&P to approve the Academic Program Self Study Tool. This tool is a guide to aid departments when submitting data and information about each program which will be used in the program prioritization as described in OP 2.1 of the Strategic Plan.

**Academic Program Self-Study Tool**

The Academic Program Self-Study Tool provides data and information for each of six criteria (not in priority order). The criteria are:

VII. Consistency with University Mission, Vision and Values and UWRF’s Strategic Plan  
VIII. External and Internal Demand  
IX. Quality – Program Inputs and Outcomes  
X. Productivity, Costs and Efficiency  
XI. Benchmarking with Peers  
XII. Crucial Information Not Addressed by other Criteria

I. Consistency with University Mission, Vision and Values and UWRF’s Strategic Plan

Describe how the activities of the program are consistent with the University Mission, Vision and Values, and UWRF’s Strategic Plan. (250 word limit)

1. List up to five core strengths that tie the program into the institution’s [Mission, Vision and Values](#), as well as the four operational goals of the strategic plan [Operating Paradigm](#).

II. External and Internal Demand and Potential for Growth

Describe the current external and internal demand for the program, its courses, and its activities. (250 word limit)

1. Is there external demand for graduates of the program? Refer to employment projections based on state information from both Wisconsin and Minnesota provided by Institutional Research.
2. Describe and address internal demand for major courses and service courses (to other departments and general education). The following data needed to address internal demand will be provided by Institutional Research (3-year history):
   i. Number of majors/minors/graduate students in the program.
   ii. Internal and external transfers of majors.
   iii. Contribution ratio: Give the number of SCH generated by a program for other programs and the total number of SCH generated by the department (e.g., other majors, other minors, general education, graduate programs, University requirements, secondary education) and the ratio of the two measures.

III. Quality – Program Inputs and Outcomes

Describe activities of the program that lead to high program quality and document how that quality is measured.
1. What steps has the program taken to develop innovative and forward-looking curricula? Give examples of course development by program faculty. (250 word limit)

2. Provide evidence of program teaching effectiveness (3 years of history):
   i. Results described in the program’s annual assessment report (Department to provide).
   ii. Teaching and Advising Awards (Department to provide)
   iii. Student evaluations of teaching (Survey Research Center to provide).
   iv. Recognition of faculty teaching load – including number of preparations and courses taught

3. Provide evidence of an active and engaged faculty. Data will be collected on an FTE basis. Faculty professional and scholarly activity data for the past five years may include:
   i. Number of refereed publications
   ii. Number of non-refereed publications by faculty
   iii. Number of juried creative works and performances
   iv. Number of state, regional or national presentations
   v. Number of grants submitted – internal to UWRF and external
   vi. Number and amounts of grants received – internal to UWRF and external
   vii. Other professional, college, and university, or community service activities
   viii. Number of textbooks, reference books, novels, volumes of collected works authored by faculty or edited volumes by faculty
   ix. Number of externally funded contracts and grants received by faculty
   x. Number of professional conference papers and presentations by faculty
   xi. Number of active faculty memberships in professional associations and/or honor societies
   Number of faculty engaged in faculty development or curriculum development activity as part of their assigned workload
   xii. Average proportion of students over past three years passing licensing, certification, or accreditation examinations related to academic major
   xiii. Number of undergraduate/graduate students formally engaged in research activity with a faculty mentor
   xiv. Number of undergraduate/graduate students engaged in internships or practica under direct faculty supervision
   xv. Number of students who author or co-author with a faculty mentor, a journal article or book chapter
   xvi. Number of students presenting or co-presenting with a faculty mentor, a paper at a professional meeting
   xvii. Service to student organizations

IV. Productivity, Costs and Efficiency

1. The following data will be provided by Institutional Research:
   i. Total FTE
   ii. Total SCH
   iii. Total Budget
   iv. SCH/FTE
   v. Budget/SCH
   vi. Budget/SCH of major (undergraduate only)
   vii. Budget/SCH of minor (undergraduate only)
   viii. Budget/SCH serving other programs
   ix. S&E/SCH
   x. Actual Credits to Graduation/ Required Credits to Graduate
xi. Advisees per FTE
xii. Auxiliary Services and any other related costs essential to the Academic Program (e.g., Group Decisions Lab, Lab Farms, GIS Lab, Greenhouse, etc.):
  i. S&E Budget
  ii. Personnel, including reassigned time

2. Space and facilities information provided by campus planning and Institutional Research
  i. Lists of space by type
  ii. Laboratory utilization
  iii. Classroom demand equivalent

V. Benchmarking with Peers

1. How does your program compare with peers in terms of cost and productivity? (250 word limit) Data will be provided by Institutional Research.

VI. Crucial Information Not Addressed by other Criteria

There may be special considerations that contribute to a program and have not been covered in the points above. This section provides an opportunity for programs to discuss such considerations. (500 word limit)

4. A motion from AP&P (Ceclia Bustamante, Chair) to approve the Academic Program Ratings Document below. This document is to be used by reviewers who will rate programs in six areas. Each area will be rated on a scale of 0-5 with the appropriate weighting in each area. The total possible number of points for each area is indicated in the product column. The total possible score is 500. This score will be used to help prioritize programs as described in OP 2.1 of the Strategic Plan.

**ACADEMIC Program Ratings**

Reviewers will rate each program on each criterion and assign a rating score ranging from 1 to 5. Each score will then be multiplied by the associated weight for the criterion and these products are totaled. A program scoring 5 on every criterion would have a total score of 500.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Rating Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Mission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Demand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Prod/Cost/Effic.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Benchmarking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Other Info.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I: Consistency with University Mission, Vision and Values and UWRF’s Strategic Plan
A motion to approve this item was made by Terry Ferriss and seconded by Terry Brown.

It was asked how benchmarking with “peers” defined. Brown said that there are standard peer groups that the university uses for certain data sets: system schools, national schools, etc.

Michael Miller moved to postpone this item and was seconded by Terry Brown.

The motion to postpone failed by a vote of 3 for, 16 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

There was a discussion on possibly sending this item back to AP&P for revision.

Chapin noted that AP&P may not meet until next semester, and therefore Faculty Senate might not get this back for a long time. He moved to amend the motion so that each item is rated on a 1-5 scale, and was seconded by John Heppen.

John Heppen moved to amend the amendment to read “Each area will be rated either 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 with the appropriate weighting in each area.” The motion to amend was seconded by Glenn Potts. The motion to amend the amendment passed by a vote of 17 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. The original amendment to the motion passed by a vote of 17 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
The motion as amended passed by a vote of 16 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

The motion as amended appears below.

A motion from AP&P to approve the Academic Program Ratings Document below. This document is to be used by reviewers who will rate programs in six areas. Each area will be rated either 1,2,3,4 or 5 with the appropriate weighting in each area. The total possible number of points for each area is indicated in the product column. The total possible score is 500. This score will be used to help prioritize programs as described in OP 2.1 of the Strategic Plan.

**ACADEMIC Program Ratings**

Reviewers will rate each program on each criterion and assign a rating score ranging from 0 to 5. Each score will then be multiplied by the associated weight for the criterion and these products are totaled. A program scoring 5 on every criterion would have a total score of 500.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Rating Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Mission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Demand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Quality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Prod/Cost/Effic.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Benchmarking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Other Info.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score 500

I: Consistency with University Mission, Vision and Values and UWRF’s Strategic Plan

1 = Consistency is lower than most programs
3 = Consistency is typical of most programs
5 = Consistency is higher than most programs

II: External and Internal Demand

1 = Low Demand
3 = Average Demand
5 = High Demand

III: Quality – Program Inputs and Outcomes

1 = Weaker than most programs
3 = Typical of most programs
5 = Among the strongest programs

IV: Productivity, Cost and Efficiency

1 = Low Efficiency
3 = Average Efficiency
5 = High Efficiency

V: Benchmarking with Peers

1 = Consistently lower than peers
3 = Consistently typical of most peers
5 = Consistently higher than most peers
5. A **motion** from **AP&P** (Cecilia Bustamante, Chair) to approve the Proposed Process and Timeline for assessing Academic Programs and Units below. This process and timeline will be used in the program prioritization as described in OP 2.1 of the Strategic Plan.

**Proposed Process and Timeline for Assessing Academic Programs and Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2008</td>
<td>Deans Council forwards proposal for assessing academic programs to AP&amp;P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>AP&amp;P forwards proposal for assessing academic programs to Faculty Senate for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21-22, 2009</td>
<td>Training for Faculty &amp; Departments in Self Study process 1-3pm on Wednesday, January 21, 2009 and 9-11am on Thursday, January 22, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13, 2009</td>
<td>Departments forward self studies to Colleges for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early April 2009</td>
<td>Colleges forward self studies to Deans Council for rating. Academic programs will be placed in one of the following categories: 1. Enhance 2. Maintain 3. Maintain but monitor 4. Reduce 5. Eliminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late April 2009</td>
<td>Rating of academic programs forwarded to AP &amp; P for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early May</td>
<td>AP&amp;P forwards rating of academic programs to Faculty Senate for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4, 2009</td>
<td>Provost presents academic plan to Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A motion to approve this item was made by John Heppen and seconded by David Furniss.

One senator asked if there would be a college level review first. Brown said that there is an assumption that there is review at the college level. Faye Perkins noted the college level review would be not ranking so much as looking at needs and discussing as a group. Each college may want to do it differently.
Nan Jordahl moved to amend the dates of the training, as the second date is Friday the 23rd, not the 22nd. The motion to amend was seconded by Miller. The amendment passed by a vote of 15 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Brown noted that originally it was asked for Deans’ Council to be augmented with faculty, and she hopes that both AP&P and Faculty Senate would read the self studies so that everyone is informed.

Chapin moved to add a footnote in “Early May” to read “Faculty Senate senators will have a minimum of one week to review these documents.” The motion to amend was seconded by David Furniss, and passed by a vote of 15 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Original motion passed by a vote of 14 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

The entire motion as amended appears below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2008</td>
<td>Deans Council forwards proposal for assessing academic programs to AP&amp;P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>AP&amp;P forwards proposal for assessing academic programs to Faculty Senate for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21-22, 2009</td>
<td>Training for Faculty &amp; Departments in Self Study process 1-3pm on Wednesday, January 21, 2009 and 9-11am on Friday, January 23, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13, 2009</td>
<td>Departments forward self studies to Colleges for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early April 2009</td>
<td>Colleges forward self studies to Deans Council for rating. Academic programs will be placed in one of the following categories: 1. Enhance 2. Maintain 3. Maintain but monitor 4. Reduce 5. Eliminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late April 2009</td>
<td>Rating of academic programs forwarded to AP &amp; P for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early May</td>
<td>AP&amp;P forwards rating of academic programs to Faculty Senate for approval. Faculty Senate senators will have a minimum of one week to review these documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4, 2009</td>
<td>Provost presents academic plan to Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miscellaneous New Business** - none

Willis-Rivera moved to adjourn and was seconded by Furniss. There was no dissention.

**Adjournment at 6:28 p.m.**