I. Motion to be Considered:

Based upon the financial emergency condition of the university, approve the attached program review processes and timelines for academic and nonacademic programs.

II. Background:

The Board acknowledged a state of financial emergency on June 12, 2002 and reaffirmed the state of financial emergency on June 27, 2003. The Board's declaration of financial emergency was based on the following facts:

1. We have lost over $8 million in base budget appropriations since FY2001;
2. We have received additional one-time withholdings of over $9.75 million during FY02, FY03, and FY04;
3. We have increased expenses by over $1.5 million annually due to inflation for items such as increased cost of health insurance and utilities over the last three years; and
4. The current projections indicate that Missouri may face a budget shortfall of $800 million to $900 million in FY05, so we cannot expect the appropriation picture for higher education to improve in the foreseeable near future.

As a result, the Board requested the university to review all academic and nonacademic programs, review the faculty profile, and review all curricula within University Studies and the academic majors.

The academic program review plan (attachment 1) and timeline (attachment 2) have been reviewed by the Faculty Senate, deans, chairpersons, and executives, and were distributed by the president to all faculty. Implementation of the academic plan is an open process that seeks the advice and counsel of administrators and a Faculty Advisory Committee.

The nonacademic plan (attachment 3) and timeline (attachment 4) were presented to staff at the two staff convocations. The proposed reductions or eliminations will be presented at open forums.
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ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Phase I—Immediate Academic Program Review in Response to Continuing Financial Emergency

On the academic side, due to the continuing financial emergency, the University must immediately identify academic programs that can be reduced or eliminated with the least loss of student majors and the least damage to significant institutional initiatives. In Phase I of implementing the Board’s directive, the University will identify a small number of undergraduate programs to be reduced or eliminated based on the following criteria:

PRIMARY CRITERIA
- Size, scope, and productivity of the program
- Revenue and other resources generated by the program
- Costs and other expenses associated with the program
- Impact, justification, and overall essentiality to the Southeast mission

OTHER CRITERIA
- External demand for the program
- Internal demand for the program
- Quality of program inputs and processes
- Quality of program outputs

During the Phase I review only those academic programs that are in the lowest quartile in terms of the average number of majors over the past three years (those with less than approximately 27 majors) will be reviewed. In this review process the Provost and President will include the deans, the chairpersons, and the Faculty Senate regarding the review process and recommendations about specific programs. In addition to seeking the advice and counsel of these groups, the President asked that a Faculty Advisory Committee be formed to review the process and to provide additional advice and counsel. The Faculty Senate will provide three nominees from each of the colleges and the School of Polytechnic Studies. The President will select the committee members from among these nominees. After completion of the program review process, the Provost will recommend to the President reductions or eliminations.

The Phase I program review will take place on the following timetable:
- By September 10, the Faculty Senate will nominate three faculty members per college for possible service on the Faculty Advisory Committee. The President will appoint the committee by September 22.
- Between September 11 and 17, the deans will receive data for verification and programs (lowest quartile) will be selected to be evaluated.
- On September 19, the Board of Regents will approve the program review process and the list of academic programs proposed for evaluation during Phase I.
- On September 22, historical data will be provided to the departments identified for program review. The departmental responses will be due on October 23. Also on September 22, the President will request the Early Retirement Committee and the Faculty Senate Compensation Committee to review possible severance pay and early retirement options with a report due November 5.
- Between October 23 and November 5, the Provost and President will review the departmental responses. Also, the Faculty Advisory Committee will review the data and departmental responses, and will make its report to the Provost and President by November 5.
- The Provost will provide final recommendations to the President who will present his recommendations to the Board of Regents at their November 14 meeting.
- Notification of program reduction or elimination will be provided to the affected departments, and the Provost and President will discuss options with the affected faculty immediately after the Regents take final action.

Two other aspects of academic program evaluation will be taking place at the same time as the academic program review process.
The Provost will be discussing with the Faculty Senate a change in the ratio of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty positions at the University, and the Board of Regents will consider a recommended goal at its September 19 meeting. The deans and chairs will present a plan for achieving the approved goal to the Provost on September 29.

After discussion with the appropriate bodies, the Provost, deans, and chairpersons will establish new targets for class frequency, class size, and number of course options for Summer and Fall 2004 and begin a review of ways to reach those targets. The review results will be given to the Provost on December 1 to meet the deadline for publishing Summer and Fall 2004 class schedules.

**Phase II – Prioritization of Programs & Services According to Refined University Mission**

After completion of Phase I, the University will fully address the Board of Regents’ directive to review all programs to become more efficient in the delivery of curricula and more aligned with a more focused institutional mission. The University will begin Phase II by conducting a streamlined strategic planning process focused on refining the mission of the University and through subsequent review of all academic and non-academic programs in light of the refined mission. In Phase II the following steps will occur:

- The University will refine its mission statement, making it more focused and identifying specific programmatic directions for the next 3-5 years.
- The Provost and President in consultation with the deans, the chairpersons, and academic departments will implement a complete and thorough review of all academic programs. Using the evaluative criteria cited above with input from academic departments, the University will review programs/curricula to meet the Board’s intent of streamlining curricula and achieving more efficient management of those curricula. As in Phase I, the Provost and President will consult with the Faculty Advisory Committee for advice and counsel and for verification that the review process proceeded as prescribed.
- After completing the review of programs/curricula, the Provost will recommend to the President those that are to be revised, reduced, eliminated, or enhanced in order to permit more effective and efficient delivery of curricula in light of the refined mission.

**Phase III – Continued Review of Programs**

In Phase III, an ongoing process beginning in the Spring of 2006, all programs will continue to be on a schedule of annual review based on key performance indicators, alignment of programs with the specific directions in the refined mission, and the evaluative criteria used in Phases I and II. The annual review process will incorporate new regional or institutional needs as they emerge over the strategic plan period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROGRAM REVIEW—PHASE I</th>
<th>FACULTY TENURE/NON-TENURE TRACK PROFILE</th>
<th>CURRICULAR REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 12</td>
<td>Administrative Council Retreat – discuss and refine program review process</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Studies Council initiates review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deans begin review of faculty profile including term appointments and vacant positions</td>
<td>Deans begin review of majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate – Provost discusses the tenure track / non-tenure track profile and possible policy limit</td>
<td>Faculty Senate – Provost discusses class frequency, class size, and number of course options issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3</td>
<td>Faculty Senate – President and Provost discuss financial condition and draft program review process</td>
<td>Faculty Senate – Provost discusses recommended policy limit for tenure track / non-tenure track positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 4</td>
<td>Faculty Convocation – President and Provost discuss draft program review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 4-10</td>
<td>Faculty Senate makes nominations to President to serve on faculty advisory committee (3 per college)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 10</td>
<td>Faculty Senate – President and Provost present final plans for program review process</td>
<td>Faculty Senate – Provost discusses recommended policy limit for tenure track / non-tenure track positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11-17</td>
<td>Deans receive data for verification and finalization of the programs to be evaluated in Phase I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deans, chairs begin development of process to be used to reach profile policy limit</td>
<td>Provost, deans, chairpersons establish targets for class frequency, class size, and number of course options for Summer and Fall 2004 and begin review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19</td>
<td>Board of Regents will approve program review process and list of programs to be evaluated during Phase I</td>
<td>Board of Regents receives recommendation for overall faculty profile policy limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22</td>
<td>Data are provided to departments responsible for programs identified for review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22</td>
<td>President appoints faculty advisory committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22</td>
<td>President requests Early Retirement Committee and Faculty Senate Compensation Committee to review possible early retirement and severance pay options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deans, chairs provide Provost with recommended plan to be used over 3- or 4-year period to reach profile policy limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 23</td>
<td>Departments being evaluated submit written responses with the data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 23-Nov. 5</td>
<td>Faculty advisory committee reviews data and departmental responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5</td>
<td>Faculty advisory committee makes its report to the President and Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5</td>
<td>Early Retirement Committee and Faculty Senate Compensation Committee make their report to the President and Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14</td>
<td>Final recommendations determined and presented to Board of Regents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review results to Provost so that Summer and Fall 2004 class schedule deadlines can be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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