TO:     President David Dooley  
FROM:  David Byrd, Chairperson of the Faculty Senate  

1. The attached BILL titled, New sections 8.86.20 - 8.86.27 to the University Manual, Focus Review of an Academic Program, is forwarded for your consideration.  

2. This BILL was adopted by vote of the Faculty Senate on October 17, 2013.  

3. After considering this bill, will you please indicate your approval or disapproval. Return the original, completing the appropriate endorsement below.  

4. In accordance with Section 10, paragraph 4 of the Senate’s By-Laws, this bill will become effective November 7, 2013, three weeks after Senate approval, unless: (1) specific dates for implementation are written into the bill; (2) you return it disapproved; or (3) the University Faculty petitions for a referendum.

David Byrd  
Chairperson of the Faculty Senate  

October 23, 2013  

ENDORSEMENT  

TO: Chairperson of the Faculty Senate  
FROM: President of the University  

a. Approved  

b. Approved subject to Notice to the Board of Education  

c. Approved subject to final approval by Board of Education  

d. Disapproved  

Signature of the President  

(date)
REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
October 4, 2013

In reviewing University Manual Sections 5.86.10 - 11 and 8.86.10 - 14, the Senate Executive Committee determined that the Academic Program Review process does not include a mechanism for targeted, unscheduled review of a program within a department or college. These proposed new sections are designed to provide a framework for a focused review of a program outside of the larger scale self-study and data gathering that occurs every 6 years within the Academic Program Review process.

Proposed new sections 8.86.20 - 8.86.27 to the University Manual, Chapter 8, Regulations for Students, Part III, Procedure for Approval and Review of Courses, Programs and other Academic Ventures:

8.86.20 Focused Review of an Academic Program. Focused Reviews outside the Academic Program Review process outlined in sections 8.86.10-14 are allowed. A Focused Review of a program may be requested by a department chair or college dean associated with the program, or the Dean of the Graduate School for any graduate program. The rationale for the review shall be in writing and clearly describe how the review falls outside the APR process. The written rationale should be distributed to the program, the department chair, the dean of the college(s), the Dean of the Graduate School for graduate programs, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall have the final decision whether a rationale justifies a focused review. The rationale should reflect substantive concerns about program quality and/or integrity, and/or a consistent pattern of deviation from established program or university policy, standards, or procedures. A copy of the rationale should also be sent to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as a notification of review rather than an invitation to participate.

8.86.21 In this section the term "program" shall be understood to include curriculum or University sponsored activity requiring the assignment of one or more faculty to serve in a teaching, research, or service capacity and intended to result in the conferral of an undergraduate or graduate degree, certificate, or other credential.

8.86.22 While the Focused Review is outside the Academic Program Review process, any data gathered during the process outlined in sections 8.86.10-14 shall be available to the Focused Review Committee.

8.86.23 Any program identified for a focused review shall have at least a three member Focused Review Committee appointed to oversee and coordinate the review of that specific program. The dean of the college associated with the program being reviewed (in consultation with the Dean of the Graduate School for any graduate program), shall appoint
two faculty members, and the program being reviewed shall appoint a third faculty member. No member may be a person who directly oversees the program. A faculty appointee from the dean will chair the committee.

8.86.24 The focused review committee may decide that outside reviewers should be consulted in a particular review or that a recent accreditation review document prepared by the program can serve as a component of the focused review. University and/or external staff with relevant expertise also may be called to participate. Outside reviewers shall be selected in consultation with the dean.

8.86.25 The focused review committee shall create a written report of its assessment of the program and any other relevant findings and submit it to all recipients of the rationale in 8.86.20. The program director, associated chairs and/or deans, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs may request a meeting with the focused review committee and interested parties. The program has 15 calendar days from the release of the report to submit a written response to all recipients of the rationale.

8.86.26 No later than 30 calendar days following the receipt of the response from the reviewed program, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the dean associated with the program and the graduate dean (for graduate programs) shall provide the program director, associated chair and dean, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee a written response to the report. In general, the written reports of the focused review committee and the response of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be made available upon request to any interested parties. Any individual or group of standing in a particular program review may request that some portions of the report, especially those relating to specific personnel issues, not be made public. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall have the final authority to decide whether or not to withhold any portions of the report from public distribution.

8.86.27 The dean associated with the program in consultation with the graduate dean, when appropriate, shall oversee the implementation of the recommendations of the review.