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**1: Project Goal**

A: The purpose of this project is to review and revise key sections of the Faculty Handbook pertaining to academic program review, tenure and promotion, program elimination procedures in times of financial emergency and otherwise, and faculty roles and rewards. The review is to be undertaken cooperatively with Faculty Senate and involve a special subcommittee of Academic Council -- the Provost's chief advisory council with membership including deans and faculty representatives of the college councils. This review responds to a Board of Regents directive emerging from a spring 2010 strategic planning retreat focused on the impact of the ongoing budget crisis in Missouri on the University and is to be conducted so as to reinforce recommendations of a just concluded action project on communication. This project should result in a unified and collegial procedures for academic program review and promotion and tenure.

**2: Reasons For Project**

A: As the University developed its strategic approach to impending State budget cuts, it became apparent that procedures for review of programs, including program elimination and program additions, required clarification and streamlining, so as to allow the University to respond more effectively to budget shortfalls while preserving its commitment to the role of faculty in governance processes. The revision of these procedures is essential for enacting the strategies set out by the Board of Regents retreat to meet the challenge of impending budget cuts.

**3: Organizational Areas Affected**

A: This project will contribute directly to the ability of the University to maintain its competitive advantage and emerge from the State budget crisis an even stronger and more responsive institution, better able to serve its students and the region. Academic colleges and departments will be most affected by this action project.

**4: Key Organizational Process(es)**

A: As indicated above, the key organizational process to be improved by this project are those pertaining to academic program review and tenure and promotion.

**5: Project Time Frame Rationale**

A: Since this project has been launched in response to a budget crisis that is expected to continue for at least two to three years and requires a quick, though strategic response from the University, the project is planned for one year.

**6: Project Success Monitoring**

A: Progress reports from the Action Team assigned to this project will be submitted regularly to the Provost, Academic Council, Administrative Council, and the Executive Staff.

**7: Project Outcome Measures**
# Project Update

## 1: Project Accomplishments and Status

The committee was formed in August 2010, and the project was completed and approved by the Board of Regents at the end of the Fall 2010 semester. The committee met weekly for discussion of drafts, and the co-chairs met with Faculty Senate, Deans Council, the President, the Provost, and the Board of Regents several times during Fall 2010 to present drafts and garner feedback. Major achievements included revision of each of the Faculty Handbook sections listed in the project. Results were the Faculty Senate approval of the policy changes, which were presented as bills for vote; approval of the bills by President Dobbins; and approval of the bills by the Board of Regents. A secondary achievement was clarification of “policy” and “procedure” for these and future changes to the Faculty Handbook.

## 2: Institution Involvement

For committee membership, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee nominated individuals for the Senate and Academic Council positions and the President selected from those names. The remainder of the committee was appointed by the President. The committee consisted of Associate Provost Janzow; committee co-chairs Scott and Swartwout; Academic Council members Lily, McMillian, and Ruediger; Faculty Senate members Althaus, Pacquin, Dickson, and Ward; and Chairperson’s Forum representative Hill. The importance and urgency of the project for the good of the faculty and University kept the project in the spotlight and the committee members, motivated. Also, the drafts of each of the three Handbook sections were presented to the Faculty Senate, Deans Council, the President, the Provost, and the Board of Regents for feedback, and the drafts were presented to each department’s faculty by their respective Faculty Senators.

## 3: Next Steps

This Action Project was completed as designed; however, the Faculty Senate is also reviewing other sections of the Handbook for updating as needed.

## 4: Resulting Effective Practices

Involving committee members from key faculty groups was essential to the success of this Action Project and is evidence of the University’s ongoing commitment to shared governance. Even with the magnitude of changing policy and procedures for retrenchment, program review, and program discontinuation, the revisions were expediently prepared and were vetted through all constituencies for feedback. Another effective practice that was developed was the clarification of “policy” and “procedure” for these and future changes to the Faculty Handbook. Policy statements were separated from procedural structures. Policy statements must be approved by the Board of Regents; however, procedures for following that policy may be changed by the Faculty Senate and the President as the need for such change may arise.

## 5: Project Challenges

A concern is that continuing the Handbook revisions without a specific and diverse committee to lead it may be a slower process. However, the Faculty Senate chairperson has indicated that the Senate is meeting the challenge and moving ahead expeditiously with revisions.
1: Project Accomplishments and Status

A: This action project was well defined and implemented. It was in response to a Board of Regents requirement, was carried out in a way that included faculty and administration in appropriate roles, and was concluded with a document that is future oriented. (AQIP Categories Four, Five, and Eight)

2: Institution Involvement

A: The inclusion of faculty throughout the project shows commitment to both the faculty (AQIP Category Four: Valuing People) and the process (AQIP Category Six: Supporting Institutional Operations). The fact that the president ultimately chose all the members of the committee appears to indicate the importance of the project to the institution (AQIP Category Five: Leading and Communicating).

3: Next Steps

A: Action Project has been completed, however continual improvement continues through review by the Faculty Senate.

4: Resulting Effective Practices

A: Inclusion of all constituencies for feedback is a good example of commitment to those constituencies by administration (AQIP Category Five: Leading and Communicating). Clearly defining policy and procedure differences will allow the institution to effectively and efficiently make appropriate changes in the future (AQIP Category Eight: Planning Continuous Improvement).

5: Project Challenges

A: Although the project is complete, there remain challenges with the ongoing work connected with any continuous quality process. It appears that the Faculty Senate has a plan for further improvements and revisions that may only need a step added to assess the effectiveness of that particular process.

Project Outcome

1: Reason for completion

A: The selected portions of the Handbook are updated and have been approved by the appropriate governing bodies. The project is finished.

2: Success Factors

A: The combined efforts of the AQIP Project committee, the Faculty Senate, and University administration made the process smooth and equitable. In the end, we have a document that we have all agreed upon as satisfactory and final.

3: Unsuccessful Factors

A: None.