

SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO PROGRAM REVIEW - FOR DISCUSSION (ADDITIONS IN BOLD ITALICS; DELETIONS CROSSED OUT.)

Background: Given the potential for program elimination during the ongoing budget crisis and Strategic Pathways Initiative, and the need for establishing a clear process, a meeting took place with Vice-Provost Alex Fitts, Provost Susan Henrichs, and the chairs of several Faculty Senate committees. At this meeting revised language that clarifies the role of the Faculty Senate in program deletions was discussed. The suggested revised program review process (below) was a result. Our objective is to have the Faculty Senate approve a revised process no later than the December meeting.

The ~~new~~ program review process will be completed as follows:

1. An initial ~~brief~~ review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit provided ~~two-page brief~~ narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere at UA, and any special circumstances that explain features of the centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary (see attached program review template for more details). The information reviewed meets the Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; attached). A single Faculty Program Review Committee comprised of one ~~tenured~~ faculty representative from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus ~~five CRCD representatives~~ **one representative from CRCD and one representative from CTC** will review the materials and make the following recommendations:
 - Continue program
 - Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
 - Continue program but improve other specific areas ~~or~~
 - ***Suspend admissions to program or***
 - Discontinue programThe committee will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review.
2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and 4 administrative representatives from CRCD will review the recommendations of the Program Review Committee, may request additional information ~~from about~~ the program, and will state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.
3. The Provost in consultation with the Chancellor's Cabinet will review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:
 - a) Program continuation is confirmed ~~until the next review cycle.~~
 - b) Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by the next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.
 - c) Recommend to discontinue program. ~~Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, w~~ When appropriate, admissions may be suspended pending action.
4. ***Faculty Senate reviews the recommendations and states their collective agreement or disagreement with the Provost's recommendation. If the Faculty Senate disagrees, it will provide an alternate recommendation.***
5. ***The Chancellor reviews all levels of recommendations and decides whether to recommend program discontinuation to the Board of Regents.***

Notes:

#1 tenured or not? Both have merits.

#4 A. This separate item clarifies that the Faculty senate role is not simply a parenthetical tack-on. B. What exactly does 'action' mean?? C. Merely saying 'no, save the X program' is not sufficient.

#5. Reflects a (painful?) reality: 'shared' governance doesn't always mean 'equally shared'. In most UAF matters, the Chancellor usually has the final say. There is merit in making this situation clear to all.