

3-20-1998

## SR-97-98-37 (APC)

Marshall University

Follow this and additional works at: [http://mds.marshall.edu/fs\\_recommendations](http://mds.marshall.edu/fs_recommendations)

---

### Recommended Citation

Marshall University, "SR-97-98-37 (APC)" (1998). *Recommendations*. 757.  
[http://mds.marshall.edu/fs\\_recommendations/757](http://mds.marshall.edu/fs_recommendations/757)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Recommendations by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact [zhangj@marshall.edu](mailto:zhangj@marshall.edu), [martj@marshall.edu](mailto:martj@marshall.edu).

**ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE  
RECOMMENDATION**

**SR-97-98-37 (APC)**


The members of the Academic Planning Committee (APC) recommend that the reorganization plan for the College of Science (COS) be approved as proposed to the committee with an amended inclusion of the following two recommendations:


- (1) that an annual evaluation/assessment program be adopted for the new divisional structure, and
- (2) that the Dean and Division Coordinators work for continued faculty and student input in the development and implementation of the reorganization plan.

---

**RATIONALE:** The members of the Academic Planning Committee (APC) were presented with a written summary of the proposed College of Science (COS) reorganization plan, outcome of the Faculty Senate initiated vote on the reorganization plan and written comments provided by faculty in the College of Science, and had their questions concerning the reorganization plan addressed by Thomas Storch (Dean; College of Science). The committee was very supportive of the 12 month availability of the Division Coordinators and the extended daily availability of the Divisional secretaries. Both of these components of the reorganization plan were seen by the committee as extremely beneficial to the advising needs and schedules of the students. Three (3) areas of concern were also expressed by the committee; (1) the faculty in the College of Science expressed concern that the process used to develop the reorganization plan and introduce the plan to faculty was not more consultative in nature, (2) concern was also expressed regarding the process used to select the Division Coordinators and the potential for conflicts of interest and administrative efficiency for those individuals who will serve as both Department Chairs and Division Coordinators, and (3) concern was also expressed regarding feelings of faculty alienation which have developed as a result of a perceived lack of inclusion in the development of the reorganization plan. Therefore, the committee voted to recommend that the COS reorganization plan be approved with the amended inclusion: (1) that an annual evaluation process to determine whether the reorganization plan and Divisional structure is meeting its stated objectives be conducted, and (2) that a major effort be made to include faculty and students in the further development and implementation of the reorganization plan.

**FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT:**

DISAPPROVED BY SENATE:  DATE: 3-20-98

**UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:**  
READ:  DATE: 3-26-98

**COMMENTS:**

Amended on the senate floor, 3/19/98. Amendment was as follows in **bold print**:

(1) that an annual evaluation/assessment program be adopted for the new divisional  
structure, and that the evaluation/assessment program be carried out be a  
committee of faculty members from the college.