

**University Planning and Budget Council**  
**Special Meeting**

Approved Minutes

Monday, April 14, 2025

Third Floor Conference Room, Lovejoy Library

10:00 am

**Members Present**

Anne DeToye (*ex officio*)  
Candace Hall  
Kelly Jo Hendricks  
Doug James  
Barrett Larkin  
Kevin Leonard

Kimberly McClellan  
Jonathan Pettibone (Chair)  
Laurie Rice  
Michael Shaw  
Ian Toberman  
James Wulfsong

**Members Absent**

Keith Becherer  
Charles Berger  
Heidy Cuervo  
Rex Jackson

James Minor (*ex officio*)  
Mary Anne Pettit  
Jeffrey Sabby  
Kevin Tucker

**Guests**

Larry LaFond

- I. Call to Order  
The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. Jonathan Pettibone.
- II. Recognition of the Public  
Jonathan Pettibone recognized the Public in attendance. One member of the Public was in attendance, Garrett Ord, Student Government.
- III. Additions to the Agenda  
The link to the REFRACTR database is in Teams now. A member from Institutional Research will be in attendance at the next meeting to provide more information and instruction on how to work with Refractor as well as to go over terms.
- IV. Guest Speaker
  - a. Larry Lafond, Chair, Department of Art and Design  
Jonathan Pettibone introduced guest speaker Larry LaFond.

V. Old Business

a. Program Prioritization Proposal: Physics, Final Recommendation

Jonathan Pettibone began a discussion regarding finalizing UPBC's formal response to the Physics Department recommendation. Anne DeToye felt that the language was too strong in focusing on tenure-track faculty rather than on a combination of tenure-track faculty and lecturers. A question was posed as to what the importance of tenure-track faculty compared to lecturers was relating to instruction. The response was that tenure-track faculty have service and research requirements while lecturers have no service requirements but are required to keep current in their field. The wording in the memo was revised to soften the language and allow for more flexibility in the composition of the tenure-track faculty and lecturers for the remaining physics instructors.

Ian Toberman questioned whether physics positions could be shared across fields, such as physics instructors teaching the physics in engineering courses. Kevin Leonard stated that he is open to the possibility; however, the departments are extremely siloed and have had issues with complaints when attempting this in the past.

Kimberly McClellan mentioned that staff impact of a potential merger between departments was not addressed in the memo while faculty impact was addressed. The memo was revised to include concerns regarding potential staff impact.

There was a concern regarding the request in the memo that UPBC be consulted in the implementation of the process. Jonathan Pettibone stated that the intended meaning was that UPBC should have been involved in the proposal of the system process as the planning and budget entity for the University. The wording of this section was revised to better state the intended meaning.

The committee agreed that the main content of the memo was finalized. Jonathan Pettibone will clean up the remainder of the language and work with Michael Tadlock-Jackson to format the memo for submission. The finalized memo will be sent to the committee for final review.

Barrett Larkin stated that there was a Student Body Senate meeting that night and questioned whether the memo could be presented during the meeting. He stated that this was the most compromising of the responses he has seen and believes that it takes into consideration the Administration, faculty, and student concerns. Jonathan Pettibone stated that the memo should not be disseminated at this time as it should be submitted through the proper channels first; however, the Student Body Senate could be informed that a formal response to the recommendation was being drafted.

- b. Program Prioritization Proposal: Specialization in Art History, 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
Larry LaFond provided feedback from the Art & Design Proposal. He stated that the department is not far off from the proposal. They are willing to remove a faculty line resulting in a savings of \$86,000, to run Art History with the two remaining faculty and lecturers as needed, and to make a curricular revision to teach three 400 level courses per semester.

The department did question whether it was necessary to remove the Art History major and minor with the current savings from removing a faculty line. All courses in Art History are full, and as such, there would be nothing to gain by discontinuing the Art History major except loss of credit. Enrollment for Art has increased significantly with direct entry with an increase of 9-10% in Art History. The department has been focusing on attracting and retaining enrollment. In addition, all Art degrees require Art History courses.

Kimberly McClellan questioned whether students in Study Abroad students take Art History courses. Larry LaFond confirmed that there are courses offered through Study Abroad. Many students receive an Art History minor as it only requires a student to take any six Art History courses offered, and they have qualified for an Art History minor. Many other majors minor in Art History.

Kelly Jo Hendricks asked for clarification that the only savings with removing the Art History major and minor is from losing one faculty member. Larry LaFond confirmed that removing one faculty member's salary would be the only budgetary savings. Art History currently has one faculty member that is planning on retiring at the end of the semester. Kevin Leonard clarified that he has not received any paperwork from this faculty member committing to retiring, and therefore, he is hesitant to guarantee the savings at this time.

Larry LaFond stated the importance of the National Association of Schools of Art & Design (NASAD) based on alumni and faculty comments. The Art History degree is currently an NASAD accredited degree. The department is in the process of aligning with the other NASAD requirements.

A question was posed as to whether there would be an overload for the remaining faculty to teach the Art History classes with the loss of one faculty member. Larry LaFond stated that the department is capable of working out a solution that would not require any overload while still maintaining the offered classes. Kevin Leonard stated that he would look at the proposal. Previously, the department argued that they required an art historian position to be successful; however, they have since changed their position.

UPBC acknowledged that most of the cost savings would come from one person should the current proposal be accepted. However, the department also has

other longstanding curricular issues. A site visitor in 2021 recommended the administration take action to correct these issue. At the time, the Chair respectfully disagreed with the site visit and made no substantive changes to the curriculum. A concern was also raised regarding the ability of the department to continue to teach the required courses with one fewer faculty member while maintaining the quality of the degree.

Jonathan Pettibone questioned whether there were room in the Phase 1 process for additional choices rather than just removing the major and minor or keeping them as they currently stand, or can the program be moved into the Phase 2 process. Ian Toberman suggested a compromise where the department must change the curriculum as recommended by NASAD or the department will be recommended to be disbanded. Larry LaFond stated that the Art History courses are the revenue makers for the Art program as they bring in the most students per course.

Kevin Leonard indicated that he was open to saving the minor. A suggestion was made that the formal response should include an extended timeline of making curricular changes but with a defined end as to when the curricular changes must be made. Ian Toberman questioned the consistency of allowing one department an opportunity to move out of the Type 1 process which could open the door for another department to request the same treatment. Kimberly McClellan stated that each recommendation should stand on its own, and UPBC should not be concerned with making precedence.

Larry LaFond stated that he would attempt to have the department's response written and submitted to UPBC prior to the April 24 UPBC meeting so that UPBC can review and discuss the response prior to finalizing the UPBC formal response. The topic will continue to be discussed at the next UPBC meeting.

Larry LaFond left the meeting at 11:14a.m.

VI. New Business

- a. Program Prioritization Proposal: Department of Foreign Languages, 1<sup>st</sup> Review  
A representative from the Foreign Language Department was not available to attend today's UPBC meeting. This item of business has been moved to the April 24, 2025, meeting.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05p.m.

Next Meetings: ***Thursday, April 24 at 2:30p.m. Third Floor Conference Room, Lovejoy Library***  
***Tuesday, May 6 at 10:00a.m. Peck Hall, Room 3302***

Submitted by Christy Bosco, Office of General Counsel.