

FLA Motions re IPRM Report

Motion 1 re: Proposal to reject the outcome of the IPRM process

Reiterating the concerns with the IPRM process that were expressed in the motion that was passed by the Divisional Councils of the Faculties Liberal Arts, and Human and Social Sciences stating:

Be it resolved: THAT the concept, method, data collection and analysis of the Integrated Planning and Resource Management process is so fundamentally flawed that this body has no confidence that it will provide reliable information upon which sound academic decisions can be made. As such, this body calls for the immediate cessation of the activities of the IPRM and the return of academic decision-making to the Senate, its rightful place as established by the WLU Act.¹

And that the following motion was passed by the Faculty of Arts:

Be it resolved that, having considered the careful arguments of our Brantford colleagues in their document entitled, "IPRM and the Brantford Campus: Some Observations of the Impact of Laurier's Program Prioritization Process on the Evaluation of Academic Programming at Brantford," this body shares the serious concerns of the Faculty of Liberal Arts and the Faculty of the Human and Social Sciences about the concept, method, data collection and analysis of the Integrated Planning and Resource Management process and about the ability of this process to provide reliable information upon which sound academic decisions can be made.

As such, this body calls for the immediate cessation of the activities of the IPRM and the return of academic decision-making to the Senate, its rightful place as established by the WLU Act.

Cognizant of many flaws in the quality of the report that has been produced, such as:

- The referral *within the same category* (e.g., Maintain) *and without apparent justification or explanation* to some programs, faculties and students as "high quality" or "successful" and not others;
- The assessments of declining enrolments, which do not take account of 2014 figures showing higher enrolments in the identified programs;

¹This is the wording of the FLA motion, as passed Feb. 3, 2014. Please see accompanying document "IPRM Motion and Observations January 29 2014" for background to the motion.

- The reference to certain programs as “niche” and “essential” while others of comparable size are described as “small”

The Faculty of Liberal Arts urges the Senate and Board of Governors to reject the IPRM Report’s recommendations regarding Academic Program Categorization.

Motion 2 re: Proposal to Institutionalize the IPRM Process

Bearing in mind that the University already has processes in place for the cyclical review of Academic programs;

Recognizing that many of the actions recommended by the IPRM with regard to academic programs were already being considered before the IPRM process began and had already been completed by the time the report was published;

Observing that the IPRM process has consumed an estimated 7000 hours of faculty and administrators' time (valued at an estimated \$1.3 million) that could have been used much more valuably in promoting the university’s mission through teaching, research, and non-IPRM-related service activities;

The Faculty of Liberal Arts calls on Senate and the Board of Governors to reject the IPRM Report’s recommendation to institutionalize academic program prioritization based on the IPRM methodology (Recommendations 16, 17, & 18), to reject the recommendations that would duplicate the work of the Vice President Academic, Deans, Divisional Councils, and individual departments and programs (essentially Recommendations 1 to 9) and to affirm their confidence in and commitment to the existing system of collegial governance and system of cyclical reviews of academic programs.