

Faculty Senate Minutes
02/09/04 Meeting

Senators present: Barry Anton, Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley (Chair), Terry Cooney, Alyce DeMarais, Julian Edgoose, Robin Foster, Darrel Frost, Suzanne Holland, Bill Haltom, Paul Loeb, Keith Maxwell, Sarah Parker, David Tinsley.

Visitors: Suzanne Barnett, Bill Barry, Marie DeBenedictis, DeWayne Derryberry, Bob Matthews, Tyler Roush, Brad Tomhave, Christine Stephan, Ron Stone, Ron Thomas, George Tomlin.

At 4:05 PM, Senate Chair Beardsley called the meeting to order.

Chair Beardsley extended an apology to Senator Haltom regarding the minutes of the December 1, 2003 meeting. Said minutes had been submitted in a timely manner on December 2, 2003 and were not missing as previously thought. The minutes for both the December 1, 2003 meeting and the January 26, 2004 meetings were approved without correction.

Chair Beardsley then welcomed President Thomas and thanked both President Thomas and the Board of Trustees, for their respect to the institution and the faculty in their consultation with the senate regarding the Occupational Therapy (OT) program. Chair Beardsley cautioned those in attendance that discretion was called for regarding the contents of today's open meeting as we were discussing a delicate matter whose outcome was not yet set. Senator Haltom raised a point of inquiry as to whether the *Trail* reporter in attendance would publish his report of the proceedings prior to the Friday, February 13 Board meeting. Reporter Roush replied that the story could be published on Friday, February 13. President Thomas respectfully requested that the *Trail* story be postponed until Friday, February 20, but left the decision to the judgement of the reporter.

Chair Beardsley distributed copies of a document approved by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees on January 26, 2004 entitled "University of Puget Sound Board of Trustees Statement on the Evaluation of Graduate Programs" (Appendix A) hereafter referred to as the "Trustee Statement". President Thomas then distributed a chart entitled "Benchmarks for the Enrollment of New Graduate Students - Occupational Therapy". He noted that the key number was the target number of 67 applicants for 2004-05. To date, 53 applicants have moved through Phase II (submitted supporting materials) while an additional 8 applicants have completed an application (Phase I), but have not yet submitted supporting materials. Assuming the formula used to derive the expected yield of enrolling students holds, President Thomas projected that 55-58 students would be admitted and 22-24 would enroll for the Fall 2004 semester. These numbers include projections of applicants moving from Phase I to Phase II and receipt of additional applications. Previously, the benchmark for enrollment was 26. This number has been revised to 23 due to program alterations. President Thomas reminded the Senate of the April 2003 charge of the Trustees to the President, reiterated October 2003, that the President consult with the Faculty Senate and return to the Trustees in February 2004 with a recommendation to discontinue the OT program if the program failed to meet the target of 67 applications.

President Thomas then presented a prepared statement to the Senate. The statement is included as Appendix B. President Thomas concluded his presentation by asking for questions and comments. Senator Loeb asked if President Thomas felt the Board would be amenable to his recommendations to continue the OT program through September 2004. President Thomas responded that if he could not offer a recommendation, he would present his proposal as advice. President Thomas then reiterated that discretion regarding the contents of today's meeting was called for particularly since we do not want to place the Board or the President in a difficult position regarding the Board's decision, we do not want to "chill" the conversion of applications to enrollment as we want applicants to make their decision based on the merits of the program, and livelihoods are at stake so we must handle information responsibly.

Senator Loeb raised a question regarding the use of the phrase "independent graduate programs" in the Trustee Statement. President Thomas responded that graduate programs, as compared to undergraduate departments and programs, are considered "free-standing", with independent recruitment, admissions, and faculty that often teach only in their given program. Senator Cooney extended the discussion by drawing a distinction between undergraduate departments where faculty can be more flexible in their teaching assignments in response to fluctuations in enrollment. Undergraduate programs do not offer their own degrees, as do graduate programs, thus highlighting another difference in the flexibility of the two systems. Although President Thomas did not wish to speak to the intention of the Trustee language, he opined that use of the term "independent" may be a way of protecting undergraduate departments from a direct transfer of the principles outlined in the statement. Senator Haltom noted that the Trustee Statement phrase "...an independent graduate program can simply become too small to support an appropriate faculty, provide a rich student climate, and meet expectations of excellence in graduate training" appears to be hypothetical to this point. Senator Cooney responded that, for OT, a minimum number of 15 students is required for maintenance of the program. He noted that fewer students could be accommodated with a smaller faculty; however, a smaller faculty would raise curricular issues, making it difficult to administer the program.

Senator Haltom then turned to page two of the Trustee Statement and highlighted the statement: "Each graduate program as a distinct entity must, like the undergraduate program as a whole, be able to meet its cost of operation." Senator Haltom was not persuaded that OT and Physical Therapy (PT) needed to be considered as distinct entities. President Thomas reiterated that he cannot speak to the intention of the Trustees but commented that OT and PT operate independently in the following areas: each offers a different degree, each has a unique application and admission process, each has different faculty, and each program is accredited separately. Senator Loeb encouraged President Thomas, when offering his valued advice to the Trustees, to emphasize the interdependency of OT and other programs at Puget Sound, including undergraduate programs. Senator Cooney added that a report on the financial and admission numbers for PT would be presented to the Trustees.

Senator Maxwell asked whether tuition structure was different for graduate programs given that they are independent programs. Senator Cooney responded that, historically, the university maintains a framework where clinical courses are administered under a different tuition scale. Senator Maxwell then asked if the tuition was sufficiently high that the university was pricing the

program out of the market. Visitor Tomlin responded that our OT program faces two pools of competitors: 1) state-run programs in the region, and 2) premier private programs around the country. Our program is competitive with the premier private programs but we must be mindful of the state programs in the region. Tomlin noted that it is difficult to quantify what difference tuition would have made to those who chose to enroll elsewhere. In a recent survey, current OT students stated that a 10 - 15% increase in tuition (proposed when 1.5 units were added to the degree requirements) would not have adversely affected their decision to enroll. Tomlin cautioned that this survey was administered at a time of applicant surplus. Tomlin also noted that applicants are making enrollment decisions based on potential employment after the degree. The job market affects the level of debt a student is willing to assume. Senator Edgoose noted that discount rates differ between graduate programs and undergraduate programs, and Senator Cooney noted that graduate students pay per unit rather than by a flat rate for full time status.

Chair Beardsley asked whether President Thomas was confident that the benchmark of 23 enrolled OT students (revised down from 26) was a sustainable number. President Thomas answered that the lowered number was due to a reduction in the number of faculty and Senator Cooney confirmed that the program is viable at its current size. President Thomas noted that any increase in enrollment would generate increased revenue that could be used to add faculty as necessary.

Senator Haltom stated he was persuaded by the claim that graduate programs differed from undergraduate programs and he introduced an apt analogy for the “independent programs” argument set out on page one of the Trustee Statement likening faculty assignments as a “hydraulic factor” where undergraduate faculty in particular could “slosh” around as necessary in response to variable enrollments in certain programs. He noted that OT faculty were more “viscous” and were somewhat more limited in their teaching assignments. While Senator Haltom was convinced by the “viscosity” argument in distinguishing graduate programs from undergraduate programs, he suggested that we cannot then claim a “demand-based” argument as outlined on page two of the Trustee Statement (“...absence of sufficient enrollments to sustain a strong program suggests a lack of demand for the education being offered.”). Senator Cooney responded that enrollment in undergraduate programs is not equivalent with the number of majors in a given program. He provided Foreign Languages as an example where the enrollment of non-majors in language courses exceeds the number of majors in those courses. Therefore, it is difficult to compare undergraduate and graduate programs in terms of specific enrollments and numbers of majors. President Thomas reiterated that the comparison was between graduate programs and the undergraduate program as a whole.

Senator Loeb expressed his gratitude to President Thomas for bringing his recommendations to the Board. Tomlin echoed Loeb’s sentiments, thanking President Thomas for keeping the Senate informed and thoughtfully addressing a delicate situation. Tomlin reminded those in attendance that the last undergraduate OT class graduated only last year and that the OT faculty has been flexible in their response to programmatic changes. Tomlin also stated that OT faculty have always participated in teaching in the undergraduate core and continue to do so. In addition, OT faculty contributes to PT teaching and vice versa. Tomlin cannot imagine a program where faculty have nowhere to teach and stated that there are flexible and creative ways to assign

faculty teaching load. Tomlin reminded us that external factors were “squeezing” the OT program over the past three years and, continuing the hydraulic theme, stated that it has been extremely challenging to get the program through the “narrow part of the river channel” yet he believes we have done so. Tomlin noted that Fall 2004 represents the 60th anniversary of the OT program at Puget Sound and he believes it would be a shame to terminate the program now when it shows promise of good value.

At this point (5:00 PM) President Thomas and Senator Cooney excused themselves from the meeting and the Senate turned to the issue of Connections course listings. Chair Beardsley referred the senators to the memo distributed via email on February 3, 2004 (Appendix C) and invited the author, Suzanne Barnett, to address the Senate. Barnett reviewed her concern that all courses in the Connections core were to be labeled “Connections” rather than designated by their department of origin. She was troubled that the Connections label would obscure those interdisciplinary programs that inspired the rubric. Chair Beardsley asked Barnett if she thought the argument applied to Connections courses originating in specific departments, such as History and Philosophy. Barnett replied that she did not see how some Connections courses would fit into a given department’s degree requirements. Chair Beardsley noted that for such courses the Connections label was an attractive alternative. Senator Foster noted that it is difficult to determine how to label courses designed by faculty from more than one department.

Senator Loeb inquired about the role of the Senate in this issue and Chair Beardsley replied that since the Curriculum Committee (CC) is a Senate standing committee the Senate can review CC decisions. Senator Loeb then asked about our course of action and Barnett suggested returning the issue to the CC for further deliberation. Senator Maxwell interjected that the course catalog description provides more information and meaning than the course label. Barnett replied that transcripts list course labels only and suggested that courses could be listed by label and title and include a referral to the bulletin for a course description.

Visitor Bill Barry noted that a CC subcommittee recommended using department labels for Connections courses and the CC returned the issue to the subcommittee stating that the interdisciplinary nature of Connections courses needs to be made clear by the label. He predicted that the CC may suggest keeping the Connections label for all courses except those from clearly interdisciplinary programs. Senator Holland objected to the Connections label, stating that it is not meaningful to anyone unfamiliar with the Connections core rubric. Senator Haltom was encouraged by Barry’s comments, stating that some courses, such as those that are not accepted as part of a given department’s degree requirements, required a label such as “Connections”; however, those courses accepted as a degree requirement by a department or program could retain the department/program label. Barry noted that Connections courses by description are interdisciplinary. Senator Tinsley stated that the position of the CC is logical - contributors to interdisciplinary programs, such as Humanities, come from a variety of departments/disciplines. He noted that what seems to be bothering the Senate is the “Connections” label itself and a better, more descriptive term for a label could be provided. Senator Holland asked why contributing disciplines could not be co-listed as a label. Visitor Matthews noted that some courses, such as SCXT 350, represent two or more disciplines yet do not neatly fit into any given discipline.

Senator Anton then *M/S* to return the Connections label issue to the CC for continued discussion. Barry asked what the recommendation to the CC would be and Senator Holland responded that the CC consider the merits of listing Connections courses, when possible, under departmental labels. Senator Maxwell reminded the Senate that the CC considered this designation and rejected it. Barry noted that the Senate could make the decision on labeling. Chair Beardsley asked Barry if his prediction that the CC may suggest keeping the Connections label for all courses except those from clearly interdisciplinary programs was viable, and Barry thought it was. Senator Holland reiterated that contributing departments could be designated in the label but Senator Loeb thought this type of designation would be cumbersome. Senator Anton asked if an asterisk could be used after the label to indicate interdisciplinary courses. Visitor Tomhave indicated that a symbol (although not an asterisk, which is already in use) could be used after the course label referring to a notation in the transcript legend. Senator Loeb then offered a *friendly amendment* to the motion to keep the interdisciplinary program labels for Connections courses from those programs but list other Connections courses by discipline, if possible, or as “Connections”. Senator Anton did not accept the amendment as a friendly one as he does not like the Connections label and wishes to send the issue back to the CC. Senators Tinsley and Edgoose agreed that Connections should be renamed. Senator Anton provided the rationale that beyond Puget Sound, no one knows what the Connections core represents. Chair Beardsley reminded the Senate that we could rename Connections. Senator Foster suggested a clarification in the CC Derryberry motion to parallel labeling in similar courses. Barry noted that the CC created a Connections Advisory Board to review potential Connections courses. Beardsley pointed out that this was in response to a faculty concern to distribute responsibility for Connections course designation and approval beyond the CC. Barry reminded the Senate that the CC was in the throes of implementing the new core and may not be able to attend to course labeling issues in a timely manner. Senator Frost noted that the combination of label and course title could reflect both the content and the interdisciplinary nature of the course. Barnett responded that the title may not necessarily indicate the discipline(s) of origin and reiterated that courses originating from interdisciplinary programs would be obscured by the Connections label.

Senator Anton then *M/S/P* to postpone discussion of the initial motion and Chair Beardsley adjourned the meeting at 5:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Alyce DeMarais
Scribe o' the Day

Appendices
Faculty Senate Minutes
February 9, 2004 Meeting

Appendix A

University of Puget Sound
Board of Trustees Statement on the Evaluation of Graduate Programs
(Approved by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, January 26, 2004)

In response to a request from the Faculty Senate about the rationale for the evaluation undertaken over the last three years of the Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy programs, the Board of Trustees offers the following statement of its responsibilities for assessing academic programs.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Puget Sound accepts and affirms its responsibility for maintaining clarity about the University's mission, for emphasizing academic excellence and program quality, for insisting on sound financial practices and budgetary integrity, and for making judgments about the good of the institution as a whole. When questions arise about existing Puget Sound programs, the Board will seek, as appropriate, full information from internal and external sources; it will develop, as needed, a framework for remedy consistent with its evaluation; and it will apply, as necessary, judgments on mission, quality, fiscal health, and institutional benefit in reaching program decisions.

Although Puget Sound's mission is directed primarily toward undergraduate liberal arts education, the Board has affirmed that graduate programs of high quality, associated historically with the University, and integrated on the campus with the academic goals and the faculty structures of the college, are consistent with institutional mission. The Board has expressed its respect for the educational role of Puget Sound's graduate programs and welcomed their community contributions.

Graduate programs at Puget Sound enroll students who most often study exclusively with graduate faculty and in graduate courses. The operations of graduate departments and schools, in turn, are directed primarily toward those students committed to a specific program, mounted entirely within the school. In these characteristics, graduate programs are distinct from departments, schools, and programs in the undergraduate liberal arts college in which students are shared, departmental faculty contribute substantially to core requirements and interdisciplinary programs, and students choose or change majors as they wish. Undergraduate programs, therefore, must be considered in terms that appreciate the program's contribution to this wider context.

Program quality for independent graduate programs involves questions of curricular and structural strength, demonstrated capacity to attract a strong student body, positive program results, and solid prospects for sustainable excellence. Much more clearly than for entities in the undergraduate college, where there are various interdependencies among departments and programs, an independent graduate program can simply become too small to support an

appropriate faculty, provide a rich student climate, and meet expectations of excellence in graduate training. The ability to maintain a faculty of satisfactory size, with an appropriate distribution of expertise; to offer necessary courses with sophistication and thoroughness; to have a sufficient body of students, which sustain or improve in quality over time as measured both coming into the program and in terms of certification statistics, employment data, and professional success and reputation—these are factors that demonstrate ongoing quality in a graduate program. The evaluation of all factors affecting program quality should lead to a positive conclusion on the prospects for sustainable excellence.

Each graduate program as a distinct entity must, like the undergraduate program as a whole, be able to meet its costs of operation. The primary source of revenue at Puget Sound is student tuition, and enrollments in each graduate program must provide an appropriate budgetary basis for maintaining operations at a level consistent with high academic quality. Graduate programs with consistently strong enrollments suggest that the University is meeting a community need by providing opportunities for interested students to obtain appropriate graduate training; the absence of sufficient enrollments to sustain a strong program suggests a lack of demand for the education being offered. Continuing under-enrollments in a graduate program drain resources from the larger academic program and may compromise the core mission of the institution. When enrollment challenges occur that call into question whether adequate revenue exists to sustain a program, the Board of Trustees will assess the program as suggested above and, failing remedy, will make an ultimate decision about continuation of the program.

The Board must keep judgments about the best interests of the institution as a whole in the forefront of any decision-making process. A limited number of graduate programs, meeting clear demands for access to advanced degree training and sustaining a high quality curriculum through their own graduate tuition, add benefit to the University and to the community. The University's interests lie with the academic excellence and good fiscal health of all its components.

Appendix B

President Thomas' Statement:

Consultation with Faculty Senate on the Occupational Therapy Program February 9, 2004

I have come to meet the Faculty Senate and to consult with you on the condition of the Occupational Therapy Program in light of the agreement established between the board and the program in 2001 to attain certain enrollment and application standards no later than January of 2004. This is my second visit with you on the subject, and I come this time at the behest of the Board of Trustees and in accordance with the provisions of the Faculty Code, which calls for such a meeting with the Senate when there is the possibility of the discontinuation of a program. This is a matter of great seriousness for us as a faculty, for me as a president, and for the trustees in their fiduciary responsibility for the university. It is, of course, an especially critical concern for our colleagues involved in the affected program and for the members of our community who enjoy the benefits of the program.

First, I come to you with a statement from the Executive Committee of the Board, which I asked to be circulated to you last Monday. That statement comes as a response to the request made by this Senate in my December meeting for a statement explaining the rationale behind the scrutiny which the OT and PT programs have undergone over the last three years. The statement provided by the board offers just such a rationale for when and how graduate programs come under this kind of evaluation. The statement's primary provisions state that, in light of the central mission of the university to provide an outstanding undergraduate liberal arts education, the select graduate programs we include in our offerings should be self-supporting, and they should not drain resources from the central educational mission of the institution. Second, those programs should also be able to maintain a number of enrollments sufficient to sustain an academic program that is consistent with the high standards we expect from a Puget Sound degree-granting program.

Moving to my second point: I come to you with a report on the applications currently in hand in OT. I will add, by the way, that the applications for PT are nearly double what they were last year, and have comfortably exceeded the target. This program seems to be thriving and to be in very good condition going forward. OT figures have also improved significantly this year, but not as dramatically as PT. At this time we have complete applications for 44 MOT/MSOT candidates plus 8 post-professional program candidates, for a total of 52 complete applications. We also have 8 additional partial applications for both OT programs (which do not include full supporting materials). This is a total of 60 applications in all stages of completion. Past patterns show between 79% and 92% yield of phase I applications to phase II. While it is an increase of more than 40% over last year, it would leave us about 12 short of the stated benchmark of 67 applications called for by the board. The normal acceptance and conversion rates would project, at this time, an enrollment of about 21-22 new students for next fall, perhaps as many as 25, depending on whether additional applications come in and are completed, after the January 15 post-mark deadline. While these numbers would produce between a 33%-50% improvement over last year, they would likely fall short of the stated enrollment target goal of 26. This significant improvement in performance is the product of our special efforts in admission, our enhancement of web presence and presentation, our production of new admission materials, and additional staff to work on recruitment for the program. Perhaps the most impressive accomplishment is a network and system of recruitment developed by the OT program faculty and staff in cooperation with the administration.

Whether this performance reflects a permanent turn-around and potential for growth is difficult to predict. The OT program is convinced that the high demand for the occupation, evidenced by the many vacant positions in Pierce County alone, and the predicted high demand for it will continue to fuel interest in the program, together with adjustments made to graduate programs with the closing of undergraduate programs and the development of recruitment systems like ours.

Third, I wish to report to you that in order to offer the most accurate financial context for the program in its assessment, we have carefully been reviewing the financial accounting for the program with the assistance of the VP and the AVP of Finance and Administration. We have

been able to find reductions in costs that would lower the “break-even” enrollment benchmark to 23 students. When I report to the Board, I will present this new information as part of their consideration. At regular levels of conversion of applications, the number we are likely to reach by the end of the spring could yield a number very close to the break-even point.

Fourth, I wish to report to you that I have met last month with the entire OT faculty (on January 9) with the Dean present, to learn more about the program from the faculty and to discuss the assessment of the current circumstances. I assured the OT faculty that I would present a full picture to the Board and emphasized how important it was to hit our targets, given the clarity of the Board’s instructions to the president last April, reiterated this October. I have consulted with the director of the program in the interim and worked with him to produce a statement to be presented to the Board expressing the views of the department on the prospects of success for the program.

As you know, the Board was quite clear in its instructions to the president last April, prior to my arrival, prior to my becoming president, instructions that were reported to the full faculty at a faculty meeting last April. Those instructions were, if by the January 15 postmarked deadline there were not 67 applications in hand, the president should consult with the Faculty Senate and return a recommendation to the board to discontinue the program. In accordance with that instruction, I have spoken once with you in December and am now consulting with you once more.

My plan in formulating a recommendation after consulting with you is as follows:

- (1) Last week, I reported to the Executive Committee of the Board, providing trustees with a summary history of the circumstances of this decision, a performance record for OT over the past three years, and a set of questions that contextualize the decision they will make. Those questions included:

How did we arrive at 67 as the target for Occupational Therapy applications in 2004?

Have any of the bases for this calculation changed since the benchmark projections and the application target were created?

How many students would be required as new enrollees in the fall of 2004 for the OT program to meet its costs for 2004-2005?

How many students would be needed on an ongoing basis for the OT program to meet its costs on a regular basis?

How many applicants would be required to produce enrollment in Occupational Therapy sufficient to meet 2004-2005 costs or sufficient to meet the target for sustaining the program over time?

Since the number of applications has risen substantially for 2004 enrollment, can we know if this performance is the result of one particularly energetic year of recruitment that may not be able to be repeated?

Have any external circumstances changed that affect the outlook for OT going forward?

What are the estimated costs of closing the program in the first year? In subsequent years?

What are our obligations to and plans for tenured faculty from the program?

In light of these considerations, how much of the costs of the OT program will be reduced from the annual budget in the event of discontinuation?

- (2) At the Board meeting, I will offer a measured estimate of the costs, direct and indirect, financial and in other terms, of discontinuing the program, an assessment of the context, and a plan for funding costs and lost revenues should the decision to discontinue proceed.
- (3) Finally, I will ask the trustees to turn their minds from the numbers and toward the principle behind their own clear objective. I will remind them that the benchmarks were a means to an end, not an end in themselves, and that the end was to strengthen these programs in terms of applications and enrollments and to enable them to move toward self-sufficiency.
- (4) Finally, I will suggest that the OT program's marked improvement in applications this year, and the prospect of a near-break-even enrollment for next year, warrants them the opportunity to enroll a class in September, the only time we can know for certain what the enrollment picture really is. I will ask to have the opportunity to manage through that scenario, with the clear understanding that without a clear enrollment at or about at 23, the program will not have met its goal and would be discontinued.
- (5) Part of that recommendation will be, with the faculty's cooperation, exploring the possibility of co-locating the thriving PT program with the OT program in a new building along with the Exercise Science Program and, perhaps, the Psychology department, all of which need new and appropriate facilities. The building, and the synergies between these programs could create another point of excellence for us in the emerging area of health and human sciences, to go with our schools of business and leadership, our school of education, and our school of music as distinctions in a liberal arts college setting.

Finally, I want to address the Faculty Senate on a matter that I know is of high interest to you and to all of us: the university's plan for faculty associated with the OT program in the event that it should be discontinued. As I have stated to you in the past, we will be guided by the Faculty Code, which calls for the administration to make every reasonable effort to seek, in consultation with the faculty affected, appropriate assignments within the university for tenured faculty and for others. The code also calls for informing the faculty one year in advance of the contemplated

closing of a program. We will abide by that. Should the board move to discontinue this program, we would enable all currently enrolled students to complete their degree requirements, and keep the program fully running for 2004-05. In the case of OT faculty, all have PhDs or credentials in another field in which we offer degrees, and provide some obvious areas to explore should reassignment become necessary. I will ask the Dean to speak further on this eventuality and our approach to it should there be questions on the matter.

I will add only what I have stated to you in the past: my last wish is to see under my watch the end of a quality academic program that offers a positive service to the community. Within the provisions of an agreement made three years prior to my coming to the university, I have made every effort this year to see that this eventuality does not take place. My first meeting with any academic department on campus was with the director of the OT program George Tomlin, to find out what I could do to help and to reinforce the point that the key to success was successfully reaching the targets. I worked closely with the Dean and with the VP of Enrollment to maintain maximum support of the recruitment effort. I have worked closely with the VP of Finance and Administration to refine the numbers, review the accounting, reduce the costs of the program, and make sure the best case could be put forward for the program's continuation if it proved viable in attracting students. We had already created new recruitment material, involved OIS in the recruitment effort, and provided additional staff support for recruitment. I met with and addressed a symposium the OT program sponsored on campus in December and encouraged an article on a graduate of the program for this winter's ARCHES. I invited the director of the program to put together a statement for the trustees, which I will distribute to them, to make the best case for the program. Throughout and from the beginning, my message has been candid and consistent: let us all concentrate on fulfilling the agreement by meeting the targets. I am now prepared to recommend to the Board continuation of the program until September, which will commit us to at least two years of OT, and if we are successful, many more. My recommendation also involves a fuller integration of this program with others in the university and the establishment of a signature strength in health and human sciences. I hope these efforts will be successful in the final accounting; if they are not we will proceed carefully and responsibly.

At last, I hope that together we can put this effort—whatever its outcome—in the context of the greater good for the university. Our collective efforts to advance the University are critical to our future, and I trust we can work together effectively to be successful through whatever obstacles we face.

Appendix C

I write to request consideration by the Faculty Senate of the Curriculum Committee action taken at the meeting on 24 November 2003, as follows:

Derryberry M/S/P motion #1: All connections courses should all have a connections (rather than departmental) label and should be listed together in one place in the catalog. When the director and advisory committee [for the connections core rubric] evolve, they will be included with the listing. Departments can acknowledge courses taught by members of their faculty in their section of the catalog so that their contribution to the core is

acknowledged.

I ask for Faculty Senate consideration of this action because the common labeling "Connections" is detrimental to the highlighting of the very interdisciplinary programs (for example, Humanities, Science in Context, and Asian Studies) cited to advance the discussion and passage of the "Connections" core rubric by the faculty. I also ask for Faculty Senate consideration because of the apparent invention of a "Connections Core" governing body in the form of a director and advisory committee; who will appoint the director? who will appoint the advisory committee?