

**Curricular Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes for Monday, November 14, 2016**  
1-2 pm, eLearning Conference Room

Members Present: Ken Abramowicz; Ana Aguilar-Islas; Casey Byrne; Alex Fitts; Cindy Hardy; Eileen Harney, Co-Chair; Jayne Harvie; Ginny Kinne; Lisa Lunn; Rainer Newberry; Caty Oehring; Kate Quick; Holly Sherouse; Claire Gelvin-Smith.

Members Absent: Jennie Carroll; Bradley Moran; Dejan Raskovic

Guest: Sine Anahita

1. Approval/Amendment of Agenda

The discussion from Old Business on the program review document was moved up to accommodate Sine A. who was attending from Faculty Affairs Committee. See notes at 4.b. (below).

2. Approval of Minutes

- a. Draft Minutes 10/31/16 – Approved.

3. Additional meeting in November or December

The committee agreed to meet in one week on November 21 to continue discussions on the program review process and other topics.

4. Old Business

- a. Misconduct Policy (ASUAF Rep may attend)
  - i. Materials from the Dean of Students

The inclusion of the “PF” grade under the Sanctions section was discussed. The consensus of the committee was that the “PF” should be removed from the document. Holly noted that transcript notes are already added for extreme misconduct violations (more extreme than behavior like cheating or plagiarism). Alex expressed her surprise that the “PF” grade was still on the draft, because when it had been brought to the Provost and Alex over the summer, they had recommended that it be taken off, and Laura had indicated she would take it off.

Questions Laura had included throughout the google document (in blue type) were discussed. Under Procedures, the committee felt the informal meeting should be a step of its own. Step 2 should begin at the second paragraph (now under step 1) whereby more formal action is started (the notification form). Further language edits were suggested. The current Step 2 would become Step 3. And, the Step 3 paragraph about the PF grade would be deleted.

Whether there needs to be an appeals process for instructors or not was discussed (Laura had a question about that under the current Step 2 section on Appeals Rights).

The committee agreed to continue the discussion at the next meeting on November 21.

- b. Program Review document
  - i. FAC's suggested changes (Introduced by Sine for FAC)

A draft policy document from the Faculty Affairs Committee was shared with CAC. Its suggestions were indicated in green typeface. Sine explained the intent of the language added by FAC, addressing the need for a separate process that could be used for programs identified as being in trouble and threatened with elimination (see the new 1.g. added to the document). FAC also suggested removing the proposed step involving the Faculty Senate president that would follow the program review committee's recommendations. The importance of keeping the involvement of the Faculty Senate president in the review process was discussed, so that Faculty Senate is involved earlier in the process and not just at the tail end. It was agreed that the words "the Faculty Senate" in red typeface in the second line of section #3 would be removed (from the FAC draft).

FAC also suggested moving the statement about Faculty Senate action out of section 3.d. and placing it in section 4. The word "action" would be changed to "vote" (*Program deletion will require Faculty Senate vote*). The suggestion was discussed at length.

A "counter proposal" draft from Eileen was shared and discussed (copy attached). The differences between the two documents were discussed, one of the biggest differences being that the FAC version proposes a two-tier review process, and the counter-proposal did not.

Alex provided some information about the current established process of special academic program review (a process which is part of the Planning and Budget Committee) and how programs get to that special process.

Sine reiterated that FAC's goal, in light of the Strategic Pathways process which is predicted to cut about 20% of faculty jobs, was to salvage what they can by a revised program review process and strengthen what is possible to retain employment and high quality programs. The Sociology program is the canary in the coal mine, and other programs are going to be experiencing the same thing under Strategic Pathways.

- 5. New Business
  - a. Minor in Tribal Management

The new Minor in TM was approved for the November 28 Administrative Committee meeting.

The following agenda items were postponed due to time constraints.

- b. Possible modifications to undergraduate petition form (Rainer and Holly)
- c. Ad hoc committee

Draft shared by FAC:

## **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:

- Continue program
- Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
- Continue program but improve other specific areas
- Modify program through consolidation with another program or other significant re-organization**
- Suspend admissions to program or**
- Discontinue program
- 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:

- Program continuation is confirmed **until the next review cycle.**
- 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.
- 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.**

Draft shared from CAC Co-Chair:

## **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.*

### **Eileen Harney's suggestions in Blue (for CAC meeting on 11/14/16).**

The ~~new~~ program review process ~~will~~ **shall** 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 ~~shall be~~ 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. The Faculty Program Review Committee shall be selected by the Provost in consultation with the deans and directors, and, once formed, the list of committee members shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval. The Faculty Program Review Committee shall** ~~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
- **Modify program through consolidation with another program or other significant re-organization**
- **Suspend admissions to program or**
- Discontinue program

**The Faculty Program Review Committee shall allow up to two representatives from the program under review to attend the meeting and to answer questions. These representatives shall be invited to provide a brief verbal statement to address inconsistencies in reported data.** The ~~Faculty Program Review Committee~~ ~~will~~ **shall** provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review. **A summary of the recommendation shall be shared with the Faculty Senate President, who may request a copy of the full narrative. The Faculty Senate President in consultation with members of the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee then who has the option to send a response to the Provost respond within two weeks.**

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and four administrative representatives from CRCD ~~will~~ **shall** review the recommendations of the **Faculty Program Review Committee**, may request additional information ~~from about~~ the program, and ~~will~~ **shall** state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.

3. The Provost in consultation with the Chancellor's Cabinet ~~will~~ **shall** review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee, **the Faculty Senate President**, 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 shall be required by the end of the next regular academic semester after a request for restructuring or similar action is made.**

**Comment [EH8]:** We need to address Orion's concern from 11/2/16. Is it permissible to have only AdComm members see this initially? Can there be an ad hoc advisory committee for the president in this process?

"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."

d) 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 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.**

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

**Comment [EH9]:** Will or Shall?

**Comment [EH10]:** We need a timeline here as well.