

1-28-2002

Program Review Request for Rationale

Jim LoBue
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

LoBue, Jim, "Program Review Request for Rationale" (2002). *Faculty Senate Index*. 520.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/520>

This request for information is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Program Review Request for Rationale

Submitted by: Jim LoBue

1/28/2002

Question:

Requested is an elaboration on the criteria used in the decision to change the status of a unit or a program of the university.

Rationale:

Program review was a stressful and time-consuming task. Recommendations concerning program review now have been made public, but it is felt by many faculty members that these results are incomplete as they don't provide the specific rationales used that result in "enhancement," "reorganization," "reduction," and "elimination." Especially desired is elaboration on these rather vague terms.

SEC Response:

Program Review Request for Rationale: The request for elaboration on the criteria used in the decision to change the status of a unit or program of the University to "Enhanced," "Reduced," "Reorganized," "Monitored," or "Eliminated" will be forward to Martha Abell, the Senate's representative to the Strategic Planning Council. She will address the question during her regular report.

Senate Response:

Dr. Jim LoBue (COST) asked the SEC for elaboration on the criteria used in the decision to set the status of a unit or program of the University to enhanced, reduced, reorganized, monitored, or eliminated. The SEC has asked Martha Abell to discuss this during her report from the EPC/SPC during this meeting.

Report from EPC/SPC Representative

Dr. Martha Abell (COST) reported that the SPC is looking for nominations for the elected faculty position on the committee. She also reported that three of the eight Level II Strategic Plans have been posted on the campus web and input is being

sought on those plans from the entire campus community. Non-academic units have already begun writing level three plans.

Dr. Abell then addressed Dr. LoBue's request for further elaboration on the criteria used to set the status of a unit or program of the University to enhanced, reduced, reorganized, monitored, or eliminated in the program review process. Dr. Abell referred Senators to the original Strategic Planning document, *Navigating a Course Through the Strategic Planning Process*, which came out in March 2001. She then briefly described how the Academic Program Review Committee applied those definitions.

Dr. Jim LoBue (COST) asked if written rationales were available for why programs received assignments other than "maintain." Dr. Abell responded that in most circumstances, written comments were made by the Deans and included in the program review document before it reached the Academic Program Review Committee. That committee made recommendations to the SPC which made recommendations to the Provost who made recommendations to the President.

Dr. Schille asked if any Dean's recommendations were overturned by the review committees. Dr. Abell responded in the affirmative and added that those types of changes occurred most between department and Dean, not later in the review process.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for a further clarification of the definitions of "enhance," "maintain," and "reduce." Dr. Trey Denton (Chair, SPC) responded that programs recommended for enhanced have demonstrated potential to advance the strategic plan in profound and unusual ways. Programs recommended for maintain will have a proven track record of consistent contributions to the institution's strategic themes and mission.

Programs in this category may request additional resources to maintain their current level of support in relation to the strategic plan. Programs recommended for reduce or eliminate exhibit a limited ability to advance the strategic plan and/or are judged to be outside the bounds of a more focused university. He added that these definitions can be found in the Board of Regents' Policy Manual, section 205.

Mr. Nick Pearson (SGA) asked if ranking 90% of programs as "maintain" was a requirement of the process. Dr. Denton responded that at the Presidential level of the review process, only 75% of the programs received a "maintain" status.

Dr. LoBue asked if programs with the status of "reduce" or "eliminate" received a detailed discussion of why they were given that status. Dr. Denton responded that no such statement had been given. Dr. Charlie Hardy (Chair, Academic Program Review Committee) discussed the communication process, emphasizing the openness of the decision process and the fact that the Academic Program Review

Committee communicated with the Deans, rather than the authors of individual program reviews. Dr. Marc Cyr (CLASS) strongly encouraged that specific explanations be supplied to the programs with the status of “reduce” or “eliminate” or to the department where these programs are housed. Dr. Denton and Dr. Hardy agreed that this would be done.

Dr. Vandegrift pointed out that a complete set of the Academic Program Reviews are on reserve in the Library. He added that the Level II Academic Strategic Plan is now available on the web and that academic departments should now be developing Level III plans that make recommendations for how the Academic Program Review changes should be carried out. He also said that the University’s vision of Academic Distinction was what drew him to Georgia Southern and that he thought the whole Strategic Planning process has been exceptionally well done.