

**Faculty Assembly**  
**Thursday, February 4, 2010, 3:45 PM**  
**Allen Hall Auditorium.**

\* Motion from Senate generating this Assembly follows minutes

Total number present: 44

Scott Davis opened the Assembly: 3:50

Peter Keller: This is an ongoing conversation about what happens next. The assumption of Vice Chancellor Moran and the state may be that not all universities in system need all programs. We were asked to show cause to keep what appears to be our under enrolled programs. MU is half the size of the average state university. Average state system school has about 8000. We don't think that our #s should be the same as W Chester or IUP, for example. This issue has been going on for a decade or more. He had a talk with Moran last Friday about why we would need the same #s, he did not have a straight answer. Fellow provosts may feel that we need to have same #s if we are getting the same amount of monies.

In the final week of classes last semester, VC Moran said we had not gone far enough in putting low enrolled programs into moratorium. April is when they want the next response from us. The state is serious about this. Information will be shared with APC. Each dept. threatened has been invited to talk with Provost about what is going on. Provost, Deans and President are all working to keep these intended reviews/moratorium threats from happening.

A number of faculty have come forward with ideas and ways to solve the problems.

RT: there are ambiguities, this doesn't seem to be coming from the Board of Governors (BOG). Under enrolled programs threats are coming from somewhere else. The justification seems to be money, but the changes asked of us have no effect on savings. Closing programs is going to lose, not save, money.

PK: Moran frequently refers to BOG, though there is no direct conversation with BOV.

*Faculty comments and Provost Keller's now summarized –*

*Questions from Assembly:*

- Why does state care about individual degree programs?
- Has there been any discussion of the nature of the University and what happens to the character of the institution, as a university, when we have to close languages, etc.

PK: that summarizes his concerns. He is troubled by what VC is saying. He doesn't seem to have an understanding of our departments and programs. He was horrified by the specific directives coming

from Moran. His (Keller's) boss is the President, not the Vice Chancellor. President is asking Keller to not follow through with what Moran is asking. Focus is on # of students graduating. They (State) are in the business of micromanaging the system at this level right now. We have less independence than we did in the early years of the system. System has concerns if we can balance budgets in the next couple years. They seem to be micromanaging at other levels too, like HR. A new cadre of BOV and a budget crisis seems to be driving this.

We were told we had to close programs unless we can show cause. 1 or 2 grads a year does not meet states' expectation. Our sister institutions have similar programs on chopping block. There may be other creative options to explore - Lockhaven has some solutions that seem to interest Moran.

We scraped by this year, but we will have less and less state resources. We face a similar problem next year as this year. President (and other system presidents) will begin lobbying the BOG for a more reasonable tuition increase. (projected shortfall: see below)

RT: again, putting these programs into moratorium will not save any \$, quite the contrary. This will not help with student retention, students will go somewhere else. We will lose our reputation. This seems to be an attempt to demoralize faculty and get them to leave, thus retrenchment. This plan leads to lowering integrity of education across the system, leading to second rate institutions.

PK: our challenge is to work with depts. to manage our enrollment so we have average class size of 27. If we can get #s up to 27 or even 28, we can balance our budget.

*Suggestions, concerns and comments from faculty:*

- University has to market our programs. We undersell a BA in liberal studies.
- If we've had "chopping block" for 10 years, maybe administration is failing in its role to shape programs. No one comes into depts. to work with them.
- We have so many assets in this university and this area, our water, environmental science, geography, geology. Encourage focusing on opportunities.
- The vote for the recent motions was because of becoming demoralized. The administration's approach did not seem to involve participation with depts., or the faculty curricular process. Appeared that provost *informed* depts. rather than showed a sense of shared governance with faculty. Communication seemed to be simply delivering decisions. We were not included in decisions.
- We ultimately don't make the decision, but would like to be a part of conversation.
- APC was handed a sheet stating what was going to be closed; APC was not included, just told. It was done. It is suggested that we use creative and imaginative approaches, yet the way the message was delivered did not allow for that. This is a university and APC crisis issue.

PK: discussion was with departments, process is still very much ongoing.

- Experience does not match written statement. English & Modern Languages submitted 2 documents that did show cause. There was no discussion, no feedback on documents. They were just *told*, when they were *expecting* discussion. The position provost is in w/ Moran is just how the faculty feel.

- The same thing happened with the football program. There was never any discussion, no input, no courtesy to get some feedback. Marketing can get students.
- Nutrition was also on chopping block. Creativity is the best thing we can do to get out of hole.
- Important that we have shared governance. Some programs have more administrative support than others.

PK: accept that, yet there were many instances where there were and continue to be creative conversations. There was never intention to exclude faculty.

President retains the power to put programs into moratorium.

The state has the right to do this and set the standards. We are trying to work with programs.

Student #s and money allocation is complicated. Mike Reid understands and can show how finances work.

*Further faculty comments:*

- Moran wants us to be creative about the #, not the programs. This is not doing any service to the students.
- We should not lose languages when so much work has been done, the new flags, travel/study abroad, development where a lot of hard work has been done. APC seems to be approaching things creatively, using brainstorming, with tangible notions emerging – this is within the university governing system, and being done in an organized fashion. This is the potential we have, if we think outside the box.
- A good university attracts students to its uniqueness, not getting a homogenous degree. State is trying to steal away our uniqueness, our talents.

PK: welcomes these kinds of conversations. Wants to stay connected with APC, this is important work. Hopes GenEd review committee is finding a way to keep us unique. Our future lies in not looking like other institutions, but state is making this a problem. They are not in a patient mood because of budget crisis.

**ROTC:**

PK: ROTC came to the university (not the other way around), he referred them to AAC, should have referred them to APC too. His mistake.

*Faculty comments:*

- APC is looking at it. They are not acting on it, just discussing it. It will then go to next level. AAC and APC will look at models at other universities; there is possibility for variation.
- Concept is 'citizen soldier', rather than military soldier. It's a good program. Kids can come with full tuition, good, top students. This is not a negative. Its not about bayonettes.

JB (AAC): there are currently 10 students we have that go to Lockhaven because we don't have it. Most of the concerns were procedural. He will keep faculty informed

RT: union did discuss it, there will not be a major problem. New programs must be initiated by permanent TT track faculty member. Contract issue is ok with ROTC. We can decide how the credits are placed.

Assembly Adjourned: 5:15

**\* Motion 4**

Whereas the decisions in the past to make changes in curriculum, including additions, deletions and other changes have been done with appropriate information gathering and data sharing in the areas of cost, interest, university mission and strategic plan; and

Whereas the Provost has not provided such information in recent decisions made by him and Deans concerning recent changes; and

Whereas the Faculty Senate has requested that such information be made available to the Academic Planning Committee; and

Whereas the President has notified the Faculty Senate of her directive to the Provost to comply with such a request, which has not yet been done,

The Faculty Assembly respectfully requests that that Provost Keller and Deans Burke and Brown make available the information requested by Tuesday, January 19, 2010 to the Faculty Assembly and further that they make themselves available on Thursday, January 21st, 2010 at a meeting of the Faculty Assembly to present the requested information and answer questions that might arise.

Assembly minutes respectfully submitted,  
Christine Moulton, Senate Secretary