

**The University of North Carolina at Greensboro**  
**Board of Trustees**  
**Special Academic Student Affairs Committee**  
**April 5, 2012**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kate Barrett, Linda Hiatt, Skip Moore, and Provost David Perrin (in person)  
Carolyn Ferree and Harriett Smalls (telephone)

**GUESTS:** Rebecca Adams, Bonita Brown, Sarah Carrigan, Cindy Reed, and Roy Schwartzman

Provost Perrin provided an update on the progress of Academic Program Review and the formulation of his recommendations to the Chancellor. He informed the committee that he and the Chancellor will meet with the Faculty Senate in a specially-called meeting on April 18, and he will present his recommendations at the General Faculty meeting on April 25.

Provost Perrin and Professor Schwartzman have been meeting with various groups to address the work/recommendations of the University Program Review Committee (UPRC), and to respond to questions. The Provost has been working closely with each of the academic unit deans by presenting what he interpreted from the UPRC report to be programs that had challenges in function/demand and/or quality and viewed as exceptionally strong. He asked each dean to review the list of programs that were on the weak end of the curve to identify opportunities for discontinuation, important to retain, and plans to strengthen those programs that had identified weaknesses. He also asked the deans to review and verify exceptionally strong programs and to advise if any programs had been missed during the process. In this case, they were given an opportunity to add programs with supporting justification and data.

It is unlikely that the process will lead to the termination of tenure or tenure-track faculty. Where appropriate, Deans and Department Heads/Chairs should work with faculty on the potential of reassignment to higher priority programs within the department or academic unit. Discussion followed regarding setting a defensible explanation of criteria, factors of consideration, general characteristics of programs recommended for discontinuation, and institutional SACS standards.

Moore recommended and the committee unanimously approved the formulation of a resolution endorsing the Academic Review Process at the full board meeting on May 3. This would include outlining the steps, emphasizing mutual coordination by all parties associated in the thorough review process, and concurrence of the academic units.

The meeting adjourned at 3:18 p.m.