

**Curricular Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes for Monday, October 31, 2016**  
1-2 pm, eLearning Conference Room

Members Present: Ken Abramowicz; Ana Aguilar-Islas; Casey Byrne; Mike Earnest for Holly Sherouse; Alex Fitts; Cindy Hardy; Eileen Harney, Co-Chair; Jayne Harvie; Bobbi Jenson for Ginny Kinne; Lisa Lunn; Rainer Newberry; Dejan Raskovic; Kate Quick.

Members Absent: Jennie Carroll; Bradley Moran; Caty Oehring

Guest: Laura McCollough, Dean of Students

1. Approval/Amendment of Agenda

The agenda was amended to include a discussion with Dean of Students Laura McCollough about a draft academic misconduct policy.

Discussion with Laura M.:

Laura shared a proposed academic misconduct policy document with the committee and invited comments and suggestions.

Alex and Mike noted there is an issue with the "PF" grade referenced in the document (UA regulations would have to be changed to include it in order for it to be used). CAC suggested removing references to a "PF" grade from the document.

Ken suggested that, under Multiple Submissions, the language be modified to include submitting the same report in the same course (not just two different courses). He was aware of problems arising from such occurrences.

Laura will post the document as a google document and CAC members can add their comments. A timeline for changes was discussed. It was agreed there was value to having Faculty Senate endorse it. That should ideally take place by the February Faculty Senate meeting in order to make the next Catalog. It was also agreed to bring the draft document forward to the December Faculty Senate meeting for discussion and feedback.

Discussion about committee chairship:

The agenda was amended to have a brief discussion about "interim chairship" vs. "co-chairship" of the committee. The bylaws do not address a process for having an interim chair; they only note that committee chairs are elected. Co-chairship or vice chairship would solve this lack of guidance from the bylaws. The committee members approved of having Eileen serve as co-chair rather than interim. Addressing the lack of guidance in the bylaws will be brought up to the Administrative Committee.

2. Approval of Minutes

a. Draft Minutes 10/17/16

The minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Old Business

- a. Program deletion and suspension policy
  - i. FAC and CAC Discussion
  - ii. AdComm Discussion

Since the last CAC meeting, Eileen has spoken with two members of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and discussed the policy with the Administrative Committee. The attached draft reflects suggested changes from those meetings. She summarized those suggestions.

She has also heard concerns about what happens to a department and its affected faculty when a program is discontinued. How in-depth should this review document go? It was pointed out that the consequences of these decisions are not part of the review process itself. The committee discussed the idea of an appeals process and what that would involve. Rainer suggested making explicit the other possible options that are available as outcomes of the process, e.g., program consolidations, and modifications of programs. The most common outcome is to continue programs with recommended changes, Alex noted.

A new bullet point under section 1. was suggested and accepted by the committee: “modify program through consolidation or other reorganization.” It would be inserted after “Continue program but improve other specific areas or” and before “suspend admission to program or.” [See the attachment at the end of this document.]

Program suspension was discussed briefly, and its role in future program deletions.

A timeframe or limit was discussed for program reorganizations. The committee added a new item 3.c.: “Program restructuring. An action plan required by end of the next full academic semester.” (The current 3.c. would become 3.d.) [See the attachment at the end of this document.]

Other possible wording additions were discussed that had to do with requesting fairness and collaboration in the process; the centrality of a program to the mission of the university; and teaching course subject matter even if a major is disbanded. Alex noted that the program review criteria are contained in the BOR policy. A resolution was also suggested.

Orion Lawlor’s concerns were discussed, about the president’s role in the review process and how open he can be in talking about it at that point in the review process. (Reference last sentence in item #1 of the document.)

It was decided to put this forward to the Faculty Senate as a discussion item for feedback, again; and then have a motion to vote on in December.

Due to time constraints, the meeting was adjourned at this point and the following items will carry over to the next meeting on November 14.

- b. Athletics Motion
- 4. New Business
  - a. Ad Hoc Committee Formation
  - b. Meetings in November and December
  - c. Student Code of Conduct (Update?)
  - d. Possible modifications to undergraduate petition form (Rainer and Holly)

## **SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO PROGRAM REVIEW - FOR DISCUSSION (ADDITIONS INBOLD ITALICS; DELETIONS CROSSED OUT.) – Oct. 31 pre-meeting version**

*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.*

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

**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 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 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.**