



President's Bulletin

University of Missouri

Volume 2 Number 3

Friday, Oct. 15, 1971

TO: FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
FROM: C. BRICE RATCHFORD

I feel it is extremely important that each of you have information on the progress and direction of the University's self-appraisal which was initiated almost a year ago. Perhaps there are some unfamiliar with the nature and scope of this study. This comprehensive and lengthy evaluation of various University programs will not be taken lightly. It was a serious assignment, the results of which will have long-lasting effects upon the University. I am writing this letter to acquaint all of you with what must now be done for the sake of a better University of Missouri.

Let me briefly review the development of this self-appraisal. Earlier the chancellors, academic leaders of the campuses, and some University-wide academic officials met to develop procedures and plans for the institutional reappraisal. Also, five of the University's advisory councils received assignments involving a number of special concerns of the University faculty and administration, such as quality of undergraduate instruction, doctoral programs, public service functions, improved library collections and academic governance.

The results of these University-wide and campus-level discussions have been summarized in a document

called Preface to Decision, which has been distributed to faculty on each campus. Those who have read this document may sense that the 1970-71 discussions deepened our realization of how much this University must venture if it is to improve in the days to come. Preface to Decision provides only a background. Now we must act decisively!

Perhaps the most important determination was to select from the Preface to Decision those areas of concern which the University ought first to face. Early last summer I met with the University's Academic Planning Council, which includes the four Chancellors and the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Extension, and Research, to complete this task. The results were submitted to the Board of Curators as an "Agenda for Action."

This document contained ten specific areas for study and investigation by members of the University community during the year ahead. Briefly stated, they are:

1. Reconsider the commitment and mission of this four-campus University;
2. Define the function and scope of each campus;

3. Evaluate the University's commitment to doctoral education in the academic and professional disciplines;
4. Plan a general appraisal of all academic programs in the University, with the intent being eventually to make such evaluation a regular experience;
5. Launch a review of all non-academic endeavors, both functional and operational;
6. Design and begin a system whereby the efforts of all administrative leaders, from Department Chairman through President, can be periodically evaluated;
7. Revamp the University-Wide Council and Committee system.
8. Reconsider the University's policy on the admission, the retention, and the continuation of students;
9. Strengthen the process of communication throughout the University;
10. Renew attention to the University's relationship with other institutions of higher education in Missouri, as well as in the region.

I appreciate the fact that it is not realistic to expect that we can simultaneously undertake the ten projects listed in "Agenda for Action." However, the Academic Planning Council and I have underway three tasks deeply important for the University's future. Each of these arises directly from the insights developed during the 1970-71 self-scrutiny. To succeed, each one will require a determined, pragmatic and realistic approach on the part of every member of our academic community. These tasks are:

1. Redefine the role and scope of each campus and University-wide unit.
2. Begin assessment of all our academic programs to determine our strength and weaknesses.

3. Develop an improved administrative structure for the University.

I know that the first two of these are of special interest to all of you. I attach for your information the plan for appraising academic programs and other material related to these tasks. Before this semester finishes, the Academic Planning Council will have initiated the first steps toward an evaluation of four major program areas of the University. These are Engineering Sciences, the Schools of Education, the Biological and Health Sciences, and each discipline in which there now exists more than one doctoral program. These areas obviously embrace a major portion of University resources. Adjustments may have to be made. To assist the Academic Planning Council in designing the review of these four program areas, a Steering Committee has been appointed. This committee, composed of Deans Dale (UMKC), McFarland (UMR), McGowan (UMC), Walters (UMSL), with Vice President Nagel as chairman, will continue to assist the Council in future evaluations of the quality and extent of our commitment in all other academic fields. Many of you will also be joining in this endeavor. In another context, we will also be evaluating all of our non-academic commitments and activities.

As the Preface to Decision discussions last year made clear, the University faces a difficult but challenging future. With new opportunities before us and a desire to improve the quality of our endeavors, we have no choice but to submit our present commitments and activity to painful evaluation. Only by making the four campuses partners in one university and by determining where and to what extent our various academic programs can hereafter best be offered, will the University of Missouri become a place where teaching, research, and service truly thrive.

Through my office and that of your Chancellor you will be kept informed of plans and projects in general. What lies ahead doubtless will profoundly affect all of us.

PRESIDENT RATCHFORD'S COVER LETTER:

university of missouri
columbia · kansas city · rolla · st. louis



office of the president
columbia, mo. 65201

17 September 1971

TO: The Chancellors
FROM: C. BRICE RATCHFORD

At the Academic Planning Council's meeting of 16 September in which you participated, two important documents were prepared and adopted. I am now transmitting these to you with the request that all the steps called for by these policies shall begin.

These two documents reflect the first major undertakings to be launched out of the insights derived during the 1970-71 period of self-study. The latter made it clear that we must establish as soon as possible a more realistic understanding of the role and scope of each campus and University-wide unit. This understanding should reflect present and anticipated circumstances in Missouri and the nation. Thus, the first plan which I enclose is to make possible this redefinition of unit role and scope by December 1971. You will note there are two important assumptions listed on which our thought about unit assignment and responsibility must proceed.

The second area of concern which was so clearly enunciated during the 1970-71 self-appraisal is to evaluate all of our academic programs. Not only is the quality of these programs an important determination, but such considerations as program continuation, combination, and location are also crucial. Obviously a new policy on division of responsibilities among the campuses and other units will have an important bearing on the context in which our program appraisal proceeds. The second document I enclose generally stipulates the spirit, method, and schedule through which we shall examine all of our academic ventures. I shall immediately appoint an Evaluation Steering Committee to assist the Academic Planning Council in this undertaking.

With these two steps, I believe that the University of Missouri has begun the process of thoughtful change necessary if the institution is to offer better teaching, research, and service in the years ahead. New circumstances call for significant modifications in our organization, programs, and methods. It is now incumbent upon all of us wisely to bring about this needed transformation.

CBR/cc

cc: Members of the Board of Curators
Members of the President's Staff Conference

PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF UNIT ROLE AND SCOPE STATEMENT

(Adopted by the Academic Planning Council, 16 Sept., 1971)

1. Each Chancellor and each director of a University-Wide unit will, in consultation with selected representatives of his choice, prepare a role and scope statement for his unit. This statement shall include an assignment of priorities, using the concept of justification from Base Zero. The statement is to be based on the following assumptions:
 - (a) The University of Missouri will be comprehensive but no individual campus will be.
 - (b) Each campus will have programs ranging from the freshman year to the doctorate in some areas.
2. The President, in consultation with his staff, will prepare a draft document on "Unit Role and Scope," using as resource material the Chancellors' and University-Wide division directors' submissions. The individual unit reports will be included as Appendices.
3. The President will send this draft of the "Unit Role and Scope Statement" to each member of the Academic Planning Council one week prior to their December meeting.
4. The December meeting of the Academic Planning Council will serve as the forum for revision and refinement of the "Unit Role and Scope Statement."
5. Material submitted by Chancellors and Directors shall not exceed three (3) pages, double spaced.

A PLAN FOR APPRAISING UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

(Adopted by the Academic Planning Council, 16 Sept., 1971)

I. Purpose

- A. To establish throughout the University precedents for periodic review of all academic programs, thereby generally hereafter improving the University's endeavors through self-knowledge.
- B. To strengthen the judgments which must immediately be made about continuing, relocating, adjusting, initiating, or terminating many doctoral and professional degree programs.
- C. To make possible more cogent decisions concerning the future status and support of all ongoing academic endeavors, thereby enlarging the University's capacity to shift resources toward needed new activities.

II. Assumptions

- A. This effort at program appraisal must be meaningful and fruitful. It must be completed quickly. It is likely to be painful. The anticipations of many persons and programs will be unavoidably curtailed or revised. Important resource documents for this appraisal shall be the 1971 Reports to the President prepared by the University-wide Graduate Council and the University-wide Undergraduate Council.
- B. Such appraisal must be preceded by fundamental decisions from the administration and the Board of Curators about the role and scope of each campus. This perspective is required before significant determinations can be made concerning the continuation and growth of many programs, particularly at the advanced levels.
- C. The University shall reassert as a guiding principle that each campus will have graduate programs at the doctoral level. It shall also announce that most fields in which the University offers doctoral education shall hereafter normally be centered on whichever seems to be the most appropriate campus under the new role and scope assignment. University-wide graduate faculty organization will be developed in many disciplines. Such organization shall permit students to have access to qualified scholars throughout

the University. It also will broadly encourage faculty participation in doctoral education.

- D. It is likely that graduate education at the master's level will exist in most basic areas on more than one campus. Such programs should develop meaningful alliances with the relevant doctoral programs, regardless of the latter's campus location.

III. Plan

- A. The President shall name a five-man Evaluation Steering Committee to be chaired by the Special Assistant to the President. This Committee shall assist the Academic Planning Council in carrying forward and coordinating the appraisal process as it proceeds upon and between the campuses. While decisions are being made during the Autumn 1971 Semester about the future status of each campus, preliminary information will be gathered about every academic program in the University. (See below for suggestions of insights to be sought about each program.)
- B. During 1971-72, attention must be given to four University commitments of special magnitude and significance:
 - 1. Engineering Sciences
 - 2. Schools of Education
 - 3. Biological and Health Sciences
 - 4. All disciplines in which the University has more than one doctoral program.

The purpose is to determine how the University hereafter might most prudently meet its future obligations in each of these important areas through relocation, reduction in scope, or termination of present activities. Results of this study must be available in time for use in preparing the 1973-74 budget request.

- C. By 15 May 1972, a schedule will be announced for review of all remaining academic programs, including those in Extension, likely to continue as part of each campus as defined by the role and scope philosophy. This evaluation will occur in the academic years of 1972-73 and 1973-74.
- D. The appraisal process during the next three years should be guided as follows:
 - 1. Wherever possible, comparable programs will be evaluated on a University-wide basis.
 - 2. A review format will be prepared by the Evaluation Steering Committee and approved for general use on the campuses by the Academic Planning Council.
 - 3. All evaluation teams will normally include appropriate persons from more than one campus, as well as authorities from beyond the University.
 - 4. The aim of this three-year period of appraisal shall be to study these aspects of every program:
 - a. Quality
 - b. Appropriateness, significance, and need
 - c. Cost
 - d. Potential for change and improvement
 - 5. Results of all appraisals will be forwarded to the Academic Planning Council and members of the Board of Curators with comments by the leadership of each campus involved.
 - 6. In accordance with the revised mission of the University and the new role of each campus, the Academic Planning Council shall make appropriate recommendations about the future of academic programs to the President for consideration by him and the Board of Curators.

- IV. Implementation Schedule: 1971-72
- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 16 Sept. - 31 Dec.: | Recommendations about the role and scope of each campus prepared for the Board of Curators. |
| 20 Sept. - 1 Dec. : | Preliminary information assembled about each academic program. |
| 1 Nov. - 15 July : | Appraisal is made of Engineering, Professional Education, Biological and Health Sciences, and duplicate doctoral programs. |
| 15 May : | Academic Planning Council announces remaining academic program evaluation process, which is to be completed during 1972-74. |

SUGGESTED CATEGORIES OF INFORMATION TO BE
ASSEMBLED ABOUT EVERY ACADEMIC PROGRAM
IN THE UNIVERSITY

1. Program goals and means of achievement.
2. Program impact:
 - a. Numbers and types of students attracted.
 - b. Students completing majors and degrees.
 - c. Graduates' career patterns.
 - d. Contribution to general and extended education.
 - e. Relationship to campus and total University.
 - f. Research, extension, and service achievements.
3. State, regional, and national reputation.
4. Faculty status:
 - a. Numbers tenured and untenured.
 - b. Background and how recruited.
 - c. Role and expectations.
 - d. Accomplishments.
 - e. How evaluated.
5. Future need for program in Missouri and in the nation.
6. Capacity of program for enlarged or adjusted use of its resources:
 - a. What innovations have recently been introduced in program?
 - b. What efforts at program review have been made recently through internal or external evaluation? What results?
7. Cost analysis. (Financial resources)
8. Physical, equipment, and library resources.