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Membership of Program Process Review Committee

- Rebecca Adams, Associate Provost for Planning and Assessment, Chair
- Josh Hoffman, Chair Elect of Faculty Senate
- Jason Morris, Chair of Staff Senate
- Katie Marshall, President of Student Government Association
- Cynthia Webb, President of the Graduate Student Association
- Steve Roberson, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
- Jim Petersen, Dean of the Graduate School
- Alan Boyette, Vice Provost
OPA Staff Support

- Office of Institutional Research
  - Sarah Carrigan
  - Karen Blackwell
  - Mark Davenport
  - Krishna Rao Chepyala
  - Sheila Gothard
  - Hank Klaiber

- Jodi Pettazzoni, Director of Academic Assessment

- Office of Planning and Assessment
  - Jessica Thomason
  - Amanda Martinez
  - Barbara Tookey
  - Shiva Krishna Gullapelli
Schedule

• Committee appointed in October, 2010
• Met first time on December 13, 2011 after a month of background research
• Met 6 times in January and February to work on process drafts and revise them in response to feedback
• February 16 Faculty Senate Forum
• February 9-21, Feedback Period
• February 21-Meeting with Provost and Chancellor to review feedback
• March 1-Final Documents Posted to opa.uncg.edu/programreview
Work Accomplished

• Review of literature and extensive review of processes that worked and didn’t work at other institutions, including web research and telephone discussions

• Process document

• Criteria document

• Undergraduate and Graduate Rubrics

• Program Profiles

• Qualtrics Program Survey

• Department Profiles and Qualtrics Department Survey to be completed by March 9
Amount of Feedback Received

- Three people took detailed notes on comments from Faculty Senate Forum
- 22 faculty posted to the website
- 8 faculty engaged in email exchanges
- 69 people, including many staff, signed up for listserv
- Proud of how much more inclusive our process has been than at most other institutions, but surprised by low level of faculty engagement
Purpose of Program 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.
Committee Philosophy

- Design a process that is as fair, transparent, and inclusive as possible
- Carefully consider what other institutions have done and their results
- Mimic the P&T Guidelines wherever possible
- Keep in mind what is in the best interest of the institution as a whole
- Start the review in the units where expertise exists
- Create a timeline that allows us to be out in front of GA
Feedback and Revisions

• The remainder of my presentation consists of a discussion of the feedback we received and the changes we made in response
• The documents have been extensively revised, so I am sure I will miss some things, so at the end of my presentation please ask about new things you have noticed if I fail to mention them
• If you have not read the final drafts of the process document, rubrics, criteria, and survey prompts, you do not have full information on how we responded
Feedback and Revisions: Composition of University Program Review Committee

- Remained convinced the process should not be a representative one; mimics P & T process
- Expertise representation is the intention of the unit-level reports; impossible to replicate at university level; no two from same unit; can invite guests
- Added another Faculty Senator
- Faculty Senators can be substituted for members of 4 curriculum committees
- Interim Associate Dean to serve instead of Dean of the Graduate School
Feedback and Revisions: Instructions to the University Program Review Committee

• Added a clause allowing University Program Review Committee flexibility regarding assignment of programs to 5 change categories

• Allows University Program Review Committee to correct for differences across units
Feedback and Revisions: The Controversial Thirds

• Change of labels
  – Received many proposals
  – Decided to call them Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3

• Suggestion to create more categories
  – Units are free to use more categories as long as they map to thirds
  – Institutions that used more found that they spent too much time arguing about the programs on the margins
Feedback and Revisions: Instructions to Units and Deans

• Units may add their own criteria
• Units may weigh the criteria however they wish
• All criteria must be reviewed by unit program review committees
• Reminder that emphasis is on discussion of patterns, not automatic cut-off points
• Deans may appoint whomever they like to the unit program review committees in addition to those specified
• All members of Deans Council will have an opportunity to comment
Feedback and Revisions: Criteria

- Added additional criteria
  - Added all university-level criteria recommended; units can add their own
- Added additional information to rubrics
  - Omitting them initially was unintentional
- Clarified quantitative criteria measures
  - Endnotes added to appropriate documents
- Weight of criteria
  - Up to unit program review committees
- Modified criteria (e.g., retention rates)
Feedback and Revisions: Miscellaneous

• Clarification of Follow-up Process
  – Added reference to SACS Teach Out agreement that clarifies how the institution must deal with students and faculty
  – Added clause allowing faculty designated for termination to resign (or retire if qualified)

• Out-of-Unit Programs
  – No unit-level review; reports go directly to University Program Review Committee
Thank you. Questions?