



Institutional Review

October 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: The Institutional Review Process.....	1
Section 1: Context and Overview.....	3
Section 2: Academic Programs.....	11
Section 3: Online Courses and Programs.....	16
Section 4: Faculty Issues.....	19
Section 5: Staff Issues.....	23
Section 6: Student Issues.....	24
Section 7: Athletics.....	27
Section 8: Inter-Institutional Relations.....	31
Section 9: External Relations.....	33
Section 10: Recommendations.....	36

THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA AT MONROE
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW PROCESS

The three-member team comprised of Dr. Gary Reichard, Dr. Aubrey Lucas, and Dr. Portia Shields was assembled in late July, and Ms. Jodi Mauroner of the University of Louisiana System office was assigned to assist them in the institutional review (see Appendix 2 for Biographies). On July 28, the full team held an initial conference call with President Randy Moffett to receive his perspective concerning the state and system context for the review, as well as issues that might warrant special attention from this review team.

Team members were provided with a number of key documents on a special website, including the 2001 ULM Institutional Review, the 2009-2010 ULM Fact Book, December 2007 University Survey Results, and—in the weeks prior to the campus visit—additional specialized information and data.

Following this initial interview, the team decided to conduct telephone interviews with several key individuals. These included: four members of the Board of Supervisors (Chair Winfred Sibille, Vice Chair Wayne Parker, Finance Committee Chair Andre Coudrain, and Board member Mildred Gallot); Interim President Stephen Richters; Interim Provost Eric Pani; ULM Foundation Chair Malcolm Maddox; Faculty Senate President Anna Hill; SGA President Brook Sebren; and Staff Senate Chair Susan Duggins. All members participated in the conference calls with Board Chair Sibille and Interim President Richters; individual members of the team interviewed the others, with Ms. Mauroner recording and sharing notes on all calls with all team members. Team observations from these calls were shared in a second conference call with President Moffett prior to the campus visit.

The heart of the review exercise, of course, was the campus visit, conducted by the full team and Ms. Mauroner from Tuesday, September 14 to Friday, September 17, 2010. The schedule included a full campus tour, individual interviews with all senior administrators, and meetings with groups of faculty, students, staff, alumni, community supporters, and legislators from the local delegation. An open forum for members of the campus and external community was held at the end of the visit on Friday, September 17. The full schedule for the campus visit, as well as a list of all those with whom the team spoke, may be found in Appendix 1.

Prior to departing from Monroe, the team met to outline the organization of this report and to identify the recommendations that appear in these pages. The draft was written and revised by all members of the team, and the conclusions and recommendations represent the consensus of the team.

SECTION 1: CONTEXT FOR THE REVIEW AND OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

This institutional review of the University of Louisiana at Monroe took place in difficult times for higher education nationally and especially in Louisiana. The long and deep recession that has crippled the United States economy for more than two years has forced all states to retrench. Across the nation, state funding for colleges and universities has suffered dramatically, creating strong upward pressures on tuition and student fees. In Louisiana, these forces have been accentuated by recurrent natural disasters, starting with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and their lingering after-effects and compounded more recently by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Although the full budget implications of these massive dislocations for Louisiana higher education in 2010-2011 are not yet known, scenarios ranging from challenging to deeply alarming are regularly discussed in the press.

Despite, or perhaps partly because of, the severe economic pressures the state of Louisiana faces, the Governor and state legislators have been sharply focused on higher education issues for the past two years. In February 2010, the gubernatorially-initiated Postsecondary Education Review Commission (the Tucker Commission) issued an influential report that included recommendations for tying higher education funding to performance indicators such as improved student retention and graduation rates, enhancement of inter-institutional cooperation, strengthening of the community college system with improved articulation between two- and four-year institutions, and regular governing board review of academic programs for quality and cost-effectiveness. In July, many of the Commission's recommendations were enacted in the Louisiana Granting Resources and Autonomy for Diplomas Act (LA GRAD Act). This measure grants colleges and universities the autonomy to raise tuition incrementally over the next few years if they enter into multi-year agreements with the state to raise admissions standards, increase program completion (graduation) rates, eliminate programs with low completion rates that are not aligned with "strategic mission," ramp-up online (distance)

education programs, and address a number of other goals proposed first by the Commission and subsequently outlined in the legislation.

Under these circumstances, the University of Louisiana System and its eight constituent institutions have been engaged in almost continuous planning during the past year and will continue in this “planning mode” throughout the current academic year. Objectives of these planning exercises are both budgetary and programmatic, as UL System institutions must further reduce expenditures in the face of declining resources at the same time they make progress toward the goals expected of them under the LA GRAD Act. Revenues from the allowable tuition increases are not projected to be adequate to avert drastic cuts on all of the campuses, including at ULM; indeed, half of the projected additional tuition revenue in the coming year is likely to be required to cover the costs of unfunded mandates such as retirement and health care for employees.

Like its sister institutions in the UL System, ULM has experienced steep budget reductions over the past few years. Further funding decreases, which appear inevitable, threaten vital university services and programs. The next few years would be challenging in any case; that ULM will experience a change in leadership introduces added uncertainties. Without doubt, budget issues will be a critical part of the agenda for ULM’s new leadership.

Decreases in state funding, of course, make tuition revenue more important than ever to maintain institutional health. Any decline in enrollment, therefore, accentuates the already grave economic situation. ULM faces particular challenges in this regard. Current social and economic demographics of the Louisiana Delta are not conducive to high levels of participation in postsecondary education, and heightened admissions standards will actually reduce the pool of local high school graduates eligible for admission. ULM officials estimate that each year, under existing admissions standards, about 1,100 high school graduates from the twelve-parish “feeder” region are admissible to a four-year university. When admissions standards are raised to UL System-mandated levels in 2011 and Board of Regents levels in 2012, the potential decrease in the number of admissible students in the region could be as much as 400 students; the potential

impact on the number of freshman admissions and matriculations at ULM is serious if nothing is done to address this issue.

Moreover, the revitalization of the Louisiana Delta Community College (LDCC), located in a brand-new facility about a mile away, promises to draw at least some first-time freshman enrollment that might otherwise go to ULM. Strong and effective articulation arrangements between the two institutions may turn LDCC's presence into a plus for ULM, but at present this situation places additional pressure on the four-year institution to find alternative ways to stimulate enrollment. The university is doing this by means of a rapidly expanding online curriculum to be discussed later in this report (Section 3 on Online Programs). Student enrollment, however, seems to be in a state of slow general decline. From a total of 9,278 in fall 2005, enrollment decreased to 8,967 in fall 2009; enrollment figures for fall 2010 indicate an additional approximate one percent decrease, to 8,858.

In other areas important to the state under the LA GRAD Act, ULM's recent indicators are mixed. On a positive note, time-to-degree for ULM students has decreased from 5.7 years (2004-2005) to 5.6 years (2008-2009), and the freshman-to-sophomore retention rate has increased from 76% to 82% in the same period. The institution's graduation rate, however, has actually fallen in the same period; from 28% for the 1999 cohort (graduating in 2005) to 27% for the 2003 cohort (graduating in 2009). This issue will pose a major challenge to the new leadership at ULM, especially in light of the importance of retention and graduation rates to the institution's ability to continue to increase tuition and student fees.

Any review of ULM's current situation and future prospects must recognize the significant positive accomplishments of the institution, even under economic duress, during the last several years under the leadership of former President James Cofer. Nine years ago, just prior to President Cofer's arrival, a similar institutional review was conducted by James L. Fisher, Ltd. That review concluded that ULM at that time was an institution in need of "significant and sustained corrective action" and included no fewer

than 53 recommendations for the then-incoming new leadership. Many of these recommendations were basic and sweeping, for example:

- The University must balance its budget and stabilize operations
- The campus and buildings must be cleaned, trash collected, urgent repairs made, and paint applied
- ULM must augment its recruitment efforts
- President Cofer should initiate a process whereby all academic programs on the campus are evaluated in terms of their cost, relevance, and viability
- Additional resources must be devoted to nourishing residence hall life and other student support areas such as campus security, counseling, and student health
- President Cofer should give early consideration to privatization and outsourcing options in both the auxiliary and non-auxiliary areas of the institution
- Fiscal stability must be restored to intercollegiate athletics at ULM
- Efforts should be made to find adequate resources to improve the staffing and funding of the Development Program
- Alumni support and involvement must be increased

Not all of the 53 recommendations from this 2001 institutional review have been addressed, but a remarkable number have, and relatively successfully. This review team feels assured by conversations with key members of the Board of Supervisors and the system leadership that ULM has been returned to a state of sound financial management and administrative stability. The campus, apparently a sore sight in every way nine years ago, is attractive and very well-maintained, and several key buildings are new or recently renovated (e.g., the Student Union Building, the Student Success Center, and several residence halls). Students, faculty, staff, and alumni with whom this review team spoke evidence a sense of pride in the university and very much appreciate the attention to repair and renovation of campus facilities during President Cofer's administration. Some important university business operations, for example, food services and the bookstore, have been outsourced with apparent positive results both in quality of operation and

savings to the institution. Recruitment efforts, although not producing increasing student numbers for reasons already discussed, have been improved under a new Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, and even relations with the local community college which were far from ideal in recent years, seem now to be on the general upswing. ULM's "branding," or "graphic identity," as the 2001 review labeled it, has also markedly improved, including the introduction of a new logo and mascot that are ubiquitous on university publications and marketable items.

Particularly heartening is the attention that has been paid to making the campus "student-centered" in the last several years. Student success has become a focus of the entire campus community, a fact reflected most visibly in the state-of-the-art Student Success Center that has been constructed in the physical heart of the campus; students, including student-athletes, with whom this team met, were emphatic and generous in their appreciation for the efforts of both faculty and staff in their behalf. In general, ULM students seem satisfied with the quality of their academic programs, as well, and told the team that the intensified workload for faculty has not had discernible effects either in the classroom or in terms of faculty availability. While this speaks volumes for the commitment of ULM faculty to serve their students well, this team believes that the breaking point may be near. Maintaining the "student-centered" environment that has been so carefully nurtured in the past several years will require administrative support and resources for student life; since the student affairs staff, too, is overstretched, the new leadership will need to consider how such support can be continued (see Section 6 on Student Issues).

A number of concerns that this review team has found resonate, at least to a degree, with findings in the 2001 review. These will be described in the sections that follow in this report. Some of these findings and recommendations reflect ongoing issues that any new leadership should and will likely address. **Notable in this regard is our first recommendation: in light of the rapidly changing budget environment over the past few years and some of the ad hoc responses that have been required by those changes, the university should undertake to define and articulate a new, realistic**

strategic plan that will clarify its mission for the next decade or so. Such an effort was undertaken in 2007 and, in fact, a strategic *Roadmap for the Future* was adopted, charting strategic initiatives for the years 2008-2013. However, realities have since overtaken the vision and mission that were articulated at that time. Moreover, there is some confusion among faculty, especially, about the institution's true mission. This review team's conversations with virtually all constituencies during the campus visit indicate a clear and pressing need for institutional redefinition and mission clarification in the context of new realities, state priorities, and new leadership.

Similarly, as was discussed in the 2001 review, funding for the athletic program remains a challenge for ULM, although this review team does not concur with the 2001 review that the institution should revisit its current positioning in NCAA Division 1-A (see Section 7 Athletics). Development operations, another strong concern of the 2001 institutional review, also still present issues for the new leadership to consider and address; although it may not yet be time to launch a capital campaign, as the 2001 review team urged, that time should soon come. ULM's new leadership, therefore, will need to carefully consider how to staff and position the institution for such an ambitious development effort (see Section 9 External Relations). Yet another major concern identified by the 2001 review team remains a major concern, perhaps for new reasons, in this review: the need to improve relations with, and institute more cooperative and collaborative relationships with, the three neighboring postsecondary institutions, Louisiana Delta Community College (LDCC), Louisiana Tech University (LTU), and Grambling State University (GSU). Members of this review team met with the presidents of these three institutions, specifically to explore ways in which this might be done by ULM's new leadership (see Section 8 on Inter-Institutional Relations).

As noted above, the 2001 review team strongly urged an overall review of academic programs, taking into account cost, relevance, and "viability." Other recommendations called for a review of the liberal and general education curriculum, and of graduate-level programs that were "unproductive based on student enrollments, cost, and program quality." This review team believes that ULM faculty and administrators have made

significant strides over the past several years in addressing these thorny issues of comparative cost, relevance, and productivity in academic programs. Although such review needs to be a continuous process and should continue under new leadership, the state of the curriculum does not seem to be particularly problematic in ways the 2001 institutional review suggested. On the other hand, the severe budget pressures already described make it imperative that the institution be prepared to make hard choices where breadth of academic offerings is concerned. It is in this area that strengthened cooperation and collaboration with the nearby sister UL System institutions (Louisiana Tech and Grambling) might pay the greatest dividends.

One of the real academic strengths of ULM is that virtually all of its programs eligible for national accreditation have achieved such accreditation. This is true of all of the institution's major professional programs, notably, Pharmacy, Nursing, Education, and Business. Such accreditation is not only mandated by the Board of Regents, but is also critical to the recruitment of new students and the effective placement of graduates. Based on what this team has learned about the steady and sharp escalation of faculty (and staff) workload, team members are very concerned that some of these accreditations are at risk if immediate attention is not given to how to address excessive faculty workload pressures (see Sections 2 and 4 for discussion of academic programs and faculty workload issues, respectively).

One new concern uncovered in this institutional review is a direct result of ULM's response to pressure from the state (specifically, the Tucker Commission and LA GRAD Act) to develop and implement more "distance" (i.e., online) academic programs. ULM has been energetic and entrepreneurial in taking up this challenge; the institution now has 17 academic programs fully online and approximately 734 student enrollments in online courses. These efforts, however, have far outpaced the university's infrastructure, as well as have begun to threaten clarity of mission, in the view of many faculty and staff. This review team sees it as a high priority for ULM's leadership (current and future) to bring this situation under control before going much further in developing such programs (see Section 3 Online Courses and Programs).

Although this review team has found ULM to be a university that is not “broken” as it seemed to be in 2001, it is nonetheless at a critical juncture. Gains and improvements during President Cofer’s tenure are obvious and visible. Positive momentum has been achieved in many ways, but the nearly continuous budget worries and reductions are taking a severe toll. As has been discussed in several contexts already; both staff and faculty, deeply committed as they are to the success of ULM and its students, show signs of exhaustion. More than any specific issues this general condition should command the immediate attention of the institution’s new leadership (see Sections 4 and 5 Faculty and Staff Issues, respectively.)

SECTION 2: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The ULM mission statement includes the sentence, “A comprehensive senior institution of higher learning, ULM offers a complete educational experience emphasizing a learning environment where excellence is the hallmark.” This review team is impressed with how diligently the administration, faculty, and staff have worked to maintain such a commitment through increasingly dire budgetary times. This includes the upgrading of academic technology, both in the classroom (there are now 74 “smart classrooms” and another 20 or so with varied degrees of multimedia capacities) and in the various “information commons” for students that exist across the campus—in the Library, the Student Success Center, and the residence halls.

As will be noted in several sections of this report, however, there comes a breaking point when hard choices may have to be made. Such a time may soon arrive with respect to ULM’s ability to continue to do all that it is doing and still maintain quality throughout its programs. It is an understandable point of institutional pride, and a great asset to the university’s marketing and student recruitment efforts, that all of ULM’s professional programs expected by the Board of Regents to be accredited do, indeed, have national accreditation. These include the university’s hallmark Pharmacy program, various Health Sciences programs (including Nursing, Dental Hygiene, Speech Language Pathology, and Radiologic Technology, for example), as well as a number of other programs that address Louisiana’s workforce needs and contribute to the state’s prospects for economic growth—for example, Teacher Education, Business Administration, Accounting, Marketing, and Computer Information Systems.

Several of these programs will not be up for reaccreditation for several years. Pharmacy, for example, will next be reviewed by Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE) in 2014, and both Nursing and Teacher Education have just been reaccredited. Among ULM’s currently accredited programs, the several majors in the College of Business Administration are at greatest risk. As will be discussed in more detail in Sections 3 and 4 of this report (Online Courses and Programs and Faculty Issues),

escalating faculty workload has begun to erode both the actuality and potential for the kind of professional activity demanded by the accrediting agency for business programs, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business-International (AACSB).

Loss of accreditation by any of these programs would not only be a sign of decline in academic quality at ULM, but would be severely damaging to its reputation both for prospective students and within the local community. Moreover, as some alumni and community leaders noted to the team, loss of accreditation by the institution's business programs could even have a negative effect on the decisions of businesses to locate in the Louisiana Delta region served by ULM. In the view of this review team, this is a very serious threat to the institution. **Consequently, it is recommended that ULM review the impacts of increased faculty workload on its accredited programs to determine which, if any, accreditations may be at risk, as well as the steps necessary to maintain desired program accreditations.**

As a comprehensive university, ULM must maintain a range of academic departments and major programs that span the arts, sciences, social sciences, and humanities, as well as the pre-professional and professional fields already discussed. To date, the university has managed to maintain such breadth in its academic programs through these damaging economic times. Here again, however, as will be further discussed in Section 4 (Faculty Issues), a critical point may be near due to increased workload and declining faculty numbers. Student enrollments across the institution's six colleges (including the Graduate College) have fluctuated somewhat during the past three years, but have remained in roughly the same proportions: Arts and Sciences 34-36% of total enrollment, Health Sciences 17-18%, Business Administration 13-16%, Education and Human Development 12-13%, Graduate 10-11%, and Pharmacy 9%. As is discussed in Section 4 (Faculty Issues), however, losses in faculty over these years have been significant, as well as uneven across the colleges. As a result, some academic majors now have only one or two regular faculty members responsible for all upper-division courses. Faculty, department chairs, and deans are understandably protective of their programs and thus express confidence that they can continue to "cover" the majors and

meet their students' needs despite these dwindling numbers of regular faculty, but this review team is not so sure. It may be time for the institution to take a serious look at the number and range of major programs being offered, and consider whether all can continue to be offered. As the common expression goes, the time may be approaching when ULM cannot continue to be "all things to all people." It may be that some programs could be offered in a collaborative manner, with neighboring UL System institutions, Grambling and Louisiana Tech (see Section 8 Inter-institutional Relations).

The program review process, as defined by the Board of Regents and the UL System Board of Supervisors and as implemented at the institution level, could be a useful tool to advance such necessary analysis. To date much work has addressed "low completer" rates for individual programs, and, in response to the interest at the Board level, ULM's University Planning Council (UPC) has developed a program review process that takes into account program quality, demand for graduates, comparative advantage (distinction), community impact, accreditation, and opportunities for growth. This process can and should be used to explore the range of issues that currently threaten the viability of individual programs at ULM and to identify ways in which those programs that the institution feels it must maintain can be kept at adequate strength.

On a more positive note, all constituencies of the university agree that ULM has some signature academic programs that are of very high quality and should receive continued strong support from the administration and be widely and effectively marketed. This review team concurs. These include, most notably, the state's only Pharmacy program at a public institution, as well as certain of the Health Sciences, Atmospheric Sciences, and some others that were frequently mentioned to the team as institutional strengths. One of the expectations of senior institutions under the LA GRAD Act is to "designate Centers of Excellence, as defined by the Board of Regents, which have received a favorable academic assessment from the Board of Regents and have demonstrated substantial progress" toward meeting five sets of goals specified in the Act (meeting workforce needs, having a high level of research productivity, etc.). This offers ULM an inviting opportunity to showcase, and perhaps even gain additional resources for, some of these

strong hallmark programs. **It is this team’s recommendation that ULM review its strongest and/or unique academic programs to determine which should be designated as “Centers of Excellence,” and what might be needed to ensure their continued excellence.**

ULM’s Pharmacy programs, and to a lesser extent certain academic programs in the Health Sciences, also pose some issues for internal consideration. The team was told that half of ULM’s entering freshmen come to the university with the intention of majoring in Pharmacy or one of the Health Sciences. Many of these students lack the academic qualifications for such programs and either give up or fail to gain admission to the Pharm.D. program. The data in this regard are striking: typically, in recent years, ULM has admitted about 325 to 375 freshman applicants to the Pre-Pharmacy program; the usual number of actual applicants to the Pharm.D. program in each of these years (not the same cohorts) has been between 250 and 280; of those applicants, approximately 65-80 are admitted to the Pharm.D. program, about one fourth to one third of those who apply. Many of these disappointed students remain at ULM and take up other academic majors. Many others, however, leave the university. Undoubtedly, this “outflow” of Pre-Pharmacy students contributes in a major way to ULM’s continually low student retention and graduation rates (see Section 6 Student Issues). There are no ready answers to this problematic situation, but if ULM is to improve its retention and graduation rates, as expected under the LA GRAD Act, not to mention give the students who come to the institution the greatest chance for academic success, this issue should receive thoughtful attention. The question is how best to market the university’s strengths, attract sufficient numbers of new students, and yet match students to the fields of study where they will have the best chance of success.

There are two additional expectations in the LA GRAD Act that call for attention at ULM and will inevitably have an impact on the university’s potential freshman enrollment. These are the expectations that senior institutions will “eliminate remedial education course offerings and developmental study programs” and “eliminate associate degree program offerings” unless such courses and programs cannot be offered by “a community

college in the same geographical area.” Since Louisiana Delta Community College has the capability to deliver these courses and programs and will be expected to do so, it will be important for ULM to prepare for the repercussions of such a shift in program delivery and, as discussed in Section 8 (Inter-institutional Relations), to work collaboratively with the community college to ensure a smooth flow of students from these programs into ULM. **In connection with these new realities, this review team recommends that ULM review its three remaining two-year degree programs to determine which, if any, it can transfer to LDCC in light of their competencies and capacity and to develop an associated plan for implementation.**

This team does not intend this assessment of ULM’s academic programs to be perceived as a criticism of what has been, and is being, accomplished by faculty, administration, and staff in terms of maintaining academic quality. As has been repeatedly stressed throughout this report, a continual erosion of the resources necessary to support the academic programs at ULM, as, indeed, at Louisiana’s other senior institutions, threatens to swamp the efforts of even these committed, hard-working faculty, staff, and administrators. This review team believes that genuine institutional introspection and strategic planning are absolutely essential if the university is to be prepared to make whatever choices may be forced by circumstances, if the budget climate does not improve.

SECTION 3: ONLINE COURSES AND PROGRAMS

ULM has been ambitious and aggressive in increasing its online classes and degree programs. The number of classes and complete degree programs available online has steadily increased under the university's Gateway to Online Degrees (ULM GOLD) program. Currently, the ULM GOLD web page lists 17 bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs as fully available online, as well as five options in the Master of Arts in Teaching program and eight options in the Master of Education program. Since one of the performance objectives of the LA GRAD Act is that institutions "increase use of technology for distance learning to expand educational offerings," it seems likely that efforts to increase the number of online programs at ULM will continue.

ULM GOLD online classes are available to both enrolled students on the Monroe campus and non-traditional and place-bound students throughout Louisiana and in other states. In fact, while traditional enrollment has declined the number of students who take both face-to-face and online courses has increased for the same period. For fall 2010 a total 734 students are enrolled in online courses (representing some 11,000 total credit hours).

While these growing enrollments reflect success in the development of online education by ULM, such success is not without problems. The review team found a high level of concern, even frustration, on the part of faculty, department chairs, and even deans, with certain aspects of the online initiative. The degree of departmental control over the roll-out of online classes and programs seems to be uneven. While some departments have initiated online delivery of part or all of their degree programs, at least some faculty and department chairs express that they felt "pushed" in that direction, and without adequate infrastructure or policy support. The common pattern seems to have been that department faculty, supported by funding from the "Quality Matters" program, have developed templates for courses to be taught online. The courses are then taught either by regular faculty, on paid overload, or by part-time adjunct faculty. The review team was told different things by different groups about how the selection of adjunct faculty for online instruction actually works. Continuing Education is responsible for the actual

hiring of such faculty, in principle, with the department having full approval rights before any adjunct is hired. In fact, however, it seems to be the case that many department chairs find it difficult to keep up with the hiring of adjunct faculty for these rapidly expanding programs. Consequently, there is fairly widespread concern about quality control in such hiring and, therefore, in the courses offered online.

In the case of regular faculty who teach online classes on an overload basis, a frequently expressed concern is that the individual's overload can suddenly escalate without his or her prior approval. For example, the review team was told by multiple sources that, prior to fall semester 2010, enrollment caps for online classes were changed from 30 to 120, and enrollments were allowed to "float upward" without the knowledge of the instructor. In some cases, enrollments over 100 resulted. Staffing solutions to handle such situations ranged from hiring additional adjunct faculty to teach additional sections of normal size (i.e., approximately 30 students), if they could be found, to increasing the overload pay of the originally-assigned faculty member to handle the additional student load. As discussed in Section 4 (Faculty Issues), faculty workload is generally a serious concern at ULM in these difficult economic times. Unanticipated faculty overloads in online education exacerbate this issue.

Although there seems to be widespread recognition across the university that increased online instruction is a practical protection against enrollment decline at ULM, a commonly expressed concern of faculty, department chairs, and deans (indeed, even among some students with whom the review team spoke) is that ULM online instruction may be expanding too quickly, without a clear strategy or overall objectives, and without consideration for how this proliferation might affect the institutional mission. There is also considerable concern about the lack of an adequate infrastructure to support faculty in online instruction, as well as confusion about process and policy due to the number of offices and individuals who seem to have responsibility for different aspects of online program decisions. Finally, some faculty and department chairs seem uncomfortable that so much authority for these programs resides in Continuing Education.

Based on these widespread concerns, the review team recommends that the university develop a strategic plan, policies, and processes to ensure that the delivery of online programs is consistent with institutional mission, standards, and workload policies. Related to the problem of inadequate infrastructure, the “crisis-management” situation produced by the uncapping of enrollments in online classes for fall 2010, without consultation with or advance knowledge of deans, department chairs, and instructional faculty suggests a need for much clearer communication about the nature and goals of online program delivery. **The team recommends that, as in all areas, decisions concerning the development and staffing of online programs be clearly communicated to faculty, staff, and students in a timely manner.**

Clearly, the ULM administration has been acting in the best interest of the university in expanding the university’s online programs. New students are being served, and the online enrollments have mitigated what might have been more significant enrollment decline for the university over the past few years. It will be important, however, for the university to get this initiative under control as soon as possible. Failure to do so will intensify already-serious issues concerning faculty workload, as well as escalate growing concerns of some faculty, administrators, staff, and students about “mission shift” whereby ULM will change its basic nature to become something akin to the University of Phoenix. Such consideration should involve faculty, staff, and students, as well as appropriate administrators.

SECTION 4: FACULTY ISSUES

Conversations with faculty, department chairs, and deans revealed a dedicated, collegial (if frustrated and stressed) group that is working with fewer resources, and under an increased teaching load, stretching themselves to give students the support they need, while continuing to be of service to the community, and struggling to remain active in research, writing, and grants. Faculty expressed pride in their graduates' accomplishments and in the many services the institution provides the community. As noted in the previous section, they understand the need for initiating more online courses and programs due to budgetary problems, but they are concerned about how the programs will affect ULM's mission, program quality, and infrastructure.

University Mission and Expectations for Faculty

Some faculty told the team that ULM's stated mission at the time of their hiring was to become a research university. Others said the emphasis is and has been to become a first-class teaching institution. Still others are unclear about the mission and worry about whether ULM's rush to provide online education is a sustainability measure only or represents a basic change in mission. The university's Promotion and Tenure Policies (Section 5 of the *ULM Faculty Handbook*) appear to offer necessary flexibility for tenure-track and tenured faculty to choose an appropriate path for themselves in terms of balancing their commitments to instruction, scholarship, and/or service, respectively, that will meet their individual needs and the needs of their department and university, and still result in tenure and/or promotion. Nonetheless, if ULM undertakes an effort "to define and articulate a new, realistic strategic plan that will clarify its mission for the next decade or so," as this team recommends (Recommendation 1 in the Summary of Recommendations), it would be appropriate to revisit these Promotion and Tenure Policies, as well, to ensure "goodness of fit."

Faculty Employment Trends and Workload Issues

As would be expected, the financial shortfalls in recent years have taken a slow but steady toll on the numbers of faculty at ULM. This has been true for both regular (i.e., tenured and tenure-track) faculty, and—especially dramatically—for the non-tenure track faculty. Data for academic years 2005-2006 through 2010-2011 show a reduction in the numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty from 273 to 255, a 6.6% decrease. For non-tenure-track faculty, the decline has been a precipitous 27.6%, from 105 down to 76. The erosion of faculty numbers at all levels directly correlates to the increasingly worrisome issue of escalating faculty workload.

Despite a high traditional workload expectation at ULM of “4-4” (four courses taught each semester) for tenured and tenure-track faculty (“5-5” for instructors), there has been an historic pattern of permitting voluntary faculty overload for additional compensation. This has continued into the current year, including 2009-2010, when the faculty voted to accept an additional course over their normal teaching load without additional compensation (the so-called “plus one” program). The scale of such paid overload teaching has varied in the period 2005-2006 to 2009-2010 from a high of over 22% of the tenured and tenure-track faculty (71 of 315) in 2008-2009 to a low of 11.9% (36 of 301) in 2009-2010 (this was the “plus one” year, meaning that those who taught such paid overloads actually were teaching two courses above normal load, or as many as six in a single semester).

Such heavy teaching loads, especially when extended over a matter of years, are harmful to academic program quality in that they deny faculty the time and opportunity even to stay current in their fields, let alone to engage in the scholarly activities that are necessary to the vitality of both undergraduate and graduate programs. Moreover, as the current (exhausted) demeanor of the ULM faculty makes clear, such workloads are unsustainable over the long haul (and perhaps even over the short haul).

What is more, as was discussed in Section 2 (Academic Programs), the erosion of faculty and the concomitant increase in workload for the faculty who remain pose particular threats to some of the university's nationally accredited programs. The College of Business Administration, for example, has seen a reduction in the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty since 2005-2006 from 48 to 34, a nearly 30% reduction. Part of the slack has been taken up by the hiring of non-tenure-track adjuncts (four more in fall 2010 than were employed by the college in 2005-2006), but the net result is nonetheless a major increase in instructional load for the regular Business faculty. As faculty from that college told this review team, this trend poses a direct threat to the college's accreditation by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business-International (AACSB), which places great emphasis on a significant proportion of the faculty being research-active. Similar concerns exist in other accredited programs.

Workload pressures also threaten institutional mission in other, less obvious ways. ULM faculty have traditionally spent many hours advising and providing service to the university, as well as offering virtually "cradle to grave" services to the community (summer academic programs, children's camps, internships, student volunteer services, nursing and dental hygiene clinics, etc.). Clearly, activities such as these that are so important to the community, and to the university's image within the community as a productive partner, will at some point become casualties to the pressures of increased instructional workload.

If these problems were not enough, as discussed in Section 3 (Online Courses and Programs), the rapid development and deployment of online programs have introduced even more pressures on workload for many regular faculty—especially when qualified adjunct faculty cannot be found to teach scheduled online classes.

Somehow, even in these financially troubled times, this issue must be addressed. Last spring, a task force appointed by then-President Cofer developed and submitted to Academic Affairs a draft *ULM Workload Policy* that attempted to wrestle with these issues; to date, apparently, there has been no administrative response to this proposal. Whether or not the task force's suggestions prove to be feasible, conversation should be

occurring between administration and faculty about this pressing issue. **In that vein, this review team believes that the university should review its workload and tenure and promotion policies and practices to ensure that they are consistent with the mission of the university.**

Shared Governance

Faculty, including the Faculty Senate leadership, told this review team that shared governance has improved significantly at ULM during the past few years. There is concern that a transition in leadership might disrupt these relatively recently established patterns of collaborative governance. Communication by the administration of significant issues and decisions is important, but it is not enough to sustain faculty (and staff) morale in such difficult times. **This review team recommends that the university ensure continuation of strong shared governance, which has helped to maintain a sense of community even in this difficult budgetary climate.**

SECTION 5: STAFF ISSUES

Throughout the team's visit, there were many opportunities to converse with and observe staff. It is obvious that the ULM staff in general is committed to the university and has pride in being associated with ULM. There are also indications that the university appreciates and values the staff. For instance, a Staff Senate was created to give the staff voice and influence in the affairs of the university. This group included articulate members who were knowledgeable about the university's strengths and challenges. It was also noted that an active "employee recognition program" shows appreciation for years of service by staff.

As perhaps in all universities, there were indications that staff in general and classified staff in particular desire better communication with university leaders. Since classified staff are not eligible to serve on the Staff Senate, there are limited opportunities for them to be heard on issues which affect them.

To support the university's recognition of the critical role of all university staff, it is recommended that staff representatives, including classified staff, be included on committees and other policy-making groups so that the university can have the benefit of staff viewpoints.

Like many other universities facing a shortfall in state appropriations, ULM has adjusted by eliminating vacant positions and leaving positions unfilled instead of discharging employees. The remaining staff has taken on additional responsibilities to ensure that regular functions continue. New initiatives, such as online learning and the conversion to Banner software, add to these duties. The staff seems to accept these overloads as a necessary adjustment to the present financial situation. This loyalty to ULM was impressive; however, concerns were expressed about fatigue and stress.

All staff, including classified staff, should have the benefit of receiving communications within the university regarding such matters as goals, achievements, issues, and the general welfare of the university.

SECTION 6: STUDENT ISSUES

ULM currently serves a diverse student population of almost 9,000 undergraduate and graduate students, many of whom are first generation college attendees. Currently 734, or eight percent, of these students are enrolled in online offerings. Eighty percent of the student body commutes from a 50-mile radius of the campus with the remainder living in campus housing. Sixty percent of the students are white, 30% African American, and the remainder is a combination of American Indian and international students.

From 2008 to 2010, the percentage of students eligible for financial aid has increased to approximately 70%; on average 37% of all students receive Pell Grants. The number of full-time freshmen has decreased over the last three years while the retention rate for the same period has increased. On the other hand, six-year graduation rates, while steady at around 28%, are low relative to institutional peers.

Student Life and Development

From faculty, staff, and student interviews as well as this review team's observations, ULM is considered a student friendly environment. Excellent services exist to promote, encourage, and reinforce academic, personal health and college adjustment issues. Students can avail themselves of the many religious, cultural, and social activities provided by over 150 student organizations that make the campus a lively, friendly, and exciting place to matriculate. As important, the university houses an excellent library and study center, maintains up-to-date computers in modern dormitories, and provides extensive tutoring opportunities. Students say that faculty and staff are not only friendly and encouraging but also accessible when needed. This is remarkable praise, given the intense workload pressures on both faculty and staff, and reinforces the commitment of ULM employees to the students.

Student Success

To its credit, ULM has initiated a number of pre-college programs that are important to encourage students to study beyond high school and establish connections with potential future students. Among other initiatives, ULM offers the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI), which is focused on pre-college students interested in health-related fields. The school also hosts Talent Search for junior and senior high school students to provide important skills and information related to success at college. Additionally, ULM's STAART program (a mentoring initiative) and its Career Connections and Experiential Education enrich career exploration, clarify expectations of college life, and create a seamless path to the baccalaureate experience.

Conversely, the LA GRAD Act seeks to redirect freshman students who do not meet mandated higher admissions standards to community colleges within the next two years as well as eliminate the delivery of remedial courses by four-year institutions. In light of these changes, the Office of Enrollment Management predicts dramatic changes in enrollment. Consequently, programs previously mentioned will be even more important in creating a seamless environment between LDCC and other two-year institutions as much of ULM's future enrollment will come from the community college system. Fortunately ULM, as have other competing four-year institutions, has already taken steps in this direction by establishing a counselor at LDCC to provide potential students with important academic advising and other information on a regular basis. Such collaboration with community colleges will be an important step in ULM's successful evolution. Further, as four-year institutions such as ULM phase out remedial education by 2012, there exists opportunities to partner with LDCC and other two-year schools to offer these courses in special academic sessions, in addition to organization and study skill courses that will be important to student success.

It is recommended that ULM intensify its efforts to offer student services and advising, using the wealth of programs already in place, such as student-to-student mentoring and engagement, articulation agreements, collaborative programs and other academic and social transition services, so as to assist potential students from

earlier ages through enrollment at ULM and beyond. These efforts must be complemented with tracking and evaluation systems to ensure their success and effectiveness.

To address low graduation rates, it is also recommended that consideration be given to providing financial resources and other career enhancing measures which recognize and encourage persistence and success beyond the first two academic years.

Such programs could include initiatives that would provide scholarships to students from the end of the sophomore to the senior year who move towards degree completion in a timely fashion. Opportunity devices, such as attaching eligibility for student leadership, athletic participation, travel, and paid internships to retention, could also positively influence graduation rates. Finally, students who fail to move forward should receive counseling, mentoring, and careful monitoring for success. Alternative college options should be explored with them before they exhaust their financial aid or take out hefty student loans.

Students and Governance

ULM students hold positions on all university standing committees, including the Budget Committee. When asked about governance, they indicated that they are included in important decisions and trust the administrators to take care of their needs. However, they did express concerns related to communication. For example, they hear rumors about programs that could be eliminated due to budget cuts and are concerned that they may not be able to complete their degrees. Also of concern was the possibility that budget cuts would lead to elimination of certain campus activities and organizations. Finally, they are worried that the increased faculty teaching loads might take a toll on faculty access and the personal attention students currently enjoy. **Therefore, it is recommended that decisions directly affecting students be communicated campus-wide as soon as they are made.**

SECTION 7: ATHLETICS

Historically, intercollegiate athletics have been important at ULM, as they have been throughout the University of Louisiana System and the state of Louisiana as a whole. Nearly two decades ago (1993), the university chose to move from Division I-AA to Division I-A, a decision that was controversial at the time and for several years resulted in serious budget deficits in athletics. In 2001, ULM moved its football program (only) from the Southland Conference, in which it had experienced considerable success, to the more highly competitive Sun Belt Conference. In 2006, the university moved the rest of its teams, both men's and women's, to the Sun Belt Conference.

Joining the Sun Belt Conference has had mixed results for the university, but on balance seems to have been a positive move. The conference consists of larger institutions than the Southland Conference, with greater visibility and stronger athletic programs. Largely because the winner of the conference in football is bowl-eligible, annual conference revenue distributions among the member institutions are substantially higher than for those in the Southland Conference (ULM received over \$755,000 in such revenues in the past year). On the other hand, while ULM's athletic budget was comparable to that of most Southland Conference schools, it is considerably below that of several Sun Belt institutions (about one-third the budget of two, and about half that of four other member institutions). Not surprisingly, this results in a major gap in the quality of facilities for ULM teams compared to many conference competitors, which, according to ULM athletic personnel, produces a challenge in recruiting student-athletes and, in turn, has kept several ULM teams from being competitive in the conference. Football is an important exception in this regard; though only 16-20 overall for the past three seasons, the team had a record of 12-10 against Sun Belt foes in that period. All other teams except tennis have records under .500, and most are considerably below that break-even point. According to the coaches, this has an adverse impact on community support.

These circumstances lead some in the university (though not on the athletics staff) to question whether the decision to move to a higher competitive level was wise. In the

view of this review team, the decisions to move to I-A and the Sun Belt Conference are settled questions, and the university is best served by pursuing success at the present level of competition.

That said, the athletics budget remains a serious challenge, especially in these troubled economic times for the university. The total annual budget of approximately \$8.5 million in 2009-2010 (with a projected budget of \$8.6 million for 2010-2011) is heavily dependent on self-generated funds (ticket sales, gate guarantees, corporate sponsorships, gifts, and other revenue such as pouring rights). If it were not for the very large game guarantees brought in by the football team (approximately \$2.9 million in 2009-2010 and the same amount projected for the current year) and much lesser guarantees brought in by men's basketball (about one-tenth of the amount of the football guarantees), the program would be in deep, perhaps insurmountable, financial trouble. Both last year and projected for the current year, about \$2.9 million of the ULM athletics budget comes from the university's E&G budget; this represents about two-thirds of the amount that the Board of Regents (BOR) rules permit the institution to shift to support athletics. (In 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, respectively, \$3.6 million and \$4.1 million in E&G funds had gone to athletics, about 90% of the BOR allowed amount.) While the budgeted allocation for 2010-2011 is below what BOR rules permit, it would be impractical and impolitic to raise the amount at the present time, given the current state of ULM's academic and student life programs. The vast majority of those on campus with whom the team spoke seem to support intercollegiate athletics, but it appears unlikely that there would be any support outside the Athletics Department to shift more internal funds toward that program.

This leaves the program and the university with a dilemma that new leadership will need to address. As will be discussed in Section 9 of this report (External Relations), for historic reasons ULM's Athletic Foundation is a separate entity from the University Foundation. For the year ending December 31, 2009, it generated approximately \$1.6 million in gifts and sponsorships. Development personnel, as well as community and alumni supporters, recognize that if the athletic program is to become truly competitive, this level of external support will have to increase. Unfortunately, the resources and

facilities gaps that ULM suffers vis-à-vis its conference competitors, with challenges to both student-athlete recruitment and win-loss records in many sports, work against building the strong level of community support that will be needed to improve this development record. This conundrum needs to be addressed directly, even if necessarily in a gradual way. **Therefore, one of the recommendations of this team is that ULM develop a strategic plan for athletics that reflects commitment to successful participation at the current level and that takes into account institutional budget realities, as well as current and projected levels of community support.**

Even in this challenging context, the athletics staff and the university seem to be doing a relatively good job of supporting student-athletes in their studies. As described in Section 6 (Student Issues), a conscious decision has been made by the university to dedicate resources to programs that promote student success (including investment in the Student Success Center). Student-athletes, of course, benefit from all of these general institutional efforts. In addition, they are required to attend monitored daily study halls and have access to tutors to help them with their class work. Athletic personnel (the Athletic Director and coaches alike) assured this review team that student-athlete academic performance is one of the six measures on which coaches' performance is measured annually. The most recent NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR) data indicate that these efforts are generally productive. With the exception of men's basketball, all of ULM's teams have achieved APRs above the NCAA required minimum and/or are performing better academically than the student body as a whole. The Athletic Director and the incoming men's basketball coach are committed to improving APRs for this team.

In sum, intercollegiate athletics remain a vital part of institutional life at ULM and represent the potential to increase community and alumni support. Among the ways in which such increased support could be generated, in the opinion of this review team, would be to schedule regular athletic contests (particularly football) between ULM and its two "natural" local rivals, Grambling and Louisiana Tech. A number of individuals both within and outside the university told this review team that there has been no bigger

community event in recent years than the GSU-ULM football game played in Monroe in 2007. Although the ULM Athletic Director sees great value in repeating such events regularly, it will likely take the active involvement of ULM's new leadership to ensure that this occurs.

SECTION 8: INTER-INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS

Northeast Louisiana is fortunate to have four institutions of higher education available to its citizens: University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM), Grambling State University (GSU), Louisiana Tech University (LTU), and Louisiana Delta Community College (LDCC). Conversations with many constituencies such as governing board members, state legislators, community leaders, college and university leaders, faculty, staff, and alumni, made it clear that the continuing decreases in tax-supported appropriations necessitate all four of these institutions to explore unprecedented ventures of cooperation.

The good news to be shared about this topic is that the three universities have, through the years, demonstrated that they can cooperate even though inter-institutional cooperation requires immense energy and trust. ULM, GSU, and LTU cooperate in providing observation opportunities for students in child development. ULM and LTU have collaborated in the offering of master's degrees in History and English and are doing so with a new EMBA venture in Monroe. The new LDCC and ULM are working on articulation agreements to ensure that there is a smooth transfer of students without loss of credit. ULM continues to allow LDCC students to participate in intramural sports and use facilities, even though LDCC has its own new impressive facilities and campus. There are other cooperative arrangements that could be cited to demonstrate that these universities have cooperated in the past.

ULM leadership, in concert with the leadership of other two- and four-year institutions, should meet regularly to identify specific academic programs, student services, athletic opportunities, and research initiatives that can provide the basis for collaboration and effective partnerships. Since "necessity is the mother of invention," the sharply declining revenue from the state will give these institutions an opportunity to develop a much needed national model of voluntary inter-institutional cooperation. In this model all institutions could be vital and maintain their useful traditions as much as possible while their individual contributions are recognized and acknowledged.

Given the decreasing state financial support for public higher education and the continuing educational needs of the people in Northeast Louisiana, it is recommended that the four state-supported institutions move quickly to collaborate in as many ways as possible to maintain high quality higher education in this region. Regular meetings of the presidents will be helpful in building relationships which are essential for effective collaboration.

SECTION 9: EXTERNAL RELATIONS

The opportunity to talk with many people external to the University indicated that ULM is growing in acceptance, support, and respect. Obviously, this increasing goodwill provides an enviable basis for additional gains among external publics.

Northeast Louisiana benefits substantially by having ULM located there. The economic impact is obvious and easily understood. A recent economic and community impact study conducted by the UL System recognized a total spending impact of \$350 million and the creation of over 3,600 jobs for the state. What is not as obvious are the many ways the university impacts the area through professional and volunteer services. Several examples are the Warhawks' Mentoring Program, in which 52 trained ULM student mentors relate to students in two area schools; and programs in the health sciences provide speech and hearing clinical services, dental hygiene, and nursing services to the general public. The teacher education program provides a variety of services to schools and has recently been cited as a model. The university arts activities in abundance enrich community life and ULM athletics provide exciting entertainment.

Alumni Relations

Alumni relations are critical to external understanding of and support for the University. Those alumni who visited with this review team expressed appreciation for their alma mater and expect it to continue to be a valued member of Louisiana higher education. University staff are aware that the quality and content of all alumni publications should be the best possible to increase the numbers of loyal alumni. University personnel who are on campus daily perhaps grow accustomed to the pleasant and well-kept campus and may forget that it is an important element in developing alumni pride. Many alumni remember when the buildings and grounds were not as impressive as they are today. The University would do well to bring as many alumni as possible to campus at every opportunity to see the beauty of this institution and to review current information about

ULM. Such activities require an investment in time, energy, and resources, but the dividends will be significant.

Media Relations

The local media are always interested in learning about the university and are an important vehicle for communicating with the larger public. The university has professional staff to provide press releases to the media about developments within the university. As members of the media said at the public forum, in addition to good news, the university must be forthcoming with university information that may be embarrassing or disappointing to the institution. Experience teaches that when a university shares “good” and “bad” news in a timely manner, media relations are enhanced by the strengthening of confidence in university leaders and media staff. **Hence, it is recommended that the institution make a concerted effort to develop better relations with the media to increase public support; media relations staff should provide continuous coverage about the many ways the university serves and enhances the state and the surrounding area.**

University Advancement

Interviews with advancement staff indicate that they are knowledgeable about their unique responsibilities and are proud to be affiliated with ULM. Gifts to ULM grew by 50%, from \$2,016,640 in 2001 to \$3,071,613 in 2009. Regrettably, the downturn in the economy in 2009 and 2010 took its toll on those gains. As state support diminishes, private gifts are even more important. **To assist the advancement staff in meeting the university’s need for more external gifts, consideration should be given to developing the areas of planned giving, major gifts, and eventually a comprehensive campaign.**

External Contracts and Grants

External contracts and grants provide a very desirable source for revenue enhancement. Over the past four fiscal years, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010, ULM faculty, staff, and administrators have been successful in bringing in a total of \$61,021,566, or an average of over \$15 million per year, to the university. Yet the university has greater need than ever for heightened grants and contracts activity. Concerns were expressed about the procedures for the processing of grant applications within the university and a need for streamlining. There was also mention of the need for assistance in locating sources of funds and writing applications.

To encourage proposals for contracts and grants, the university should review its policies and procedures to ensure expeditious processing of such proposals; further provide adequate infrastructure; and, as resources are available, fill the position of Director of the program.

SECTION 10: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. ULM should develop a strategic plan that will define and articulate its mission for the next decade particularly in recognition of changes in the external (including budgetary) environment.
2. ULM should review the impact of increased faculty workload on its accredited programs to determine which, if any, accreditations may be at risk, as well as the steps necessary to maintain desired program accreditations.
3. ULM should review its strongest and/or unique academic programs to determine which should be designated as “Centers of Excellence,” and what might be needed to ensure their continued excellence.
4. ULM should review its three remaining two-year degree programs to determine which, if any, it can transfer to Louisiana Delta Community College in light of their competencies and capacity. An associated plan for implementation should be developed.
5. ULM should develop a strategic plan, policies, and processes to ensure that the delivery of online programs is consistent with institutional mission, standards, and workload policies.
6. ULM should clearly communicate to faculty, staff, and students in a timely manner all decisions concerning the development and staffing of online programs.
7. ULM should review its faculty workload and tenure and promotion policies and practices to ensure that they are consistent with the mission of the university.
8. ULM should ensure continuation of strong shared governance, which has helped to maintain a sense of community even in this difficult budgetary climate.

9. ULM should include staff representatives, including classified staff, on committees and other policy-making groups so that the university can have the benefit of staff viewpoints.
10. ULM should communicate with all staff, including classified staff, regarding such matters as goals, achievements, issues, and the general welfare of the university.
11. ULM should intensify its efforts to offer seamless student services and advising using the wealth of programs already in place, so as to assist potential students from earlier ages through enrollment at ULM and beyond. These efforts must be complemented with tracking and evaluation systems to ensure their success and effectiveness.
12. ULM should give consideration to providing financial resources and other career enhancing measures which recognize and encourage student persistence and success beyond the first two academic years.
13. ULM should communicate decisions which directly affect students as soon as they are made.
14. ULM should develop a strategic plan for athletics that reflects commitment to successful participation at the current level and that takes into account institutional budget realities, as well as current and projected levels of community support.
15. ULM should move quickly to collaborate in as many ways as possible with Grambling State University, Louisiana Tech University, and Louisiana Delta Community College given the decreasing state financial support for public higher education and the continuing educational needs of the people in Northeast Louisiana. Regular meetings of the presidents will be helpful in building relationships which are essential for effective collaboration.

16. ULM should make a concerted effort to develop better relations with the media to increase public support; media relations staff should provide continuous coverage about the many ways the university serves and enhances the state and the surrounding area.
17. ULM should consider developing the areas of planned giving, major gifts, and eventually a comprehensive campaign to assist the advancement staff in meeting the university's need for more external gifts.
18. ULM should review its policies and procedures to encourage proposals for contracts and grants to ensure expeditious processing of such proposals; provide adequate infrastructure; and as resources are available, fill the position of Director of the program.

APPENDIX 1

PREVISIT AND CAMPUS INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS AND SCHEDULE

Mary	Adams	Susan	Duggins
Laurel	Andrews	Bobbye	Earle
Julia	Barnhill	Virginia	Eaton
Cory	Barton	Larry	Ellerman
Dawson	Beene	Catherine	Estis
Ronald	Berry	Steve	Farmer
Benny	Blaylock	Joe	Farr
Johanna	Boult	Tasha	Fisher
Brian	Bramstedt	Timothy	Ford
Katrina	Branson	Karen	Foster
Lillian	Brown	Mildred	Gallot
Ralph	Brown	Chris	Gissendanner
Keith	Brown	Paula	Griswold
Wayne	Brumsfield	Seth	Hall
Ronald	Bush	Johntavious	Hampton
David	Caldwell	Robert	Hanser
Patti	Calk	Anna	Hill
Kirby	Campbell	Sandy	Hill
Sarah	Carriger	Frank	Hoffman
Jeffry	Cass	Linda	Holyfield
Sean	Chenoweth	Erik	Hsu
Jose	Cordova	Anne Case	Hunks
Andre	Coudrain	Cecil	Hutto
Brian	Coyne	Mathew	James
Camile	Currier	Beverly	Jarrell
Kendall	Dawkins	Charles	Jastraw
Terrence	DeJongh	Seetharama	Jois
Jessica	Dolechieck	Rhonda	Jones
Danielle	Dugas	Amal (Khalil)	Kaddoumi
Brooke	Dugas	Kay	Katz

Laura	Knotts	Dan	Reneau
Sushma	Krishnamurthy	Stephen	Richters
Matt	Laird	Chris	Ringo
Stacy	Lamb	Fabio	Riveiro
Cindy	Leath	Luke	Robins
Sandra	Lemoine	Tracey	Rogers
Brianna	Love	Adam	Rogers
Megan	Lowe	Pamela Higgins	Saulsberry
Donna	Luse	T.J.	Scarborough
Malcolm	Maddox	Mary	Schmeer
J.D.	Malone	Cori	Scroggins
Anthony	Malta	Brook	Sebren
Mona	Martin	Caroline	Shade
Matthew M.	Mastusick	Winnfried	Sibille
Michelle	McEacharn	Don	Skelton
Sharon A.	Meyer	Ahmaad	Solmone
Lisa	Miller	Collin	Stagg
Randy	Moffett	Bobby	Staub
Sam	Moore	C. Turner	Steckline
Dave	Nicklas	Roxie	Stewart
Michael	Oates	Gary	Stringer
Madeline	Ocon	Bryan	Thorn
Eric	Pani	Ashley	Tonore
Van	Pardue	Allison	Walker
Gail	Parker	Mike	Walsworth
Wayne	Parker	Tom	Whatley
Joann	Perrer	Lindsey	Wilkerson
Jann	Perrer	Stan	Williams
Roslynn	Pogue	David	Williamson
Frank	Pogue	Monica	Winkel
Ava P	Pugh	Debbie	Wisenor
Wendel A	Ray	Laura	Woodward
Jordan	Rawson	Karen	Woolie
		Cord	Wright

INTERVIEW TEAM
MEMBERS

PARTICIPANTS

TITLE

8:00-8:20/LIBR 632

All members of team

Dr. Stephen Richters

Interim President

Vice Presidents

8:30-9:00/LIBR 705

All members of team

Dr. Eric Pani

Acting Provost for Academic Affairs

9:10-9:40/LIBR 705

All members of team

Lisa Miller

Assc Provost for Enrollment Management

9:50-10:20/LIBR 705

All members of team

Dave Nicklas

VP for Business Affairs

10:30-11:00/LIBR 705

All members of team

Wayne Brumfield

VP for Student Affairs

11:10-11:40/LIBR 705

All members of team

Dr. Don Skelton

VP for University Advancement

11:50-12:30/ LIBR 705

All members of team

Bobby Staub

Director of Athletics

12:30-1:30/LIBR 706

All members of team

Deans

Dr. Jeffrey Cass

LUNCH WITH THE DEANS

College of Arts and Sciences

Dr. Ronald Berry

College of Business Administration

Dr. Sandra Lemoine

College of Education and Human Development

Dr. Benny Blaylock

College of Pharmacy

1:30-2:30/LIBR 651

All members of team

Faculty Group

to be determined

2:45-3:45/LIBR 622

All members of team

Senior Administrators

Tom Whatley

Asst V.P. Technology & CIO

Gail Parker

Asst. V.P. of Finance

Bryan Thorn

Director of the Physical Plant

Larry Ellerman

Chief of University Police

4:00-4:45/LIBR 622

All members of team

COMMUNITY LEADERS/LEGISLATORS

Katie Murphy

Senator Kostelka's office

Mike Walsworth

Senator

Frank Hoffman

Representative

Kay Katz

Representative

WEDNESDAY SEPT 15

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<u>TIME/ LOCATION</u>	<u>INTERVIEW TEAM MEMBERS</u>
5:00-6:00/LIBR 622	All members of team

PARTICIPANTS

Foundation
Malcom Maddox
Van Pardue
Joe Farr
Linda Holyfield
Dr. Don Skelton

TITLE

Foundation President
Foundation Vice President
Foundation Past President
Foundation Member
Foundation Executive Director

THURSDAY SEPT 16

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<u>TIME/LOCATION</u>	<u>INTERVIEW TEAM MEMBERS</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>TITLE</u>
8:00-9:00/LIBR 651	All members of team	<u>Dept Chairs</u>	College of Arts and Sciences College of Business Administration College of Education & Human Development College of Health Sciences College of Pharmacy Graduate School
9:15-10:00/LIBR 651	All members of team	<u>Student Leaders</u>	to be determined
10:15-11:15/LIBR 622	All members of team	<u>Faculty Senate Officers/Board</u> Anita Hill Matthew Matusiak Cecil Hutto Megan Lowe	Chair Secretary
11:30-12:00 LIBR 609	Aubrey Lucas	<u>Issue Specific Senior Staff External Affairs</u> Laura Woodard Keith Brown	Director of Media Relations Exec Director of Alumni and Community Relations
LIBR 705	Portia Shields	<u>Senior Staff Student Affairs</u> Camile Currier Karen Foster Joann Perrerr	Asst V.P. for Student Affairs Dir of Univ Counseling Center Articulation Officer
LIBR 622	Gary Reichard	<u>Athletics</u>	Coaches
12:00-1:00/LIBR 706	LUNCH	Dr. Luke Robins	Chancellor of LA Delta Community College

<u>TIME/LOCATION</u>	<u>INTERVIEW TEAM MEMBERS</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>TITLE</u>
1:15-2:15/LIBR 651	All members of the team	<p><u>Staff Senate</u> Susan Duggins (President) Chris Ringo (Vice Pres) Kirby Campbell Katrina Branson Bryan Thorn Tasha Fisher Gail Parker Cori Scroggins Catherine Estis Cindy Leath Lindsey Wilkerson Anthony Malta Mary Schmeer Camile Currier Laura Knotts Pamela Saulsberry Roslynn Pogue</p>	<p>Enrollment Mngt Physical Plant External Affairs Human Resources Physical Plant Compliance Services Budget Office Financial Aid Student Affairs University Development University Relations Registrar's Office Recruitment and Admissions Student Services Student Life and Leadership Social Work Career Connections</p>
1:45/LIBR 622	Dr. Portia Shields	Dr. Frank Pogue	President Grambling State University
2:30-3:30/LIBR 651	All members of the Team	<u>Student Group</u>	to be determined
3:45-4:45 LIBR 706 LIBR 622	Aubrey Lucas Gary Reichard	<p><u>OTHER</u> Dr. Dan Reneau</p> <p><u>Alumni</u> Ron Bush Bobbye Earle Sam Moore Adam Rogers</p>	<p>President LA Tech University</p> <p>Past President President Elect</p>

FRIDAY SEPT 17

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<u>TIME/LOCATION</u>	<u>INTERVIEW TEAM MEMBERS</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>TITLE</u>
9:00-10:00/SUB Ballroom A	All Members of Team	PUBLIC FORUM	
10:00-10:30/LIBR 623	All Members of Team	<u>Interim President</u> Dr. Stephen Richters	Interim President
10:30-12:00/LIBR 705	All Members of Team	Team Review	

APPENDIX 2

DR. GARY W. REICHARD

Gary W. Reichard served as Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer for The California State University from February 2006 until July 2009, with responsibility for leading system-wide academic planning and program implementation, staffing the CSU Board of Trustees Committee on Educational Policy, and working with presidents and provosts throughout the twenty-three-campus CSU system to ensure strong and consistent implementation of system priorities and programs. As Executive Vice Chancellor, Dr. Reichard coordinated the Board of Trustees' 2006-2008 strategic planning initiative, which produced the CSU's new system plan, *Access to Excellence*.

Prior to serving as the CSU system's chief academic officer, Dr. Reichard held senior leadership positions at California State University, Long Beach, an institution of over 30,000 students. From 2002 to 2006, he served as Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; for the eight years prior, he was Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel, Planning, and Assessment—a position in which he was primarily responsible for faculty affairs and academic labor-management relations. Dr. Reichard's earlier administrative positions included Director of University Honors (University of Delaware), Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (University of Maryland System), and Dean of Undergraduate Studies (Florida Atlantic University). He has also been a tenured faculty member at each university where he has served, including his initial appointment at The Ohio State University; in addition, he served as History department chair at both Ohio State and Florida Atlantic.

A specialist in recent United States History, Dr. Reichard is widely published in his field, and has contributed numerous papers and presentations on broad topics in higher education. He received his B.A. from the College of Wooster, his Master's Degree from Vanderbilt University, and his Ph.D. from Cornell University.

DR. AUBREY KEITH LUCAS

Dr. Aubrey K. Lucas is President Emeritus and Professor of Higher Education at the University of Southern Mississippi, where he served for 22 years as President. He had previously served as President of Delta State University for four years. Dr. Lucas earned his B.S. and M.A. degrees from Southern Miss and received his Ph.D. degree from Florida State University. Mississippi College awarded him an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters degree.

Prior to becoming a university president, he served as an instructor at Hinds Community College; Director of Admissions, Registrar, Professor of Higher Education, and Dean of the Graduate School at Southern Miss.

Dr. Lucas has served as a consultant to other colleges and universities and as president of state, regional, and national organizations. He recently served as Interim Commissioner of Mississippi State Institutions of Higher Learning. Several years ago he was selected by college and university presidents of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities to be chairman of that organization. He has been inducted into many honor societies and fraternities. He is a tree farmer and is retired from the Board of Directors of Mississippi Power Company.

Dr. Lucas is active in civic and charitable organizations as well as the United Methodist Church. He currently serves as the Lay Leader for the Mississippi Conference and has served on the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, the General Board of Global Ministries of the United Methodist Church, and on the Board of Directors of Africa University in Zimbabwe. He has served as Chair of the Center for Ministry at Millsaps College.

Dr. Lucas served as Chair of the Lauren Rogers Museum of Art Board of Trustees, Chair of the Hattiesburg Salvation Army Advisory Board, Chair of the Mississippi Arts Commission; Chair of the Mississippi Institute of Arts and Letters; Chair of the Board of Directors of the Hattiesburg Area Community Foundation, and has served on the Mississippi Humanities Council. He is a member of the Hattiesburg Convention Center Commission.

DR. PORTIA HOLMES SHIELDS

Portia H. Shields served as the C.E.O. of Concordia College from 2007 to 2009. Prior to serving as the C.E.O. Dr. Shields served as Albany State University's first female president for eight years. Under her leadership, the 107-year-old University was recognized as one of the strongest institutions in the University System of Georgia and her educational outreach initiatives attributed to this success.

Dr. Shields received her Ph.D. in Early Childhood/Elementary Education from the University of Maryland after obtaining a master's degree in Education from George Washington University and a bachelor's degree from the District of Columbia Teachers College. After completing a post-doctoral fellowship in West Africa awarded by the African American Institute, she began her distinguished career as a public school teacher, Howard faculty member, School of Education Department Chair and Director of Medical Education and Biomedical Communications at Howard University's College of Medicine. After three years at that position, Dr. Shields was promoted to Dean of the School of Education at Howard, where she served until coming to ASU.

As dedicated to community service as she was to the University under her charge, Dr. Shields served on a number of prestigious boards and committees, among them the Commission of Advancement of Racial and Ethnic Equity for the American Council on Education, the American Council on Education (ACE), American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO) and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE),

Among the founding presidents of the American University of Ethiopia and named one of Georgia's 50 Most Influential Women by the Georgia Informer, Dr. Shields is also the recipient of the University of Maryland's Distinguished Alumni in Education and Outstanding Leader in Education awards. Dr. Shields is the recipient of the 2006 Thurgood Marshall Leadership in Education Award and the 2006 recipient of the Education Leadership Award from her undergraduate alma mater. She has presented numerous papers and made presentations throughout the U.S. and the world. After nine years as president of ASU, President Emeritus Shields has been working on the African American Male Initiative with the Board of Regents, serving on several boards, writing and consulting.