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.

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 collaborated 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) have been excluded from this review unless the unit dean requested that they be included.

The Deans were asked to 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 were due to be submitted to the Director of Institutional Research by February 11. Also during February, the proposed criteria and process for program review were discussed with constituent groups and senior leadership, revised according to their feedback, and submitted to the Provost for approval.

Step II: Data Preparation and Collection (last half of February through first half of April 2011)

By 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, by March 9, 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 were being prepared, program leadership began 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 leadership will have an opportunity to provide concise responses to each quantitative datum including corrections, if any; interpretations, if relevant; and comparisons with peers, if available. For data collected only at the department level, program leadership will also have an opportunity to provide their perception of whether each datum applies consistently across programs and, if not, estimate how it is apportioned across programs. By April 15, program leadership shall submit the 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. It will be possible to upload documents to support the information provided in response to the survey prompts, including the most recent department review or accreditation report. These responses will be included along with the centrally-provided data and additional data provided by departments in the Expanded Program Profiles to be reviewed by unit program review committees and the University Program Review Committee.

**Step III: Data Correction and Distribution (last half of April 2011)**

By April 29, 2011, the Office of Institutional Research will resolve any issues regarding the accuracy of the quantitative data, expand the profiles to include the additional information and responses to the quantitative data provided by programs, and distribute the expanded program profiles to the unit program review committees for initial review.

**Step IV: Unit-Level Review (May through first half of June 2011)**

During May and the first half of June of 2011, the Deans will lead the unit-level review process. (With the permission of the Provost, a dean may opt to develop a program review schedule for his or her unit, extending out to the end of June; however, the university-level review will begin on June 15 nonetheless). The Dean of each academic unit with programs to be reviewed will appoint and charge a review committee, which will report to him or her throughout the process. The chair of each unit program review committee shall be a full-time tenured faculty member. Full-time faculty, including at least one non-tenure track member, shall 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 shall 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 shall recuse themselves from the review of programs with which they are affiliated.
The unit program review committees shall consider both the quantitative program profiles and the additional information and responses to the quantitative data provided by program leadership. Using the standard rubrics, they shall score programs on quality, functions and demand, and efficiency. For each program, these three scores shall be summed to produce a fourth overall score. The unit program review committees shall consider these four scores as they sort programs within a unit into three groups of equal number (plus or minus one)—Group 1, Group 2, and Group 3, with Group 1 being the highest ranking. Any unit programs for which appropriate paperwork for discontinuation is voluntarily submitted after the unit-level review process begins can be included in the unit’s list of Group 3 programs.

At UNCG all undergraduate degree programs and all but four graduate degree 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 June 15, the Chair of each unit program review committee shall submit the following items to the University Program Review Committee for further review: the four rubric scores for each program, the unit’s three grouping lists, 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. Also by June 15, the Dean of each unit shall 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 to make suggestions for how these programs and others might be modified to be more supportive of their own unit’s endeavors in the future.

Step V: University-Wide Review (last half of June through August 2011)

The Provost will appoint the University Program Review Committee, including a full-time tenured faculty member 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 shall include the Interim Associate 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); two members of Faculty Senate; and one member of each other shared governance group (Staff Senate, GSA, and SGA). Should the Provost be unable to appoint a member of the university-wide committee from a curriculum committee, he will instead appoint a member from the Faculty Senate. Among the faculty who are members of the University Program Review Committee, no two shall be from the same academic unit and none will be serving as chair of a department or in any other administrative role. 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 have served as voting or non-voting members of a unit program review committee.

This committee will review the same information provided to the unit program review committees, the categorization and evaluations of programs provided by those unit program review committees, and any additional relevant data or analyses made available to it that it chooses to examine. Following the review process, to be completed by August 31, the University Program Review Committee shall recommend to the Provost what action should be taken regarding each program reviewed. This committee shall make recommendations that one-third of all programs it reviews (plus or minus one) be (1) discontinued; (2) curtailed; (3) combined with other UNCG programs; (4) combined with other UNC system programs; or (5) continued with budget-neutral interventions to address program quality, functions and demand, or efficiency. This committee shall also recommend whether programs not classified in one of these first five categories should be (6) continued as is or (7) continued as high priority programs to receive additional resources as they become available. Also on August 31, 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 (August through October 2011)

Before September 30, 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 October 31, at which time they will be forwarded to the Provost.

Step VII: Decisions about Programs (November 2011 through receipt of responses from SACS)

Following review of the University Program Review Committee’s recommendations, consideration of the aggregate auxiliary responses, and consultation with Deans Council, by November 15, 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 and approval by the Board of Governors, with due notice to the Board of Trustees of her decisions.

Subsequent to action by the Board of Governors, appropriate notification will be sent to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). UNCG will notify SACS regarding any programs to be discontinued before discontinuation is implemented and, for programs with teach-out agreements with another institution, will notify SACS six months before discontinuation. 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, Closing an Institution or Program: Teach Out Agreements (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.