University of Missouri Task Force on Academic Program Analysis, Enhancement, and Opportunities

Final Report

January 22, 2018

This report provides the final recommendations from the University of Missouri Task Force on Academic Program Analysis, Enhancement, and Opportunities (the "Task Force").

Introduction

Beginning with the first meeting of the Task Force on June 30, 2017, the members unanimously agreed that our work was to strengthen the University of Missouri (MU) as an Association of American Universities (AAU) member institution and a land-grant university dedicated to serving the people of Missouri through excellence in teaching, research, and outreach. This principle was present in all of our analyses, in every deliberation, at every meeting, and guided our final recommendations.

In the simplest terms, our charge was to examine all of the academic programs at MU and make recommendations for investment, combination, or inactivation. With this charge in mind, it was our privilege to meet with stakeholders in more than 50 meetings over the course of several months. In these meetings, we learned of excellent work done by our faculty, staff, and students in classrooms, labs and studios across the University. We ended this process with renewed appreciation for the outstanding work occurring at MU and with anticipation of opportunities for future innovation and growth. We hope that this report will contribute to ongoing initiatives focused on growing and strengthening our academic degree programs, further enhancing the experience and outcomes for our students, and providing research, engagement, and economic development that helps the people of Missouri, the United States, and the world.

Through the process of collecting and analyzing data and soliciting input from around campus, we realized that undergraduate programs are often highly interconnected across colleges. For example, sometimes courses in one academic program are required for majors in other programs, while in other instances a program with a small number of majors may make critical contributions to our general education curriculum. After discussing all of the undergraduate program data at length, we concluded that recommendations regarding undergraduate programs require a more extensive review that solicits a broader array of information and input than we have access to at this time. Consequently, our recommendations focus primarily on graduate programs. We believe that our recommendations here will strengthen graduate education at MU, which is itself of strategic importance for the training, teaching, and research missions of the university.

The faculty, students, and staff with whom we met offered compelling ideas for future interdisciplinary teaching and research that would involve multiple colleges. Yet we also heard of phenomena—some budgetary, some structural, and some academic—that were hindering pursuit of these ideas. We discuss these and hope that our report will be taken into serious consideration by the campus strategic planning and budget allocation committees as MU develops new and innovative plans for the future. Our work also revealed several instances of overlapping courses and academic content both within and across colleges. We discuss some of these in the report, but we encourage our colleagues to reflect further on their own programs in the broader context of educational offerings across MU and consider additional ways to collaborate with other programs across campus. Progress has been made, but there remain tremendous opportunities at MU for innovative interdisciplinary teaching and research. We hope

that our report contributes to efforts underway to innovate our approaches to teaching our students, developing research, and serving our state.

The task force went to great lengths to ensure we gathered the most accurate and current data available during the six and one-half months of our work. While we are confident of our findings, we note that they are based on the data and input available during the course of our review. Our efforts to obtain information revealed that the university has systematic issues related to overall data management and organization that need addressing if we are going to make informed data-based decisions.

As the University of Missouri continues to build the excellence of its teaching, research, and service to the state, it will be crucial to continue the work we have begun here. To that end, we strongly recommend the establishment of a permanent campus standing committee for the regular review of our programs along similar lines. Systematic data coupled with a thoughtful, consequential process for program evaluation will enable MU to innovate and adapt so that it can continually offer excellent academic programs that prepare our students to solve the problems of the future.

Task Force Formation

The formation and guiding principles of the Task Force were discussed in the Phase 1 report dated September 1, 2017 (http://provost.missouri.edu/about/academic-programs-task-force/index.php) and are summarized here.

The Task Force was formed in response to an April 3, 2017 message from UM System President Mun Choi on the topic of UM System Budget Guidance that specified, among other matters, the need for a comprehensive review of academic programs on the University of

Missouri campuses to "Identify programs to be protected with supporting performance measures that indicate excellence…. (and) Identify programs that no longer meet the goals of excellence and those that we can no longer afford to support…[1]".

Subsequently, Provost Garnett Stokes formed the Task Force for the University of Missouri Columbia campus (MU), and gave it three general charges: (1) Recommend areas for additional campus investment; (2) Recommend academic programs/units that could be combined or consolidated; and (3) Recommend academic programs/units for closure. Provost Stokes consulted with members of the campus community to identify Task Force members. She specifically sought individuals who had experience working with multiple units across campus, were familiar with program assessment and some of the data sources the Task Force would be using, and/or had recent experience in both administrative and faculty roles. She also ensured that the Task Force was diverse in terms of both demographic characteristics and academic background. Finally, she charged the Task Force members to make recommendations that were in the best interests of MU, even if they might have negative consequences for their home units. See Appendix A for a list of Task Force members.

Guiding Principles and Processes

Three core principles informed the work of the Task Force. First, the Task Force recognized that although budgetary considerations served as a catalyst for its work and were a factor in its deliberations, the group's primary focus was on making recommendations that would enhance educational, research, and/or engagement activities on campus and in the state. The Task Force was aware of the need to make recommendations that would provide some reduction

[1] See UM System President Budget Planning/Timeline: https://www.umsystem.edu/media/president/BudgetPlanning-MUFacultyStaff-20170403.pdf

in expenses and increase efficiencies, but we were not provided a specific target related to cost-savings. Second, the Task Force recognized that as one of the only comprehensive, land-grant, AAU-member institutions in the country, MU has a responsibility to (1) provide high-quality degree programs across diverse scholarly and professional disciplines that meet the needs of its students; (2) produce research and scholarship of the highest quality that addresses important societal issues in Missouri, the United States, and the world; and (3) actively engage with citizens of the state in efforts designed to enhance and improve their daily lives. Finally, the Task Force was committed to transparency and shared governance. As part of the data gathering process, the Task Force sought input and feedback from a host of campus constituents (described below). The Task Force met approximately every other week, for two hours, beginning June 30, 2017. The co-chairs organized and set the agenda for the Task Force meetings. Meeting time was devoted to providing updates from meetings with campus constituents, reviewing and evaluating data, and discussing recommendations related to the Task Force's charge.

Data Sources

The Task Force gathered a diverse array of quantitative and qualitative data in order to inform its deliberations and recommendations. For all quantitative variables, we created a multi-year average. In most cases, the averages included five years of data. Quantitative data that the Task Force used included:

- Student Census Data, including student credit hours and number of degrees awarded. These were examined both as totals and as ratios (e.g., per ranked faculty member), and examined separately for undergraduate, master's, and doctoral students.

- Results from the 2017 Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) audit. MDHE periodically conducts an audit of degree programs at public universities throughout the state and identifies programs whose average number of graduates falls below its threshold (10 graduates per year for an undergraduate program; 5 graduates per year for a master's program or graduate certificate; 3 graduates per year for a doctoral program). Each university is required to provide a response to MDHE for each identified program, stating its plans for the program along with a justification.
- Racial/ethnic composition of degree programs. For each degree program, we examined the percentage and raw number of students from underrepresented groups (students who are from ethnic groups that are under-represented at the university when compared to the total population of the state of Missouri (see https://glossary.missouri.edu/terms/underrepresented-minority.php)
- For master's and doctoral programs, we examined the average number of applicants, the average acceptance rate, and the average matriculation rate, as per data obtained annually by the MU Office of Graduate Studies. For doctoral programs, we also reviewed the average time to degree. For master's programs, the time to degree rates were more difficult to compare across programs because many programs award master's degrees as stand-alone degrees, while others award the degree on the way to a PhD, as well as to doctoral students who have not been successful but have completed the coursework/capstone expectations consistent with a master's degree.
- The National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity, also known as the "Delaware Data" (see http://ire.udel.edu/cost/). These data provide estimates of student credit hour cost and productivity for degree programs. We examined two specific measures: the average

student credit hour per FTE of instructional faculty and the total cost of instruction per student credit hour. These data provide one measure of program cost and efficiency compared to similar programs across the country.

- Research productivity data, including information from Academic Analytics that compared departments and programs to peer institutions in their fields and grant productivity data provided by our Office of Research. Academic Analytics produces a Scholarly Research Index (SRI) for each department/program in its database, which measures average research productivity across activities relevant to a particular field. Higher SRI scores indicate greater research output relative to peer institutions.[2] In instances where questions emerged about a unit's overall SRI score, the Task Force followed up with a more focused examination of the unit and its faculty (e.g., examining individual level faculty data; examining departmental data across individual research metrics like grant dollars, journal articles, books; etc.). In terms of grant data, the Task Force examined total grant dollars attributed to a unit via shared credit and via administering unit, as well as grant dollars that fall under AAU Phase 1 and Phase 2 indicators (see https://www.aau.edu/who-we-are/membership-policy). The Task Force also used Academic Analytics to compare a unit's grant dollars per faculty member to similar programs and departments around the country.
- Descriptive comparisons of similar degree programs housed in different units.
- The Task Force examined other data sources that were not always directly related to individual academic programs or departments, but nonetheless provided information relevant to its charge (e.g., comparisons by Classification of Instructional Programs [CIP] code of

[2] The Task Force recognized the limitations of Academic Analytics data, including the lack of appropriate national comparators for some units, the time-lag between now and the period for which the data is captured, and the fact that some indices of scholarly productivity are not captured by Academic Analytics. As such, these data were not viewed in isolation but instead as part of a comprehensive review of programs' activities.

degrees awarded at MU versus other state institutions; see https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55).

The Task Force collected qualitative data during meetings with administrators, faculty, students, staff, and retirees. In consultation with members of the campus community, the Task Force strove to ensure all interested individuals/groups had opportunities to meet with the Task Force. To this end, we initiated meetings with numerous faculty, staff, and student groups; agreed to meeting requests that were received; made information available on the Provost website (http://provost.missouri.edu/about/academic-programs-task-force/index.php); and held an open forum. During these meetings, attendees provided input and feedback related to the Task Force's charge. The Task Force attempted to identify themes and patterns from these meetings, as well as instances where qualitative and quantitative data corroborated each other. The Task Force held 39 meetings with campus constituents (see Appendix B for a list of the meetings and dates on which they were held), including the following groups and individuals:

- Separate faculty meetings with each school/college
- A forum open to all MU faculty
- Faculty Council
- Staff Advisory Council
- Individual meetings with each dean
- The Vice Chancellor for Research, Graduate Studies, and Economic Development
- The Vice Chancellor for Inclusion, Diversity, and Equity, along with representatives of his staff
- The Provost's Staff

- Representatives from the Missouri Student Association, Graduate Professional Council, and Graduate Student Association
- Representatives of the MU Retirees Association (MURA)

Campus Initiatives Announced Prior to the Issuance of the Task Force Report

Three decisions were made by campus units during the course of the Task Force's work that were relevant to its charge and deserve mention in this report. First, the College of Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources (CAFNR) inactivated two undergraduate degree programs (see Table 1).

Table 1: Degree Programs Inactivated by CAFNR

Program Name	Degree	Rationale
Agricultural Economics	BS	Declining Enrollment, Merged with agribusiness management degree
Science and Agricultural Journalism	BS	Low Enrollment, Overlap with Other Units

Second, as of Fall, 2017, the College of Arts & Science formally combined several degree programs and two departments into the School of Visual Studies. The Department of Art, the Department of Art History and Classical Archeology, and the undergraduate degree programs in Film Studies and Digital Storytelling were combined into one unit. The opportunities for scholarly and educational collaboration and curricular and administrative efficiencies led the faculty and College to bring the units together. Although only in its first year, the School of Visual Studies has been able to reinvest administrative savings and begin building stronger programs.

Recommendations for Program Inactivation

The Task Force identified two categories for program inactivation: 1) Programs with extremely low or no enrollment, and 2) programs with low enrollment that, combined with other factors such as low research productivity, appear unsustainable in their current form. The Task Force intends for these recommendations to serve as a starting point in strategic considerations of opportunities for innovation and growth in academic programs at MU.

Programs with Extremely Low or No Enrollment

MU has a number of programs and emphasis areas with extremely low enrollment (e.g., zero graduates over the past several years). These programs were identified via the most recent MDHE audit and an internal audit from the Office of the Registrar that identified programs that were not currently admitting students. In some instances, there were discussions between the Office of the Provost and the academic unit about inactivating these programs prior to the formation of the Task Force. In other instances, the Task Force briefly discussed the programs and recommended them for inactivation. These programs are included in Tables 2 and 3 below.

Table 2: Programs Recommended for Inactivation Due to Extremely Low Enrollment

Program Name	School/College	Degree	Rationale
Accounting Information Systems	Business	Graduate Certificate	Low Enrollment; Market Changes
Analysis of Institutes and Organizations	CAFNR	Graduate Certificate	Low Enrollment
Autism and Neurodevelopmental Disorders	Graduate Studies	Graduate Certificate	Low Enrollment
Education Improvement	Education	Graduate Certificate	Low Enrollment; Lack of Faculty
Electronic, Commercial, and Intellectual Property Law	Law	Graduate Certificate	Low Enrollment

Energy Efficiency	Engineering	Graduate Certificate	Low Enrollment
European Union Studies	Graduate Studies	Graduate Certificate	Low Enrollment
Military Social Work	HES	Graduate Certificate	Low Enrollment; Lack of Faculty
Nuclear Engineering	Engineering	Graduate Certificate	Low Enrollment
Taxation	Law	Graduate Certificate	Low Enrollment
Career and Technical Education	Education	MEd	Low Enrollment; Lack of Faculty
Career and Technical Education	Education	EdSP	Low Enrollment; Lack of Faculty
Career and Technical Education	Education	EdD	Low Enrollment
Career and Technical Education	Education	PhD	Low Enrollment; Lack of Faculty
Clinical and Translational Science	Medicine	MS	Low Enrollment
Clinical and Translational Science	Medicine	PhD	Low Enrollment
Learning, Teaching, and Curriculum	Education	MA	Low Enrollment
Special Education	Education	EdD	Low Enrollment
Pre-Occupational Therapy	SHP	BHS	Curricular Changes

Table 3: Emphasis Areas Recommended for Deletion Due to Extremely Low Enrollment

Emphasis Name	School/College	Degree Program	Rationale
Administration and Supervision of Special Education	Education	EdSP in Special Education	Low Enrollment
Curriculum Development for Exceptional Students	Education	MA in Special Education	Low Enrollment
Curriculum Development for Exceptional Students	Education	PhD in Special Education	Low Enrollment
Family and Consumer Sciences Education	HES	BSHES in Human Development and Family Studies	Low Enrollment
Family and Community Services	HES	MS in Human Development and Family Studies	Low Enrollment
General	Education	EdSP in Special Education	Low Enrollment

Health Education and Promotion	Education	MA in Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology	Low Enrollment; Lack of Faculty
Health Education and Promotion	Education	MEd in Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology	Low Enrollment; Lack of Faculty
Health Education and Promotion	Education	PhD in Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology	Low Enrollment; Lack of Faculty
Mental Retardation	Education	MA in Special Education	Low Enrollment
Mental Retardation	Education	MEd in Special Education	Low Enrollment
Mental Retardation	Education	PhD in Special Education	Low Enrollment

Current Programs Recommended for Inactivation

In addition to the programs no longer enrolling students listed above, the Task Force identified several current programs that we recommend for inactivation. We recognize that these programs all have strengths, contribute to the university mission, and have individual faculty who have been successful and productive. Nonetheless, the Task Force found factors in each of the programs recommended for inactivation that suggest they are no longer sustainable; in these cases, the Task Force came to consensus in making recommendations for inactivation.

All of the programs recommended for inactivation in addition to those listed in Tables 2 and 3 are at the graduate level. For each graduate program recommended for inactivation, we provide context and our rationale. Primary factors that informed the Task Force's recommendations included a low number of average graduates per year and low faculty research productivity when compared to peer institutions. Although small programs are not necessarily unsustainable, a small number of graduates may be indicative of low student demand and/or a

limited job market for graduates. Research productivity was also seen as particularly relevant to graduate training, especially doctoral training, where it is essential that students be taught and mentored by productive scholars in their disciplines. High research productivity also aids in graduate student recruitment and eventual job placement. Other factors that informed our recommendations included average time to degree and average number of applications for admission into the program. Inactivating these graduate programs may free up resources that could be used to strengthen the undergraduate programs within their units. For example, faculty in these departments who were teaching smaller graduate seminars could be reassigned to teach undergraduate courses. Closing programs with very low enrollment may also spur the creation of new, interdisciplinary graduate programs that will have higher student demand and can draw on expertise across campus. Finally, pursuant to Missouri Department of Higher Education rules, students currently enrolled in these degree programs must have the opportunity to finish their degree.

- Agricultural Education—PhD., Rural Sociology—MS, PhD: It is the Task Force's understanding that the Division of Applied Social Sciences in CAFNR is considering consolidating or combining some of its graduate degrees. The Task Force identified three graduate programs within the division, the PhD program in Agricultural Education and the MS and PhD programs in Rural Sociology, which had low average numbers of graduates per year. The Task Force recommends that these programs be inactivated and that the division consider developing an overarching interdisciplinary or integrated graduate degree program.
- Applied Mathematics—MS: The mathematics department at MU offers two master's degree programs—an MA in Mathematics and an MS in Applied Mathematics. The MS program has

low enrollment relative to the MA program, and the Task Force recommends inactivating the MS program and focusing on increasing enrollment in the MA program.

- Art History and Archaeology—MA, PhD: The Task Force recommends inactivating the master's and doctoral programs in Art History and Archaeology. The primary rationale for this recommendation include the small average number of graduates per year from both of these programs, the extremely high average time to degree for students in the doctoral program, and concerns about research productivity among faculty in the program relative to peer institutions.
- Classical Studies—MA, PhD: The Task Force recommends inactivating the master's and doctoral programs in Classical Studies/Classical Languages, which are housed in the Department of Ancient Mediterranean Studies. The rationales for this recommendation include the small average number of graduates per year from these programs, the very high average number of years to degree for PhD students in this program, and the low research productivity among program faculty relative to peers.
- Clinical and Diagnostic Sciences—MHS: The Task Force recommends inactivating the Master of Health Science degree in Clinical and Diagnostic Sciences. It is the Task Force's understanding that students in only one of the department's program areas, Diagnostic Medical Ultrasound, receive this degree. One rationale for this recommendation is that enrollment in this master's degree program is relatively small. Additionally, a master's degree is not required for certification/ licensure as a diagnostic medical sonographer or ultrasound technician.
- Chemical Engineering—PhD: The Task Force recommends inactivating the doctoral program in Chemical Engineering. The rationale for this recommendation includes low

average number of graduates per year and very low research productivity in comparison to peer institutions. Further, inactivating the doctoral program in Chemical Engineering will allow the School of Engineering at MU to focus its efforts in other areas. Because Missouri S&T offers a doctoral degree in Chemical Engineering, interested students can still obtain the degree within the UM System.

- Dispute Resolution—LLM: The Task Force recommends inactivating the master's degree program in Dispute Resolution. The primary rationale for this recommendation is low enrollment in this program with no expectation of future growth. The Task Force recognizes that the School of Law has expertise in dispute resolution, but it believes that the school can continue to excel in the area without the master's program. For example, the Task Force recommends no changes to the professional certificate in Dispute Resolution offered by the school, nor does it recommend changes to the Center for the Study of Dispute Resolution within the school.
- Nuclear Engineering—MS, PhD; Nuclear Safeguards Science and Technology—Graduate Certificate: The Task Force Recommends inactivating the master's degree, doctoral Degree, and graduate certificate in Nuclear Safeguards Science and Technology. It is the Task Force's understanding that these programs are currently not accepting new applications. There have been faculty members affiliated with these degree programs who have been individually productive, but over the past several years there have been documented organizational and administrative challenges associated with the Nuclear Engineering academic programs. Inactivating the Nuclear Engineering programs will allow the college to focus its efforts in other areas. Missouri S&T offers the Nuclear Engineering degree at both the graduate and undergraduate level, meaning the UM System will still offer training and

education in the area to residents of the state. Finally, the Task Force has been informed that inactivating this program will have no negative impact on research activities at the MU Research Reactor.

- Personal Financial Planning—Graduate Certificate, MS, PhD Emphasis area within the Human Environmental Sciences Degree Program: The Task Force recommends inactivating the master's degree, graduate certificate, and PhD emphasis area in Personal Financial Planning. The rationale for this recommendation includes the small number of average graduates per year from these programs and relatively low research productivity compared to peer institutions. Further, a graduate degree is not required for certification/ licensure as a financial planner.
- Religious Studies—MA: The Task Force recommends inactivating the master's program in Religious Studies. The primary rationale for this recommendation is the small number of average graduates per year from this program. Additionally, there are very few applicants to the program each year. The Task Force was also concerned about the research productivity among faculty in the program relative to peers.
- Romance Languages—PhD: The Task Force recommends inactivating the doctoral program in Romance Languages. The primary rationales for this recommendation are the small number of average graduates per year from this program and the low number of applicants each year. The Task Force was also concerned about the high average number of years to degree for PhD students in this program, and research productivity among faculty in the program relative to peers. As discussed in more detail in the section of the report on potential combinations and consolidations, the Task Force recommends creating a consolidated

master's degree program that includes Romance Languages, German, and Russian and Slavonic Studies.

- School of Medicine—PhD programs: The School of Medicine is currently engaged in a process to address the future of PhD training in the school. Specifically, the school is considering developing a single interdisciplinary degree program, an idea the Task Force endorses. Several of the individual PhD programs suffer from low enrollment and/or relatively low faculty research productivity in comparison to peers. Additionally, feedback from constituent meetings suggested institutional benefits to an integrated interdisciplinary program. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that the School of Medicine pursue creating a new integrated interdisciplinary doctoral degree program, and subsequently inactivate the individual PhD programs in Biochemistry, Medical Pharmacology and Physiology, Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Nutrition, and Pathobiology.
- Graduate Certificate Programs: The Task Force recommends inactivating three graduate certificate programs, primarily due to the small number of graduates. The specific certificate programs recommended for inactivation are Center for the Digital Globe, Gerontology, and Lifespan Development.

Programs Recommended for Further Review at the Unit Level

The Task Force reviewed a group of programs in which significant concerns were identified, and we concluded that these programs may be in a position to address the identified concerns. Therefore, we recommend that academic units be charged with developing plans for addressing program limitations and be reevaluated at a future date (e.g., in 3 years), as an alternative to inactivation at this time.

- American Law—LLM: This new program has low enrollment and is not strongly linked to the core mission of the School of Law. If enrollment in the program does not increase, it should be considered for inactivation.
- Biological Engineering—PhD; Industrial Engineering—PhD: The Task Force identified concerns with the doctoral programs in Biological and Industrial Engineering, which are discussed together because of overlapping concerns. These included low research productivity relative to peer institutions; low external funding, particularly funding that counts as a Phase I AAU indicator; and, in the case of Industrial Engineering, relatively few PhD students. The primary reason that the Task Force is not recommending inactivation of these programs at this time is that they connect with areas of potential interdisciplinary strategic investment, which are noted later in this report. Nonetheless, we recommend that these departments develop plans for increasing their scholarly output, particularly in terms of external funding, and that they be reviewed in the near future.
- Food Science—PhD: The Task Force identified concerns with the doctoral program in Food Science. The primary concern involved low level of research productivity, particularly very low grant activity, relative to peer institutions. Food Science may connect with some of the areas of investment identified later in this report, however, and so the Task Force is not recommending inactivation at this time. If the university decides not to make these investments, the doctoral program should be considered for inactivation.
- Genetics Area Program—PhD; Neuroscience—Graduate Certificate, MS, PhD: The Task Force identified concerns with the doctoral program in Genetics and the graduate programs in Neuroscience, primarily the low number of graduates per year. As discussed in the investment section below, one common theme the Task Force heard from its constituent

group meetings was the need for more interdisciplinary programs that can attract strong students and address societal needs. The Genetics Area Program and Neuroscience Programs have existed for some time on campus and have a high number of affiliate faculty, but they receive little central administrative support. The Task Force recommends that the University determine whether to invest in and support these interdisciplinary programs. If the University decides that such investments are not a priority, then the Task Force recommends inactivating these degree programs.

- Geological Sciences—BA, BS, PhD: The Department of Geological Sciences offers bachelor's, master's, and PhD programs, all with relatively low enrollment. Faculty in the programs teach a reasonable number of undergraduate student credit hours, and the unit as a whole is among the most cost-effective on campus. The department is also among the highest on campus in terms of external funding that counts as an AAU Phase I indicator. Given the considerable strengths in this department, the Task Force recommends that the department and university develop a strategy to increase the number of undergraduate majors and doctoral students.
- History—PhD: The Task Force identified concerns with the doctoral program in History, including low faculty research productivity in comparison to peer institutions and a relatively long time to degree. There are also well-documented concerns with the academic job market for historians. We recommend that the department enhance its scholarly output, reduce time to degree for its doctoral students, and identify strategies to help ensure that its graduates will be competitive on both the academic and non-academic job market. The PhD program in this department should be reviewed again in the near future.

- Learning, Teaching, and Curriculum—MEd; PhD: The Learning, Teaching, and Curriculum department, as a whole, graduates a relatively high number of master's and PhD students, and its research activity compares favorably to peer institutions. Within the department, however, there are a large number of emphasis areas, and the Task Force identified concerns with the viability of offering graduate degrees for all of them. There have been considerable differences across the emphasis areas in terms of the number of graduates per year, particularly in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, and Social Studies Education, and the Task Force recommends that the department consider focusing its graduate programs on a smaller number of areas of strength. These emphasis areas should be reviewed again in the near future.
- Sociology—PhD: The Task Force identified concerns with the doctoral program in sociology, primarily its very low faculty research productivity in comparison to peer institutions. Although the PhD program is relatively large, the low research productivity is of significant concern with respect to the quality of the program that the PhD students receive. We recommend that the department develop strategies designed to enhance its research output, which could strengthen the doctoral program. The program should be reviewed again in the near future.
- Truman School of Public Affairs—Graduate Certificates in Public Management and Organizational Change: The Task Force identified two graduate certificates offered through the Truman School, Public Management and Organizational Change, which have had steady but relatively low enrollment for a number of years. The Truman School offers several graduate certificates, and the Task Force recommends that the School thoroughly review its

graduate certificates and focus on a smaller number of areas that both have the potential for growth and contribute to the mission of the school.

Possible Combinations and Consolidations

A second charge of the Task Force involved identifying program areas that could be potentially strengthened and/or operate more efficiently through combinations and/or consolidations. The Task Force identified several such programs, although in some cases data that specifically support or refute combining/consolidating programs were lacking. Decisions to combine or consolidate programs need to consider factors such as curricular integration, possible accreditation issues, administrative issues, and space restraints. We recommend that administrative unit leaders work with faculty in the following programs to assess the pros and cons of combining or consolidating the following program areas:

- Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology (College of Education); Health Psychology (School of Health Professions); Psychological Sciences (College of Arts and Science). MU has three departments of psychology that each offer its own degree programs. Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology offers graduate degrees across a variety of emphasis areas (e.g., Educational Research, Methods, and Analysis; School Psychology). Psychological Sciences offers BA and BS undergraduate degrees in psychology, along with graduate degrees across several emphasis areas (e.g., Clinical Psychology, Social/Personality Psychology). Health Psychology faculty have historically engaged in primarily clinical and research activities, but recently the department initiated a Master's program in Applied Behavior Analysis. Both Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology and Psychological Sciences have a high number of graduates per year, and the research activity of faculty in the

departments compares favorably to peer institutions. The research activity of faculty in Health Psychology also compares favorably to peer institutions. Nationally, it is common to have multiple psychology departments across different schools/colleges at the same university. Yet, there may be benefits to combining the academic programs into a single unit, which would allow undergraduate students the opportunity to learn from a broader array of psychology faculty; enhanced opportunities for faculty collaboration; and administrative efficiencies. These benefits need to be weighed against potential costs, such as disrupting successful academic programs and logistical challenges associated with creating an extremely large academic unit. The Task Force does not have a specific recommendation regarding whether or not to combine these programs/departments, but recommends that administrators and faculty associated with the programs explore the issue in greater detail. Even if the program areas do not formally combine, there may be opportunities for enhanced collaboration across campus (e.g., having faculty from all departments teach undergraduate classes; collaborating across departments on research projects and graduate courses common to the different program areas).

- German and Russian Studies (College of Arts & Science); Romance Languages and Literatures (College of Arts & Science). The Task Force recommends that the College of Arts & Science consider combining the departments of German and Russian Studies and Romance Languages into a consolidated languages, literatures, and cultures department. The degree programs at the master's level (German, Romance Languages, Russian and Slavonic Studies) are relatively small and potentially unsustainable over time. However, if the programs were combined and some courses shared—such as comparative literature or culture—the programs could maintain specific emphasis areas. Some areas might still not be

sustainable, and the departments should consider which areas should be taught at both the graduate and undergraduate level. A combination of these programs into one department would generate administrative savings and create greater opportunities for collaboration that could enhance the educational experience of students in the units as well as faculty scholarship.

- Management: There are several academic programs on campus with a focus on management. One of the College of Business's four departments and core academic programs is Management. Additionally, CAFNR has several management academic programs, including Hospitality Management (a degree program housed within the Division of Food Systems and Bioengineering that includes several management emphasis areas) and Sport Management (an emphasis area within the Parks, Recreation, and Sport degree program, which is housed within the School of Natural Resources), and Human Environmental Sciences has degree programs in Textile and Apparel Management. The undergraduate programs in CAFNR are popular, typically averaging greater than 100 graduates per year. The Task Force discussed in multiple meetings whether the CAFNR management programs are currently housed in units where they are best positioned to succeed. The Task Force does not have enough data to make a direct recommendation regarding this issue, and it recommends that university leaders systematically consider the question and determine if there is a strong rationale to move one or more CAFNR management programs to a different academic home.
- Policy Studies: There are a number of units on campus that have a focus on policy studies. These include the Truman School of Public Affairs (which transitioned in September, 2017 from a stand-alone school to a unit within the College of Arts & Science), the department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis within the College of Education, the School of

Law, and several centers/institutes such as the Center for Family Policy and Research, Economics and Policy Analysis Research Center, the Institute for Public Policy, and the Kinder Institute on Constitutional Democracy. There are individual strengths associated with these units, and there seems to be some level of collaboration among many of them. Considering the importance of policy studies and their contributions to the State of Missouri, the Task Force recommends that university leaders systematically examine MU's policy-related educational, research, and engagement activities. The goal of this analysis would be to determine what initiatives could be implemented that would coordinate and enhance the university's policy-related efforts as a whole, including combining units.

Strategic Investments

During the course of our meetings with campus constituents, the Task Force heard a number of interesting ideas for future strategic investments. Furthermore, the data we collected indicated there are a number of strong programs on campus—based on factors including student interest, selectivity, and research productivity—that could become even stronger with additional support. However, we faced a number of challenges in identifying specific areas of investment. A primary concern was our inability to systematically gather information that would allow us to identify and compare areas of opportunity. From our meetings with constituents, we surmised that in only a few of the meetings was the Task Force viewed as being charged with selecting areas for investment; rather, participants most frequently had questions or ideas related to program inactivation or consolidations. When presented with ideas for investment, it was often difficult for the group to evaluate the viability or feasibility of the idea or initiative. Second, the Task Force believes it did not have sufficient information to effectively balance the relative

importance of building upon already strong and well-resourced programs versus investing in small/under-resourced programs with strong potential, where there are often greater returns to be gained. Further, it can be critical to invest in areas that are struggling but have the potential to meet important institutional goals, particularly because some programs are struggling as a result of recent budget cuts beyond their control. Third, it was difficult for the Task Force to think about recommendations for investment without also considering budgetary implications, which went beyond the scope of our charge.

Therefore, the Task Force decided to focus on a relatively small number of ideas for investment that primarily included broad areas encompassing multiple units. Most of these recommendations are based on feedback and input the Task Force received during meetings with campus constituents. During these meetings, it was relatively rare for meeting attendees to suggest investments in specific departments or academic programs. Instead, attendees often suggested investments in broader areas, disciplines, and societal challenges that would benefit the university as a whole. The Task Force gave greater weight to ideas that were presented across multiple units, particularly those that could also be evaluated with other data sources. We believe that the recommended investments below would strengthen not only those academic programs and departments affiliated with the initiative, but also would position MU well in the future, thus serving as a strong recruitment tool for both students and faculty for the university as a whole. Each recommendation includes a brief description and rationale. Please note that the order of the recommendations does not imply preference or priority.

- *Big Data Analytics.* During several meetings with constituent groups, Big Data Analytics was identified as a promising area for future investment. Big Data Analytics is defined as the study of large and varied data sets to address important questions across fields. This area

encompasses multiple schools and colleges, and it will likely have more societal importance and relevance as technological advances continue. It is important to note that the initiative is not limited to traditionally STEM departments or disciplines. Schools and colleges such as Education, Human Environmental Sciences, Business, and Journalism also have significant needs related to Big Data Analytics and could improve with more campus capacity in the area. MU has an interdisciplinary institute devoted to a range of data analytics applications, the MU Informatics Institute (MUII), which includes a degree program and may be able to serve as a foundation for future efforts on campus. Core faculty at MUII come from Arts & Science, CAFNR, Engineering, Human Environmental Sciences, Medicine, Nursing, SISLT, and Veterinary Medicine. With the emergence of iSchools (see http://ischools.org/), MU has the opportunity to become a major contributor to training information professionals within different disciplines. We recommend that campus consider investing faculty lines and other organizational support in Big Data Analytics, while also facilitating strategies to promote more coordinated efforts across campus.

- *Center for Teaching and Learning.* The need to invest in activities designed to promote better, culturally responsive teaching was addressed in many meetings with constituent groups. MU lags behind peer institutions in terms of its systematic support for improved teaching. For example, unlike most peer institutions, MU's current Teaching for Learning Center does not occupy any physical space. Perhaps because of this lack of support, peer institutions appear to offer considerably more services and programs designed to enhance teaching and learning on campus. MU needs to increase its support for the design and implementation of both in-seat teaching formats and on-line/distance or hybrid forms of teaching. Investment in resources, particularly space and dedicated faculty/staff, designed to

enhance teaching has the advantage of potentially improving virtually all academic programs on campus. In addition, this proposed center could contribute to the efforts to promote inclusion in the classroom by offering workshops for faculty and graduate teaching assistants, which would enhance the profile of diversity, equity, and inclusion across the campus.

- *Coordinated and Integrated Health Research*. The lack of coordination and integration among entities engaging in health-related research was frequently identified as a limitation on campus. MU has a rare combination of schools and colleges engaging in health-related research, being one of the only universities in the country with schools/colleges of health professions, medicine, nursing, and veterinary medicine, along with health-related initiatives in other colleges across campus (e.g., biological engineering, nutrition and exercise physiology). Yet, a common issue raised in the meetings was a lack of collaboration on research and teaching among these units. Future campus investments need to incentivize collaboration and focus on more coordinated, interdisciplinary efforts that could boost research output and enhance educational opportunities for MU students. For example, one idea mentioned in multiple meetings was the possibility of developing a human-animal cardiovascular research center, which would take advantage of existing expertise and serve as an attraction for future students and faculty. Another idea was a clinical trials center that could support both human and animal trials from multiple schools across campus. Paramount to the success of such initiatives will be the willingness of individual schools and colleges to work collaboratively with other units to advance common interests.
- *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion*. Addressing issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion is an important campus goal, and we recommend investments that will improve student, faculty,

and staff diversity on our campus and promote the critical concept of inclusion in our classrooms and curricular activities. One strategy is to invest in innovative programs that attract and retain a high percentage of students from underrepresented groups. For example, the Digital Storytelling undergraduate program has only been in existence for 1.5 years and already has 147 majors, 27% of whom are from underrepresented groups. Equally important are efforts to attract students from underrepresented groups to programs with traditionally low enrollment of such students. A second strategy is to add programming that will promote the success of students from underrepresented backgrounds in targeted degree programs. As one example, Biological Sciences graduates one of the highest proportions of underrepresented undergraduate students on campus, mostly due to its targeted fellowship programs. The resources required to support this program are an investment in enhancing diversity and inclusion in the life sciences, which in turn raises the academic and scholarly success of the program. We recommend that campus invest in these strategies designed to better infuse issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion across the broad campus curriculum and promote initiatives that encourage inclusive teaching. This could be a component of a substantially more robust center for teaching and learning, as discussed above. Finally, a renewed/continued focus on recruiting and retaining diverse faculty and staff is of paramount importance. This should be encouraged in every school and college, and will enhance the academic profile of the entire campus.

- *Interdisciplinary Degree Programs.* Perhaps the most common theme heard in Task Force meetings with constituents, including students, was the need for MU to invest in and support the development of interdisciplinary academic programs. The Task Force agrees with this observation, as the development of interdisciplinary programs reflects changing interests and

needs of students at both the undergraduate and graduate level. One specific example discussed in several meetings involves the concept of developing "stackable" certificates or focus areas that could lead to a graduate degree. Stackable certificates would provide students the opportunity to combine training in multiple areas relevant to an interest area or need, while still receiving an accredited graduate degree. In order to successfully develop more interdisciplinary programs, MU needs to address a number of administrative and environmental questions, some of which were detailed in a recent Interdisciplinary Task Force Report that was submitted to the Provost in November, 2017. One important question involves where interdisciplinary programs should be located. Previously, many interdisciplinary programs were housed in the Graduate School, but the Graduate School was disbanded in 2014 as a stand-alone unit. The existing Office of Graduate Studies is not an academic unit. A second important and related issue involves incentives on campus for developing interdisciplinary programs. Repeatedly, the Task Force heard that constituents believed that campus did not incentivize the development of interdisciplinary programs, considering the manner in which outcomes like student credit hours and research credit were assigned to individual academic units. In many cases, units understandably responded to disincentives for interdisciplinary work by providing no support, leaving interested faculty to do the work outside of their normal teaching, research, and service duties. Another common concern was the perception that MU's promotion and tenure processes are often not aligned with valuing interdisciplinary work. Thus, the Task Force recommends that campus develop processes and an administrative structure that promotes the growth and development of interdisciplinary programs that meet the needs and interests of potential students.

- *Interdisciplinary Research Programs.* The Task Force also regularly received feedback indicating that MU is not investing sufficiently in interdisciplinary research activities, which we address here briefly because such research when properly supported can enhance graduate education. The general sentiment among faculty members and many administrators was that interdisciplinary research collaborations almost always occurred via grassroots processes, with faculty members and students coming together organically and developing collaborative research projects. These types of collaborations are critical and indicative of a healthy academic community. What many faculty felt is missing, however, is systematic university investment in initiatives designed to promote and facilitate additional interdisciplinary collaborations that would help yield major research outcomes, such as federal center grants, which would also positively impact MU's academic programs. The Mizzou Advantage program was designed to facilitate such processes. Despite admirable efforts of individuals involved in the program, in many of the Task Force meetings there were questions about its current status and effectiveness as a mechanism to promote interdisciplinary research. The Task Force believes that if the university is serious about growing its interdisciplinary research, it will need to make significant strategic investments that will complement and facilitate the culture of interdisciplinary collaboration that already exists in many units across campus.
- *Sustainability and Security*. Investing in sustainability and/or security was mentioned in several campus meetings and is consistent with emerging societal needs. Sustainability has been identified by the College of Engineering as one of its strategic priorities, and is an area with expertise on campus that encompasses multiple colleges and departments. Likewise, addressing issues related to food, water, and plant security may capitalize on campus

expertise in areas including CAFNR and Veterinary Medicine. Investments in these areas can occur in engineering (e.g., industrial and manufacturing systems engineering), life sciences, law, and social sciences, as successfully addressing the issue includes the need to educate and motivate more sustainable and secure behaviors and policies, while also creating technological advances that promote efficiency, energy renewal, and improved security. The Task Force also received input suggesting that academic programs focused on sustainability would likely be a strong draw for students both within Missouri and across the country.

Recommendations for Additional Improvements

The Task Force made specific recommendations related to the three facets of its charge when the group believed that existing data supported such a recommendation. Yet, during a number of Task Force internal discussions on specific topics, it became clear the data that the group had access to was insufficient to inform specific recommendations or decisions. In some instances, the Task Force's work yielded additional questions or issues that could not be adequately addressed by the group given time constraints for the Task Force's charge and/or insufficient information. Based on the data gathered, the extensive meetings with campus constituents, and numerous internal discussions, the Task Force has a number of recommendations in terms of additional improvements for campus administrators and leaders.

1. This report should not be treated as the last word regarding decisions associated with its charge. The Task Force certainly hopes that campus administrators and faculty will give serious consideration to the findings in the report, and recognizes that they should be conceptualized as initial steps in developing a broader strategic plan for MU. The Task Force has made specific recommendations that are supported by the data to which it had access and

made in the best interests of the University, considering the challenges it is facing. Yet, there are a number of important questions and issues that the Task Force grappled with that we did not have the data or time to answer, or were beyond the scope of our charge.

2. The Task Force experienced challenges in making recommendations for future campus investments. Based on the data that were available, we could identify programs that were stronger than peer institutions in terms of research productivity; more popular than other programs on campus in terms of number of majors; number of graduates, etc., and generated more grant dollars than other programs on campus. However, our charge was not to identify the strongest or "best" programs on campus to recommend for investment. Relative strength on such metrics should be only one of several factors to consider when thinking about strategic investments. The Task Force encourages campus administrators and faculty to use the findings in this report to help guide their strategic decision making, but recognizes that decisions regarding campus investments need to be made in the context of a much broader discussion of what MU and the State value going forward and what resources will be available for such investments.
3. Specific recommendations regarding budget were beyond the scope of the Task Force. However, we repeatedly heard in meetings with campus constituents that MU's budget model creates a lack of incentives, or even disincentives, for collaborative/interdisciplinary activities. Issues such as how to assign "credit" for teaching in an interdisciplinary academic program, or how indirect dollars from an interdisciplinary externally funded grant are allocated, should not be barriers that keep faculty, students, and staff from pursuing such activities. The Task Force recommends that campus invest time and energy in developing a budget model that incentivizes interdisciplinary activities consistent with campus strategic

priorities. Relatedly, current budget models deter even more basic cooperation among units, for example by discouraging departments from teaching students majoring in other disciplines.

4. The Task Force did not make recommendations for inactivating undergraduate programs. Compared to graduate programs, undergraduate programs are often more interconnected in terms of providing a comprehensive education to MU students. For example, there are some departments on campus that have undergraduate programs with relatively few graduates per year, but whose faculty make substantial contributions to the general education curriculum. There are also programs that offer courses essential for majors in other programs. Therefore, eliminating an undergraduate degree program could have unanticipated ripple effects across the entire campus. MU also has a strategic goal of increasing the size of its incoming undergraduate class to 6,000 by 2023, which raises questions about concurrently reducing undergraduate degree offerings. In order to make recommendations for inactivating undergraduate degree programs or revamping undergraduate education, MU should consider convening a group to examine the academic, curricular, and financial complexities associated with offering the most effective undergraduate education on our campus.
5. Although beyond the scope of our charge, the Task Force received feedback about potential duplication/overlap of courses across campus. One common example involved different academic departments offering similar graduate research methods courses. Sometimes there may be a legitimate pedagogical justification for different units offering similar courses, but this may not always be the case. Identifying and eliminating unnecessary redundancies could save resources and enhance interdisciplinary connections among students on campus. Additionally, there are overlapping courses and programs across the UM System. While

these may often be needed to serve each campus's constituents, some programs already collaborate across the campuses. A review of opportunities for more collaboration should be undertaken.

6. The activities of the Task Force illustrated the significant problem MU has in terms of data storage and organization. Instead of being centrally stored, data that the Task Force needed were often located in different units across campus. Data definitions were often inconsistent across these units, and the lack of a common program/department identifier made combining the data extremely cumbersome. In many instances, a Task Force member had to enter manually relevant data for all of the campus programs, and when manual entry was not required, data had to be merged by hand. Instead of hours to build the data, it took days of work by the Task Force to put together the data required to review programs. Finally, there were variables that the Task Force thought would be available to help guide decisions, but for a variety of reasons remained unavailable. Campus should restructure the way it organizes, manages, and shares institutional data if it wants to engage in serious data-driven decision making.
7. Processes should be put in place to facilitate a more systematic and consequential examination of academic program performance. Academic programs at MU are evaluated on five-year cycles, with annual updates provided on a yearly basis, and usually all of a department's programs are evaluated simultaneously. Currently, detailed examination of enrollment and graduation trends are not included in the yearly update. Additionally, certificate programs are rarely a focus of the program review, and stand-alone certificates housed outside of an academic department may not be subjected to any regular review. One solution for these issues would be for Institutional Research to provide the Provost with an

annual report that summarizes the number of graduates, majors, time to degree, and student credit hours taught for each academic program on campus, which could be shared with each unit. The Office of Graduate Studies provides most of these data for doctoral programs that could serve as a model upon which to expand (see https://gradstudies.missouri.edu/academics/program-statistics.php). Doing so would allow faculty and administrators to be aware of concerns such as low or declining enrollment trends and to take appropriate actions. It would also allow faculty and administrators to see if new programs are meeting expected enrollments, and to take corrective actions if such programs are failing to thrive. MU could also consider creating a campus standing committee of both faculty and administrators that would regularly review the overall performance of academic programs, and make recommendations to the Office of the Provost. Such a committee could be integrated into program review processes (e.g., if the Office of the Provost identified concerns with a program during its review, it could be referred to this committee for additional review and recommendation).

Appendix A

Task Force Members

Cooper Drury (Co-Chair)	Associate Dean Professor, Department of Political Science College of Arts and Science
Tim Glass	Professor and Chair, Department of Chemistry College of Arts and Science
Jeni Hart	Associate Vice Chancellor for Graduate Studies and Associate Vice Provost for Advanced Studies Professor, Higher Education College of Education
Jill Kanaley	Professor and Associate Chair Department of Nutrition and Exercise Physiology College of Human Environmental Sciences School of Medicine College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources
Lynda Kraxberger	Professor and Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies School of Journalism
Matthew Martens (Co-Chair)	Faculty Fellow for Academic Programs, Office of the Provost Professor, Department of Educational, School and Counseling Psychology College of Education
Nicole Monnier	Teaching Professor, Director of Undergraduate Studies and Associate Chair Department of German and Russian Studies College of Arts and Science
Joi Moore	Professor and Director School of Information Science and Learning Technologies College of Education
Joe Parcell	Professor and Director Division of Applied Social Sciences College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources
Stephanie Reid-Arndt	Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Associate Professor of Health Psychology School of Health Professions
Ann C. Riley	Vice Provost for Libraries and University Librarian
Chris Robert	Associate Dean of Graduate Programs Associate Professor of Management Trulaske College of Business
Hani Salim	LaPierre Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering Associate Dean of Academic Programs

	College of Engineering
Stephanie Shonekan	Associate Professor of Ethnomusicology and Chair Department of Black Studies College of Arts and Science
Jim Spain*	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and eLearning Professor, Department of Animal Science College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources
Ben Trachtenberg	Chair, Faculty Council (2015-2017) Associate Professor of Law School of Law
Bill Wiebold	Chair, Faculty Council (2017-2018) Professor, Division of Plant Sciences College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources

* Recused himself after accepting the invitation to serve as interim provost.

Appendix B

Task Force Meetings with Constituent Groups

Date	Constituent
8/30/2017	Pat Okker, Dean, College of Arts & Science
8/31/2017	Kris Hagglund, Dean, School of Health Professions
9/1/2017	David Kurpius, Dean, School of Journalism
9/5/2017	Kathryn Chval, Dean, College of Education
9/6/2017	Ajay Vinze, Dean, College of Business
9/7/2017	Carolyn Henry, Interim Dean, School of Veterinary Medicine
9/8/2017	Christopher Daubert, Dean, College of Agriculture, Food, & Natural Resources
9/11/2017	Elizabeth Loboa, Dean, College of Engineering
9/12/2017	Sandy Rikoon, Dean, College of Human Environmental Sciences
9/13/2017	Judith Miller, Dean, School of Nursing
9/15/2017	Patrick Delafontaine, Dean, School of Medicine
9/20/2017	Mark McIntosh, Vice Chancellor for Research, Graduate Studies, and Economic Development
9/22/2017	Lyrissa Lidsky, Dean, School of Law
9/29/2017	Faculty Council-Academic Affairs Committee
10/12/2017	University Chair's Council
10/12/2017	Faculty Council
10/17/2017	J.D. Bower, Director, Honor's College
10/20/2017	Faculty-School of Law
10/24/2017	Graduate Faculty Senate
10/26/2017	Staff Advisory Council
10/27/2017	Faculty-School of Nursing
10/30/2017	MU Informatics Institute
11/1/2017	Faculty-College of Engineering
11/2/2017	Faculty-School of Veterinary Medicine
11/3/2017	Faculty-College of Agriculture, Food, & Natural Resources
11/3/2017	Faculty-School of Journalism
11/7/2017	Gary Ward, Vice Chancellor for Operations and Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
11/8/2017	Faculty-College of Human Environmental Sciences
11/8/2017	Missouri Students Association
11/9/2017	Faculty-College of Education
11/14/2017	Kevin McDonald, Vice Chancellor for Inclusion, Diversity, and Equity (included several staff members)
11/15/2017	Faculty-College of Arts & Science
11/16/2017	Faculty-School of Health Professions

11/28/2017	Faculty-College of Business
11/30/2017	Faculty-School of Medicine
12/6/2017	Graduate Professional Council and Graduate Students Association
12/8/2017	Faculty Open Forum
12/12/2017	MU Retiree's Association
12/13/2017	Provost's Staff