<div align="center">

Proposed Amendment to
Faculty Governance Structure and Process document
2014

</div>

Proposed by: Program Review Team

We, the undersigned, propose to amend section XXX, as follows (~~strikeout~~ denotes text to be deleted, <u>underline</u> denotes text to be inserted):

(l) Program Review Team

(i) Composition

The composition of the Program Review Team shall be as follows: Each academic unit will be represented by two elected faculty members, with the <u>following two</u> exception<u>s: the College of Arts and Sciences will have four elected members;</u> ~~of~~ Library Services<u>,</u> ~~which~~ may choose to have <u>either</u> ~~only~~ one<u>,</u> <u>member</u> or to serve on an as-needed basis. Elected members from academic units will serve staggered <u>3</u>~~2~~-year terms<u>, with elections for seats to be held according to the schedule published and approved by the IAT and Senate Executive Team</u>. These members will be nominated and elected by the in-unit faculty members of their respective units. *Ex officio* members: <u>Senior</u> Associate Vice <u>Provost and Vice</u> President of Planning and Institutional Performance and/or designee.

(ii) Responsibilities and Duties

<u>a.</u>   Provide recommendations to Faculty Senate for the development, periodic review, and revision of standards, policies, and procedures for university-level management of program review, ~~creation and elimination of all degree and certificate programs and~~ <u>including</u> the seven-year University Program Review Plan.

<u>b.   Provide a university-wide faculty perspective related to the BOG program review process and each program review, including the selection of qualified reviewers, comments on the official reports, and follow-through with endorsed reviewer concerns.</u>

<u>c.   Monitor the integrity of the BOG review process from a faculty perspective and ensure that the review process is as equivalent as possible for accredited and BOG-reviewed programs.</u>

<u>d.   Serve as a resource for program faculty to seek input regarding findings from external program reviews and report to Senate when patterns of problems and strengths emerge in program reviews.</u>

~~a.~~<u>e.</u> Suggest ways to streamline, align, and simplify assessment and program review processes in order to reduce redundancy across related processes.

~~b.   Based on information received from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, the Undergraduate Curriculum Team (UGCT) and the Graduate Curriculum Team (GCT), provide recommendations to Faculty Senate for the development, periodic review, and revision of standards, policies, and procedures for establishing new degree programs.~~

~~c.   Review the process of program review of all degree and certificate programs, inform and make recommendations to Faculty Senate regarding the outcomes of that process; specifically:~~

~~i.   Review guidelines for the selection of, and charges to external reviewers for each program under review.~~

      ii.   ~~Review self-studies and make recommendations on their suitability for program review.~~

      iii.   ~~Review the reports of the external reviewers and make recommendations on the adequacy of the report for program review.~~

      iv.   ~~Review the response to the report from the program and the college leadership.~~

      v.   ~~Provide comments/recommendations in addition to those of the external reviewer as appropriate.~~

      vi.   ~~Track program review response meetings, their results, and one-year follow-up actions.~~

~~d.~~f. Create additional working groups as deemed appropriate or necessary by the PRT members. The PRT facilitator can extend invitations for membership on working groups to FGCU faculty members, administrators, and/or staff members otherwise unaffiliated with the PRT.

~~e.~~g. In consultation with the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance (PIP), provide recommendations to Faculty Senate on future needs and directions in program review.

~~f.~~h. Provide information to Faculty Senate on how well FGCU program review procedures and products conform to current an**d** future Florida Department of Education's Division of Colleges and Universities' directives (e.g. Academic Learning Compacts).

Rationale:

PRT currently provides a peer review function for programs reviewed in a seven year cycle established by the Board of Governors. This process applies to programs that are not externally accredited by a specialized agency (e.g., AACSB, ABET, NCATE, etc.). After accreditation is received, the BOG accepts the accreditation team report in lieu of a separate self-study process.

The BOG oversees scheduling of the reviews in collaboration with the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance (PIP) through a seven year plan. The process requires the use of external reviewer(s), a self-study report, and one-year follow-up on recommendations made by the reviewer. PIP reports on the results of the process to the BOG annually. It is a detailed process with nine steps that PRT members numbers for convenience. We are involved in the selection of the external reviewer (step 1), commenting on the official reports (step 5 and 8), and ensuring in general that the process is followed, providing a university-wide faculty perspective.

The PRT was established at a time when most University programs were reviewed, using the seven-year BOG program review cycle. The University was too new to have earned accreditation by national specialized accreditation agencies. Consequently, the PRT was initially involved with external program reviews for all university programs. As a team that was representative of the University at large, we could provide a peer review of programs that spanned the University. However, as more and more programs earned external accreditation, the role of PRT shifted to reviewing mostly programs in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Over the years, other problems and opportunities have also surfaced. Chief among them is the proliferation of program review (a.k.a. assessment) requirements for multiple monitors – strategic plans, SACS, other accreditation agencies, state agencies, and likely others. Team members have found themselves commiserating about the need to fill out the same forms over and over. Even the template we developed several years ago to facilitate the BOG process is now redundant with other internal documents and needs another review/update.

Finally, the larger the University became, the less opportunity there was for formalized faculty discussion and support in terms of general patterns emerging from various program reviews, including but not limited to the BOG process.

The changes proposed in these bylaws address these shifts and opportunities.

Specific Rationales for Individual Changes:

Composition: Because most programs in the BOG process are located in CAS, the Team wants to double CAS representation so that the workload of members outside of CAS can be reduced, with attention turned to other matters that may be of more general University faculty benefit. Library has asked to reduce its membership/involvement. Election cycle changes were suggested by Shawn Felton. Dr. Snyder's job title was updated.

Responsibilities and Duties:

Paragraph a: We eliminated work on degree/certificate programs, since we have never done that, and it appears to be more appropriate for the curriculum committees.

Paragraph b: This replaces the first deleted paragraph that began with "review the process…" The language was too complicated and conflicted with the step numbers we use, confusing the ad hoc review team. More important, though, PRT members are concerned about the tone of this paragraph. We do not feel we should determine "suitability" or "adequacy" of the work of our colleagues, especially since most of them are in one college and most of us are in another. The reports are very specific to a discipline (e.g., specific courses and facilities). The disciplines are too far removed from what we know, and that is why we need to rely on qualified external reviewers. We are comfortable only commenting from a broad-university perspective.

Paragraph c: This role is not new but is formalized here. We have always worked closely with PIP to track the process steps. The last item in the previous paragraph ("follow-through with endorsed recommendations") is an important example of this. We found that recommendations were falling through the cracks – dropped (no comments) by programs or by Academic Affairs, and that has now been fixed. We also see the need to bring some level of consistency to the two different types of reviews to ensure continuous improvement of all programs.

Paragraph d: This is a new role. There is no place in the University for faculty from one program (accredited or BOG) to seek input from colleagues from other units about parallel needs, identified in an external review, that could be discussed in Senate. Last year, we reported findings that spanned CAS programs and that was well-received. This addition helps PRT advocate for faculty university-wide, regardless of the type of external review they undergo.

Paragraph e: This is a new role. In the past, we made the BOG program review process more systematic, creating a template for the review. The burden of documentation for all reviews, though, is becoming of greater concern to faculty. PRT has worked on more streamlining of its processes so that, combined with increased membership from CAS, some time can be devoted to thinking about how we can conserve faculty time by reducing redundancy in various documentation needs.

Paragraphs f, g, and h are unchanged.

Presenter: Judy R. Wilkerson, Ph.D., PRT Chair and Professor of Research and Assessment