

=====
ATTACHMENT C
=====

Dean Yarbrough's response to questions raised by the AA Committee

November 25, 1997

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Affairs
Dr. Peggy O. Jessee, Co-chair
Dr. James A. Richardson, Co-chair

FROM: James D. Yarbrough

SUBJECT: Proposal to Merge Language Departments

The following is my response to the questions raised by the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Affairs in a memorandum dated November 17, 1997.

1. Will the language undergraduate programs be exempted from the ACHE viability criteria (because they offer service courses for the University?) At the present moment, I do not know what the outcome will be of the proposal to exempt the undergraduate programs in the liberal arts from ACHE viability. There is a three-year moratorium before any decision or action will be taken on the issue of exempting liberal arts courses.

2. Do you envision combining language degree programs to improve ACHE viability? The department should explore possible options that would allow our programs to meet ACHE viability. But beyond the so-called "ACHE viability" numbers is the fact that our language programs have low numbers of undergraduate majors. The ACHE viability aside, this is a major problem. I would not impose any plan on the department but would ask the department to look carefully at all of their degree programs and see what could be done in the way of making them more attractive to more students.

3. Would merged programs need to have a majority of course work in common to be considered one program under ACHE standards? It is my impression that, although tracks under one bachelor's program have been

proposed and accepted in the past, the Commission is less likely to approve such proposals now. I would hope that an advantage of a larger faculty size would impact our programs, change our curriculum, and lead to more attractive majors. I will not impose a "common" course curriculum on the department. I will ask the department to explore a wider range of options.

4. What are your plans to reduce the cost of these programs after merger? I have no plans to reduce the costs of the programs per se. I do have plans to more effectively use the resources that the programs now have. For instance, beginning with the development of the Language Acquisitions Center we will need technical support as well as staff support to keep such a center going. The reorganization of current staff duties would help reduce the need for additional monies for the program. There are savings that are gained by the size of the department simply because of the elimination of duplication of effort.

5. Do you anticipate lost faculty positions? No, I do not.

6. Do you anticipate a reduction in the number of non-tenure-track faculty and/or staff? I do not at this time anticipate the reduction of non-tenure-track faculty nor do I at this time anticipate a decrease in staff. In time, a reduction in staff through a reorganization of the department might well occur. However, there are no plans at this time to reduce either faculty or staff.

7. What are your plans regarding faculty governance for the new department? My plan is to allow the new department to develop its own governance structure within the context of the College and University policies and procedures.

With regard to the committee's request for a written response concerning my intent for tenure and promotion procedures in the merged department, it would be unfair to impose guidelines relative to tenure and promotion on the faculty who are currently on probationary appointments in the departments. Obviously, the department would be expected to develop a new series of common guidelines for tenure and promotion procedures that would govern the new modern languages department. As far as the current probationary faculty are concerned, the guidelines, policies, and procedures for promotion and/or tenure to which they would be held would be those that were in place at the time of their hiring.

I hope this answers the committee's concerns .
