

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 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 proposed revised program review process (below) is a result of that meeting and subsequent changes proposed by FAC and endorsed by CAC with additional CAC changes. Changes in green proposed by FAC 11-9-16. FAC recommends establishing a separate Special Program Review process that will provide for more deliberative and thorough decision-making for threatened programs without unnecessarily slowing down the "regular" program review process.

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 **selected by the Faculty Senate** 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:
 - a) Continue program
 - b) Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
 - c) Continue program but improve other specific areas
 - d) **Modify program through consolidation with another program or other significant re-organization**
 - e) **Suspend admissions to program or**
 - f) Discontinue program
 - g) if the program is identified as needing major changes (e.g. suspension, discontinuation), the program will enter the Special Program Review process [to be established]

The Faculty Program Review Committee shall allow up to two representatives from the program under review to attend the meeting and to answer questions. The Faculty Program Review Committee will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review. ~~The recommendation shall be shared with the Faculty Senate President who has the option to respond to the provost within two weeks.~~

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and four administrative representatives from CRCD will review the recommendations of the **Faculty 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, **the Faculty Senate**, 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) **Other actions, such as a major program restructuring. An action plan will be required by the end of the next regular academic semester after a request for restructuring or similar action is made.**
 - d.) Recommend to discontinue program. **Program deletion will require Faculty Senate**

Comment [1]: Our discussion indicated a need for distinctions between the regular program review process and the special program review process --

Comment [2]: How would this selection process take place? (ie. would it be in conjunction with each school's dean/director with consideration for faculty workloads, etc)

Comment [3]: As president, it can be difficult to get people to agree to this kind of major service work.

Comment [4]: The Provost also spoke to the time commitment of this committee and suggested that the Provost's office work with deans and directors, submit a list of committee member names, and then Faculty Senate has a process to approve those faculty members

Comment [5]: It doesn't belong in this policy, but my hope is faculty senate can help ailing departments adapt and survive, rather than just be discontinued. I've started collecting creative ways to change how we do business here:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1q47BbrQvcQw9tLtOCX37g2K0shnQ0ySaKQkI97wUNuU/edit>

Comment [6]: We should discuss how widely I should share these recommendations. The advantage of wide sharing is the ability to collect input from more people. The disadvantage of wide sharing is the potential for programs to be harmed by an early-stage recommendation to suspend or discontinue becoming public, before it is even fully decided.

Comment [7]: I'm hoping this change clarifies that the president looks at the recommendation and narrative in parallel with the deans, not before they see it.

~~action. However, w~~ When appropriate, admissions may be suspended pending action.

4. Faculty Senate reviews the recommendations to discontinue or suspend programs and states their collective agreement or disagreement with the Provost's recommendation. If the Faculty Senate disagrees, it will provide an alternate recommendation. Program deletion will require Faculty Senate vote.

5. The Chancellor reviews all levels of recommendations and decides whether to recommend program discontinuation to the Board of Regents.