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Purpose of Review:

The purpose of this review is to position UNCG to be as strong academically as possible while maintaining a sound and balanced educational program that is consistent with its mission, strategic plan, and its functions and responsibilities as an institution of higher education. The review committees will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the University’s academic programs in terms of their contributions to these three areas. The context of this review includes an environment of diminishing resources in higher education, changes in mandates from the North Carolina legislature and UNC Board of Governors, and the impending UNC GA review of program duplication across the UNC system. One outcome of this process is likely to be the reallocation of resources, which may involve the enhancement of some programs and the discontinuation, curtailment, or combination of others.

Definition of Program:

“Program” is defined as a subcategory of an undergraduate major or field of graduate study in a degree offered at a particular level (e.g., Global Social Problems, Sociology BA; Criminology, Sociology MA). This definition includes interdisciplinary programs (both those housed in departments and those not housed in departments) but not initiatives that apply across programs such as disciplinary honors.

Step I: Inventory of Programs and Establishing Headcounts (February 2011)

At UNCG, each program has been assigned an Area of Study (AOS) code. The Director of Institutional Research and the Registrar will collaborate to produce a complete list of academic programs to be included in this review, organized by department and including degree or certificate level, AOS code, program name, and student enrollment headcount. Programs that have been initiated within the last two academic years and those that have already been officially discontinued (but still have students enrolled in them) will be excluded from this review unless the unit dean requests that they be included.

The Deans will work with departments to identify any cases in which AOS codes might reasonably be combined to comprise one program for the purposes of this review. Their recommendations will be due to be submitted to the Director of Institutional Research by February 11. Also during February, the proposed criteria and process for program review will be discussed with constituent groups and senior leadership, revised according to their feedback, and submitted to the Provost for approval.
Step II: Data Preparation, Collection, and Correction (last half of February through June 25, 2011)

Before March 2, the Office of Institutional Research will produce a quantitative program profile for each of the programs included in the inventory. UNCG collects most data at the department level rather than at the program level. Therefore, the Office of Institutional Research will also prepare a department profile including data that cannot be logically attributed to specific programs centrally.

During the last half of February while the quantitative program profiles are being prepared, program leadership will begin to gather and describe additional information to be considered along with the centrally-provided measures (e.g. job placement data, graduate professional enrollment of former undergraduates, national recognitions, opportunities to partner with other UNCG and UNC system programs, ways in which programs could be improved or enhanced).

Once the two quantitative profiles are available, program leaders will be given an opportunity to provide concise responses to each quantitative datum including corrections, if any; interpretations, if relevant; and comparisons with peers, if available. Simultaneously, the Office of Institutional Research will address problems with the data as they are reported by program leadership. [Program leaders were originally asked to submit additional information and responses to the elements of the quantitative profiles electronically to the Office of Institutional Research via two Qualtrics surveys, one a program survey and one a department survey. In response to concern about the accuracy, meaning, and appropriateness of the data, this deadline was extended and an outside consultant was hired to work with the Office of Institutional Research to address these issues. After the original survey responses were submitted and before May 25, the Office of Institutional Research provided program leadership with Microsoft Word templates including their survey responses.] Additional information will be provided to program leadership by June 25 so that they can finish or edit their responses before final submission.

Step III: Submission of Department and Program Surveys and Data Distribution (August 15 through September 1, 2011)

The final responses to the department and program surveys shall be sent to the Office of Institutional Research (OIR@uncg.edu) as email attachments by August 15, 2011. These responses are to be included along with the centrally-provided data in the Expanded Program Profiles to be reviewed by unit program review committees and the University Program Review Committee. Program leadership are not asked to respond to data on program efficiency, which will not to be considered by the unit program review committees or the University program review committee. By September 1, the Office of Institutional Research will expand the profiles to include the additional information and responses to the quantitative data provided by programs and post the Expanded Program Profiles for the unit program review committees to review.
Step IV: Unit-Level Review (July 1 through November 24, 2011)

The Dean of each academic unit with programs to be reviewed appointed and will charge a review committee, which will report to him or her throughout the process. The chair of each unit program review committee will be a full-time tenured faculty member. Full-time faculty, including at least one non-tenure track member, will comprise at least a simple majority of the voting members of each unit program review committee (i.e., half plus at least one). At least one member of Staff Senate, one member of Faculty Senate, one graduate student, and one undergraduate student will serve as voting members on each unit program review committee. In order to represent the diversity of its programs and departments appropriately, a unit may include more faculty on its program review committee than constitutes a simple majority of voting members and, if it wishes, staff and students in addition to those specified above. If possible given the structure of the academic unit, faculty, staff, and students who are members of unit program review committees will recuse themselves from the review of programs with which they are affiliated. If the status of individuals appointed to participate on these committees changes during the process in ways that would have excluded the possibility of their initial appointment, they will be allowed to continue to serve. New appointments, however, will be made following the guidelines outlined in this document whenever they are made during the process.

From July 1 through November 24, the Deans will lead the unit-level review process. From July 1 through August 29, they will work with the unit program review committees to clarify the relative importance of data for the evaluation of programs in their units and to develop review procedures. The unit program review committees will officially begin their work on September 1, 2011, which is when the data will be available for review.

The unit program review committees will consider both the quantitative program and department profiles and the additional information and responses to the quantitative data provided by program leadership. Using the 6-point scales provided on the rubrics, they will score each program on two overall criteria: (1) quality and (2) functions and demand. These two scores for each program will be provided to the University Program Review Committee.

At UNCG all undergraduate degree programs and all but a few graduate programs report to an academic dean. The material for any program subject to review that does not report to an academic dean will be reviewed by the University Program Review Committee, but not by a unit program review committee.

By November 24, the Chair of each unit program review committee shall submit the following items to the University Program Review Committee for further review: a unit program report form for each program including the two rubric scores, a SWOT analysis, and suggestions or recommendations regarding the program’s future; a list of the members of the unit program review committee; a description of the unit review process; and a concise narrative including any other general information the unit program review committee would like the University...
Program Review Committee to consider. These reports will be made available to Deans Council and the University Program Review Committee by November 28.

By December 2, the Dean of each unit will provide to the University Program Review Committee a concise commentary on the report of the unit program review committee, its process, and its rankings. Furthermore by this same date, all members of Deans Council not serving on the University Program Review Committee may submit a brief commentary indicating which programs outside of their units are particularly important to their unit’s endeavors and suggestions for how these programs and others might be modified to be more supportive of their own unit’s endeavors in the future. By December 5, the reports of the unit program review committees, reports of the Deans of academic units, and commentary from members of Deans Council not on the University Program Review Committee will be made available to UNCG Community.

Step V: University-Wide Review (December 5, 2011 through March 1, 2012)

The Provost will appoint the University Program Review Committee, including a full-time tenured faculty member from the College of Arts and Sciences to act as committee chair. All members of this committee will be expected to participate in this review process as conscientious citizens of the University, not as representatives of particular programs, departments, or units. In addition to the Chair, who will vote only to break ties, the voting members on this committee will include the Dean of the Graduate School; the Dean of Undergraduate Studies; one full-time faculty member of each committee responsible for maintaining the integrity of the curriculum (UCC, GSC, SLEC, and GEC); four members of Faculty Senate; and one member of each other shared governance group (Staff Senate, GSA, and SGA). If the Provost is unable to appoint a member of the university-wide committee from a curriculum committee, he will instead appoint a member from the Faculty Senate. Department heads and faculty who serve in other higher-level administrative roles will not be eligible to be included on this committee as voting members. In addition to the voting members of this committee, ex officio non-voting members will include the Vice Provost and the Associate Provost for Planning and Assessment. So constituted, a majority of the voting members of the Committee members will be full-time faculty. Faculty, staff, and students who are members of the University Program Review Committee shall recuse themselves from the review of programs with which they are affiliated. No members of the University Program Review Committee will serve as voting or non-voting members of a unit program review committee. As in the case of appointment to unit program review committees, if the status of individuals appointed to participate on the University Program Review Committee changes between the two academic years in ways that would have excluded the possibility of their initial appointment, they will be allowed to continue to serve. New appointments, however, will be made following the guidelines described here whenever they are made during the process.

This committee will review the same information provided to the unit program review committees, the evaluations of programs provided by those unit program review committees, and any other relevant data or analyses made available to it that it chose to examine. In its
review process, to be completed by March 1, the University Program Review Committee will
provide to the Provost answers to each of the following questions about each academic
program, accompanied by explanatory comments:

1. Does the unit report provide adequate evidence that the program is exceptionally weak
or strong in quality?
2. Does the unit report provide adequate evidence that the program is exceptionally weak
or strong in functions and demand?
3. Does the University Program Review Committee recommend that the Administration
further review the resource commitment to the program based on the evidence in the
unit report?

By March 2, the recommendations of the Committee will be made available electronically to
the University community, including the academic administrative officers and faculties of the
departments, academic programs, academic units, and schools that might be affected by
decisions made in response to the report of the University Program Review Committee.

Step VI: Auxiliary Responses to Recommendations of University Program Review Committee
(March 2012)

The results of the work of the University Program Review Committee will be presented as an
information item to the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, SGA, and GSA. These four leadership
groups may provide their written advice and recommendations in response to the work of the
Committee. Similarly, the academic administrative officers and faculties of the departments,
academic programs, academic units, and schools that might be affected by decisions made in
response to the report of the University Program Review Committee may also provide their
written advice and recommendations. These commentaries shall be submitted electronically to
the Office of Institutional Research by no later than March 31, at which time they will be
forwarded to the Provost.

Step VII: Decisions about Programs (April 2012 through receipt of responses from SACS)

Following review of the University Program Review Committee’s recommendations,
consideration of the aggregate auxiliary responses, seeking advice as needed on program-level
efficiency from relevant deans and program directors, discussion with faculty and staff affected
by policy or resource recommendations, and consultation with Deans Council, by April 20, the
Provost will forward his recommendations to the Chancellor proposing actions to be taken
regarding each program reviewed. After consultation with Executive Staff, the Chancellor shall
then decide what programs to discontinue; curtail; combine with other UNCG programs;
recommend for combination with other UNC system programs; continue with budget-neutral
interventions to improve program quality, functions and demand, or efficiency; continue as is;
or continue with additional resources to be allocated as available. This determination is subject
to agreement by the President, approval by the Board of Governors, notification of and
approval of any required teach-out agreements or plans by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, with due notice to the Board of Trustees of her decisions.

After the Chancellor has decided which programs to recommend for discontinuation, program leadership in the affected programs will prepare relevant discontinuation paperwork and submit it to the University Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Studies Committee, whichever is appropriate. As per their normal processes, these committees will review the paperwork for each program to be discontinued in a good faith effort to minimize any adverse impact to students and other programs that are reliant on it. To the extent that any of the Committee’s recommendations would result in material changes to the Chancellor’s previous decisions on curtailment or discontinuation, those recommendations will be forwarded to the Chancellor for her approval, disapproval or modification. Afterwards the Office of Planning and Assessment will submit appropriate paperwork following standard protocol approved for program discontinuations.

Immediately subsequent to any action by the Board of Governors, appropriate notification and requests for approval of teach-out agreements or plans will be sent to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). UNCG will make a good faith effort to assist affected students, faculty, administrative and support staff so that they may experience a minimal amount of disruption in the pursuit of their course of study or professional careers. In all cases, individuals will be notified of the decision to close a program as soon as possible so that they can make appropriate plans. Students who have not completed their programs will be advised by faculty or professional counselors regarding suitable options including transfer to comparable programs. Arrangements will be made to reassign faculty and staff or assist them in locating other employment. Throughout this process, UNCG will abide by the SACS policy, Substantive Change for Accredited Institutions of the Commission on Colleges. (http://www.sacscoc.org/).

In determining which faculty members’ employment is to be terminated as a result of any decision regarding changes to academic programs, the Chancellor shall give consideration to tenure status, rank, years of service to the institution, and other factors deemed relevant. The primary consideration, however, shall be the maintenance of a sound and balanced educational program that is consistent with the functions and responsibilities of the institution. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s delegate shall send the faculty member whose employment is to be terminated a written statement of this fact by a method of delivery that requires a signature for delivery. This notice shall include a statement of the conditions requiring termination of the faculty member’s employment; a general description of the procedures followed in making the decision; a disclosure of pertinent financial or other data upon which the decision was based; a statement of the faculty member’s right, upon request, to a reconsideration of the decision by the Committee on Due Process, if the faculty member alleges that the decision to terminate the appointment was arbitrary or capricious; and a copy of the procedure on termination of employment. Faculty designated for termination will be given the opportunity to resign or, if they are qualified, to retire; in either case all appeal and reconsideration rights will be considered waived.
Step VIII: Faculty Appeals

Individual faculty appeals of terminations will proceed in accordance with applicable Board of Governors policies and the *Regulations on Promotion and Tenure*. 