

Graduate Program Review Appeals Committee Meeting with President Bailey: July 6, 2006

Attending: Judith I. Bailey (President), Bruce Ferrin (College Curriculum Committees), Leigh A. Ford (Graduate Studies Council), John Jellies, chair (Faculty Senate), Mary Lagerwey (Faculty Senate), Janet I. Pisaneschi (Provost), David Reinhold (Undergraduate Studies Council), Gwen Tarbox (Graduate Studies Council) **Absent:** Lee L. deLisle (College Curriculum Committees), Adrian “Ed” Edwards (Academic Deans), William Liou (Research Policies Council), Richard O’Hearn (Academic Chairs, Directors)

President Bailey called the meeting to order at 3:31 P.M.

1. President reported that program representatives appreciated manner in which they were treated by committee members, adding that she, Dr. Pisaneschi, the deans, the Board of Trustees, and the University as a whole owe the committee a debt of **gratitude**.

President reported that she has **read the relevant appeals documentation** in its entirety (data from GPR groups, deans’ comments, appeals committee’s recommendations, etc.); has spoken to the dean of each college with a program that has appealed; and will go to the Board with her final decisions on July 14. In response to programs’ concerns about possible errors in documentation, president reviewed enrollment data supplied by registrar (data recorded number of students who attended either semester during past three years).

2. President appreciated all of committee’s recommendations and was prepared to forward them as written. She did, however, seek clarifying comments regarding two programs that she thought might warrant further attention:

Industrial/Organizational Psychology M.A.

*Motion moved and seconded to support the appeal of the M.A. in Industrial /Organizational Psychology.
Motion failed.*

Committee:

- Deliberations were very difficult and emotive.
- Program presented many positives (e.g., highly productive faculty, program is well structured, faculty provide service to business community) and two or three concerns (e.g., program is small, ramifications of closure are difficult to gauge, program has minimal amount of external funding).
- As with Statistics Ph.D. (see below), committee considered recommending suspension but decided that such a contingency might be counterproductive.
- No external review data is available for I/O programs, so committee had no way to assess statement that WMU’s is “premiere behaviorally oriented I/O program in the U.S.” Program appeal left some ambiguity.
- Committee had difficulty reconciling statement that program is indispensable and discrete with fact that several I/O graduate students teach Behavior Analysis and take Behavior Analysis courses with an I/O concentration.
- Committee differed with program team on extent to which certain GPR criteria were met.
- Committee felt that consolidation with Behavior Analysis M.A. would not result in significant loss for department (e.g., faculty would remain and continue teaching at doctoral level). Committee clarified that this should be considered only as part of any reconfiguration initiated by department and was not a specific recommendation.

President:

- Discussing data issue with dean, associate deans, and program representatives, president emphasized importance of discrete enrollment codings.
- President feels she lacks expertise to draw line between Behavior Analysis and I/O M.A.s. Sees value of offering diversity of programs for which there is demonstrable demand.
- Most persuasive elements of program’s case:

- I/O journal has national reputation.
- Having heard testimony from companies helped by program, president recognizes that I/O faculty are good “corporate citizens.”
- As with Statistics Ph.D. (see below), president’s decision to maintain I/O Psychology program will contain specific conditions.

Statistics Ph.D.

Motion moved and seconded to support the appeal of the Ph.D. in Statistics. Motion failed.

Committee:

- Statistics recommendation was possibly most difficult of committee’s decisions.
- Committee reiterated profound respect for Statistics faculty.
- Some committee members were reluctant to vote against appeal. Saw potential but were troubled by lack of progress since 1992.
- Committee was not convinced by some arguments for maintaining program (e.g., Statistical Computation Laboratory has limitations; service-oriented role of faculty raises question of how much time is devoted to students; with strong faculty involvement, termination of Ph.D. might be mitigated in part by master’s degree).
- Research issues:
 - On most projects involving Statistics faculty or graduate students, initiating P.I.s are from outside program.
 - Committee was concerned by program’s apparent lack of progress in securing external funding.
- Significant number (70 percent) of Statistics master’s students stay at WMU for Ph.D.
- Appeal was focused on meeting service obligations to undergraduates and faculty (i.e., consulting services). While recognizing the value of this role, committee had hoped to see more emphasis on academic strength of program.
- Committee felt that Ph.D. is less competitive than comparable programs at Purdue, University of Michigan, etc.
- Committee felt that program failed to take opportunity to change its strategic vision when Pfizer began cutting back in Kalamazoo.

President:

- Dr. Bailey’s conversations with dean and associate deans:
 - If Ph.D. were terminated and no additional faculty hired, department could not cover workload.
 - Without Pfizer, few part-time teachers are available.
 - Enrollment policy is key.
 - Without “pipeline” to Ph.D., department would enroll fewer master’s students.
 - In cases where program is to be maintained with conditions, president will request improvement plan with metrics. Plan will be signed by dean and provost.
 - President’s decision to maintain Statistics program will contain specific conditions.
3. President notified committee that summary of her **decisions and recommendations will go out to campus community by e-mail** on July 7, and that hard copies will be made available to Board. Dissemination process will be as transparent as possible.

President adjourned the meeting at 5:05 P.M. and officially **discharged** the appeals committee.