BRADLEY University

Bradley University Senate
Special Meeting of the 2019-2020 Senate

3:10 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., January, 30, 2020
Michel 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

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 3:11

Motion: to approve the minutes of the December, 2019 Meeting of the Senate.
    First: Senator Banning.
Approved.

Remarks by President Gary Roberts:
    Search for new University President: The pool has been narrowed to a small handful of finalists who the Board will meet at their meeting next week in Chicago. The decision should be announced in February.

    Security: Over the break there were five armed robberies. It turned out that 2 individuals did them all using an air gun. They are in custody. Despite these incidents, Bradley is one of the safest campuses in any urban area.

    Financial Situation:
    - *Program prioritization* is only one piece of the larger picture that was discussed at the town halls last semester. There are new academic programs in partnerships with an on-line vendor (in Counseling and Nursing) with projections of long-term revenue potential, a revived program in speech therapy, and an online program in Computer Science, and growth in Interactive media. The focus for a healthy university future should be on growing revenue. In Student Affairs, Nathan Thomas is working to create a women's ice hockey team and e-sports -- extra-curriculars that appear to draw students.
    - *Cost cutting measures* discussed last Fall (eliminating the Graduate School office, and discussion of reducing to 4 rather than 5 colleges) are off the table.

- *Cost cutting measures that remain on the table* include:
  - changes to health insurance plans which shift expenses to employees
  - outsourcing "back office" functions
  - reassigning custodian tasks as some leave Bradley
  - increasing parking fees.
  - cancelling cell-phone stipends and club memberships that apparently some individuals in this university have
  - reducing administrator compensation packages
- General reflections on Program Prioritization included the following:
  - The process to design Program Prioritization started before the Administrators knew that there were fiscal problems. Originally it was meant to respond to the fact that the Administrators were assigning budgets based on arbitrary assumptions. The Board of Trustees wanted this to change.
  - There has been lots of involvement in the process: As soon as the Strategic Planning Committee finalized the strategic plan, they turned to Program Prioritization and were involved in creating the criteria, and Deans and Chairs have been involved in working things out so this was an open and transparent process.
  - The Provost made the final judgements and the President approves. The process is now in place, and it will allows the Administration to make decisions about how to allocate resources in the future.
  - He finds the specific recommendations to be solid, defensible, and modest and measured in light of the size of the deficit the Administration allowed to occur.
  - He sees these changes as part of the evolution of the institution.
- Next Steps: This information will be presented to the in the meeting scheduled for the week of February 3-7. There's a chance that BOT will say we should do more. He hopes they will accept this as a first effort.
- The people who are directly affected will have a distressed and dissenting perspective.

Motion: To allow non-Senators to speak without approval of the Senate and to limit each speaker to 2 minutes time; then, after all have been heard, individuals can speak again.
    First: Senator Banning; Second: Past Senate President Timm.
Approved.

Remarks by Senate President Fakheri:
    He provided a history for this issue. Provost Glassman did a similar study but it did not go far. This process was crafted by Provost Zakahi's along with the Strategic Planning Committee during weekly meetings. The process was intended originally to reallocate resources, but with an idea of helping struggling programs to grow, but with no idea of cutting.

    The process for developing and evaluating the Program Prioritization documents was reviewed.

These are administrative recommendations and the next step is that the Senate will need to approve program elimination. They will either go to SPC and then to Senate, or they can be brought to the floor by a Senator; the Provost is a Senator. Does not see these as a done deal. The Board will weigh in, but even after that Senate approval is required.

Remarks by Provost Walter Zakahi:

He noted that this meeting is informational only. He is not asking for any action from Senate right now. After the February Board meeting, he will bring matters to SPC and if it passes SPC it will come to the Senate.

- He will review the recommendations from the email of January 29.
- Suggested that this is part of a larger plan to put Bradley on a better path. Program prioritization is part of that, along with review of business processes being led by a consultant agency. New programs are being developed will produce 2000 new Bradley students by 2024. And cost cutting, etc.
- Comments that a process like this will always feel rushed and that he does not think that if the cuts or mergers were different it would change the issues fundamentally. Challenges to higher ed: Number of prospective students is decreasing, increasing discounts, online grad programs are in demand.
- Reads from email.
  - University will work to find funds for top quintile….
  - Eliminations of physics degree, theatre degree, retail merchandising degrees;
  - Mergers reviewed.
  - Remaining programs in fifth quintile and fourth quintile are unlikely to receive new resources.

Observations:
1. Data are not perfect
2. He attempted to be measured.
3. Strategic Planning Committee showed integrity throughout.
4. Deans have been passionate in their defenses.
5. Factors in choosing some for elimination included
   a. The number of students
   b. Faculty status
   c. Avoided targeting one sector too much

- Asked faculty not to criticize the decision by suggesting that they should not be "internecine" – asks that no one denigrate one program to defend another; not impugn SPC; hopes that people see that he is attempting to assure the future of the University.

What follows are comments and questions from representative faculty (denoted by a bullet point: •) and answers from the Provost (denoted by the letter: A). One statement from Gary Roberts is noted below as well.

- This process shows lack of understanding of what concentrations are. They are treated as programs, but they use no extra resources. They are packaging for marketing purposes. Eliminating them may quell student interest.

- When a department's or unit's offerings are parsed out, a program may look weak, even though it draws no resources. For instance, the FCS major has no faculty assigned. How can data be used toward these conclusions without reviewing other perspectives?

- Regarding the elimination of Physics for lack of majors -- from an academic perspective, Physics encompasses the foundations of many other programs with Quantum, Mechanics, etc. Eliminating the major eliminates the upper division classes that allow the faculty to hone their abilities and gives credibility to the program. The academic impact may not be able to be measured in dollars and cents. Please consider.

- What disciplines are essential to a respectable University regardless of the numbers?

A: Can't answer that right now. Nature of higher ed is changing. Physics needs to be taught, but we don't need a major.

- Question raised about the validity of metrics. Sometimes the data does not measure what we are trying to measure. Given Bradley's emphasis on teaching excellence, it is important to weight teaching effectiveness at 30%; however, the main question asked regarding teaching is not about teaching effectives, but about a "teaching improvement plan" involving attendance at CTEL forums among other measures. This is not a valid metric. The real measure should be tied to NESSI data. So how are we assessing the assessment instruments.

A: While he can't remember what goes into each measure, he thinks that all the measures are good.

- Next month there will be a motion to activate the University Assembly, which is referenced on page 12-13, article 3, in the Handbook. The Assembly is charged with reviewing the actions of the Senate. They can approve, disapprove, modify, or return actions with a quorum.

- With respect for the work of the USPC, data collection methods are nonetheless flawed and not inclusive of faculty will. For instance, faculty said strongly that we did not want Grey's demand factor to be the main point. A process like this must always be run twice to test validity of instruments and to evaluate the metrics and to re-assess whether this is the best way to measure what we are trying to measure.

- Question about Process. The USPC analyzed stuff but the recommendations are only from the Provost. USPC should review the recommendations, and that faculty/Senate input should precede report to BOT.

A: BOT meeting is only informational.

- How will the recommendations be voted and will they be final?

A: Each program deletion will be voted one item at a time; all programs in the bottom quintile will not get new investment and as people will leave they will not be replaced.

- But if Senate votes against, then you will not go ahead and recommend this to the Board.

A: The Provost will not go forward with elimination if the Senate votes against deletions. But the BOT still gets to decide.

- Why are remedies offered to some programs (mergers) but not to others?

A: Considerations included the number of students, how many faculty were tenured or not, and available outlets for faculty to be moved within the University.

- So there's not a way to make corrections and win a reprieve?

A: Feels he has been clear about the need for change in all the programs impacted.

- 1. To what extent do you take into consideration the University's identity, charter and values and mission and its role as the only University in this city?
  2. Now that we've been ranked and quintiled, what plans are in place build collegiality and not be stigmatized.

A:
  1. He is trying to assure that Bradley has a long future in support of Peoria, and so he won't take a purist approach to what should be the future of the institution.
  2. Concerns about stigmatizing – this is challenge of trying to be transparent. But he has no current plan to help with minimizing stigma.

- Those programs in quintile 4 and 5 will have our resources taken for quintile 1. Is it fair to call it being left to die on the vine? What hope is there for quintile 4 and 5 to reach quintile 1?

A: He has worked within this kind of situation before when resources were taken. It can be done. One of the challenges is that demand is weighted at 30%, as he insisted. Some programs do not have that kind of demand. But if demand is not one of the most important factors, the University won't continue. But he found ways to reallocate internally and to move forward with programs that he personally led in the past.

- 1. Understands the idea of feeding programs that are growing, but we won't save much money. The biggest costs will be still be there. 2. Also, 17-year-olds want to see things on the menu so cuts (like cutting Physics) need thought. 3. Smaller programs with less opportunities to recruit seem to be on the block.

- 1. This is a data driven process…so what is the date on how much will be saved? 2. PLS doubled majors from 50 to 100; this success, and others like it, are not in the data.

A: 1. The proposed cuts will save 1 million by the end of the process; but some of the savings are realized in terms of faculty lines and space. 2. Grey's demand data was drawn from a 6 state market and focused on a) interest in degrees in an area (measured by clicks for a program within an area) + number graduating + number enrolled in that area and b) competitive intensity (how many offer that degree in the market); and c). job outcomes (placement in jobs that "match" the program, but also grad school applications).

- Is this data a single snapshot, rather than analysis of change over time?

A: It's a quarterly process [Grey reports on data once a quarter].

- Was there a look at constants of demand?

A: No it does look at demand shifts over time – 2-3 years.

- What is the definition of "impact?"

A: 30% of "impact" score is demand (bringing more students to Bradley, but 15% of the score is based on financial return, and other pieces included unit quality, and centrality to mission.

- Can you explain in the weights about the issue that contact hours were removed.

A: There was one place where this couldn't be counted, and in many cases write-ins made the data more usable.

- What happens to pre-tenure faculty in cut programs whose packets are awaiting tenure decisions.

A: not sure, but most likely not go forward with tenuring those individuals.

- Please repeat.

A: If we are eliminating the program we most likely will "not go forward with tenure".

- So faculty who have met all demands for tenure will be denied and their careers will be injured.

A: Not going forward with tenure is not the same as denying tenure. They will be allowed to continue in the "teach-out" process. If they seek positions elsewhere, he'll support them by clarifying that they were not denied tenure in the traditional sense.

- How can removing or eliminating programs lower quintiles that make money help the current situation?

A: One or two in the upper quintile are not revenue positive. Many of those lower quintile programs are revenue positive because of SCH not because of students they bring in. Must make use of "opportunity cost." He wants to invest in the programs that bring students to campus.

- What evidence do we have that show the validity of Gray's quantification of demand? And how many other schools are making decisions and similar adjustments off this same data set?

A: Other schools are using this same data. His look at Grey's methodology makes sense to him.

- The data is a matter of concern. Measuring departments by clicks means that unfamiliar programs are disadvantaged. But the measure of competitive intensity is especially problematic because it means that if we have a program that has no competition (example: buggy whips), we'll score well but no students will come. In addition, we will lose internal transfers who will move to other schools when they learn that their "first choice" is not their final choice.

A: Understands that some students find programs when they get here, but we have to have programs for clicking on. But take a look at the data for identified programs.

- Gray is a black box – we were not able to vet or look at how these would be measured. But job outcomes appear to be measured by simply does the job ad say X. The only measure that seems valid are how many are enrolled now, and how many are going to grad school. Grow the successful, but don't starve the programs that are not because they may be struggling due to being already starved.

- Did Grey provide any measures of external validity?

A. Yes and he will provide it and share it out.

- When a department has a small major and a small staff, they can't grow. Such departments need help not elimination. (Physics was particular focus).

- When students click law school or tech writing, programs at Bradley (like English, PLS, PHL) serve them well, but Grey doesn't see that click because it doesn't map onto an exactly same-name program. Furthermore, Grey can't distinguish between concentrations. A rethinking of the scorecards is needed.

- Simpson's paradox needs to be considered here. This states that when you are trying to disaggregate data to make comparisons, the disaggregated data can produce wildly

different results than the aggregated data. Aggregating can move programs from the bottom to the top.

- An Alum now on faculty spoke to her own path to being a very employable graduate due to her experiences at Bradley in programs like Engilsh and Theatre.

- Negative revenue term does not make sense? Perhaps Profit Margin should be used?

A: They use Positive Revenue. And numbers are after overhead.

- Is there a way other than elimination, such as enhancing efficiency?

- Athletics needs to be on the table. Loses 4-8 million $ a year. We don't know. Sports need to be on the table.

- What kind of coding method was used in the narratives?

A: There was no interrater reliability analysis. Raters discussed, they did a dry run for agreement of a separation of no more than 1. If there was a larger than 1 split, there was a process of discussion rather than an additional round of reading, or worries that the method might be flawed.

- Tenure question…what if we don't have a plan after the due date for tenure decisions.

    A: Holding onto tenure packets and not making a decision is his plan.

- There's so much faculty expertise for the very kinds of analysis that are being done. But we're rebuffed. Use us.

- Marketing capstone is taking Bradley as a project. And the BU admin is using them.

- There are 169 programs listed on the data – Biology is 18 of them.

A: The term is "program prioritization". There may be inactive programs, but they tried to weed them.

- Reward the people who have been successful in their tenure bid. Does the University save that much money by withholding tenure from those who've earned it?

A: No response at this time.

- LAS has just received the biggest gift ever for the sciences at Bradley. Physics was part of what earned the gift.

A: Aware of the gift but recommendation didn't change.

- Contact hours are left out of the analysis. 2016-2018 theatre is the highest. 8843 – In 2018 alone, 12800 for Theatre were left out. And this is deeply important.

A: Contact hours were included. He can show this. It occurs in 2 places.

- Was accreditation included?

A: Accreditation was a yes or a no. If you didn't have this you

- Impact for non-theatre students included. A great deal is lost when theatre goes away. Collaborations and contributions go away. Was diversity and inclusion put in as a driver.

A: Depending on how you slice it, no.

Gary Roberts, speaking as President: Thinks we're done. Feels bad for Walter. Asks folks for a dose of reality. WZ is the biggest defender of faculty and values of the institution before the BOT; he is devoted to playing within the rules for governance. Process is entirely within the rules of the game. Doesn't want there to be a war between faculty and trustees. Trustees see deficits, and they want a plan to make us better. Walter has proposed changes that will eventually produce 1 million in savings a year. We should breathe a sigh of relief. Says he is sympathetic, but warns that if the faculty does not approve this or something like them the Trustees will not go for it. If we say that we're delaying because the methodology was bad etc. This could end up in a really ugly battle, but the Board will win. We need to keep this perspective. He has heard that there is a desire to go back and start over. We have to make changes. If we don't do these, what will we do? Data may be imperfect, but demand has to be relevant. Not sufficient to do nothing. The status quo will not do it. Thanks to the committee, they've done tons. Is all perfect, no.

- When and in what form will the BOT response come back to the University?

A: In February at 2 open forums to be held before the next Senate meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 pm