

The Senate Leadership Team formally thanks the Senate Teams Ad Hoc Review Team for the work that they have done and look forward to their continuing work with the Senate standing teams.

Motion Passed: 7 in Favor, 3 Abstentions

## Senate Teams Review Committee Report

### Committee Members:

Anna Carlin, LIB

Mollie Venglar, CHPSW

Charles Daramola, CHPSW

### Committee Charge:

1. Work with all Senate Team and Committee Chairs to examine work from last two years  
**This charge was only partially fulfilled. Team chairs/facilitators were not asked for input or feedback during the initial review of work plans and bylaws.**
2. Compare work products with the established purpose identified in bylaws.  
**Charge met by the review committee; this document contains the results.**
3. Provide recommendations or changes needed to bylaws, workplans, or team structures to Senate.  
**Charge met by review committee; this document contains the recommendations and the recommendations were presented to the Senate Leadership Team on 2/21.**

### Process:

Workplans from 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 from each Senate team/committee were reviewed. Listed action items were compared to the stated responsibilities of the team in the Senate bylaws. Disparities were researched and recommendations compiled.

### General recommendations from this review committee:

- The executive team is not referred to in the Senate bylaws, but workplans exist for the previous 2 years. Consider adding composition and function of the executive team to the bylaws.
- Workplans would be more easily assessed if they were designed around the bylaws for each team. Consider listing each duty of the team, as specifically stated in the bylaws, on the workplan as the "Goal/Agenda/Task"
- Faculty need to show leadership as part of the PDP and for promotion purposes. Although not currently in the bylaws, consider limiting facilitator term limits to no more than 3 consecutive years. This allows for greater access to the leadership role for faculty as well as encouraging more faculty to seek service opportunities on various teams or committees. Recommend adding this to Article 4. Standing Teams, Section 4.01 General Principles, as part of item (h)
- Specific team recommendations are embedded below.

## Section 4.02 Composition, Responsibilities and Duties of Faculty Standing Teams

### (a) Leadership Team

#### (i) Composition

The Leadership Team consists of the following members of the Faculty Senate: the President, the Vice President, the Secretary, and the current facilitators of the other standing teams and the President of the UFF chapter. The immediate Past President of the Senate shall be an *ex officio* member.

#### (ii) Responsibilities and Duties

The President of the Senate acts as the facilitator for the Leadership Team. The Leadership Team's duties include the following: (a) set the agenda for Senate meetings, (b) coordinate operation of the standing teams (c) recommend to the Senate a means of resolution if conflicts over areas of responsibility of team assignments occur, and (d) appoint faculty to *ad hoc* teams as required. (All requests for faculty membership on University teams should include the approximate time commitment per week required of the member and the length of time that the team will be in operation.) The Leadership Team represents the faculty to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Deans' (Academic) Council, or their designated representatives, as appropriate.

Workplans were not available for the Leadership Team

Recommendation:

Consider removing (a)(ii)(d) appoint faculty to *ad hoc* teams as required. This task is undertaken by the Appointments Team.

### (b) Faculty Affairs Team

#### (i) Composition

The Faculty Affairs Team consists of two (2) faculty members representing each academic unit, with the exception of Library Services, which may choose to have only one. At least one member from each unit must be at the rank of Associate Professor or higher, with the exception of Library Services. Members must have at least four years full-time experience in higher education to be eligible for service on the Faculty Affairs Team.

#### (ii) Responsibilities and Duties

The Faculty Affairs Team is a standing committee of the collegial faculty governance 326 system, reporting to the Faculty Senate. It provides a direct faculty voice regarding all personnel-related matters pertaining to faculty that are not subject to collective bargaining, as well as the traditional professional expectations and responsibilities of faculty. The team, at the direction of the Senate leadership, **reviews and recommends policies, consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, concerning matters relating to:**

- (a) general faculty status of university employees, in situations where faculty or non-faculty status is not delineated by the Collective Bargaining Agreement;
- (b) annual review, promotion, and reappointment issues across academic units
- (c) assessment of faculty teaching, research, and service;
- (d) merit criteria;
- (e) the availability and allocation of summer support opportunities
- (f) sabbaticals and leaves of absence;
- (g) professional development and resource support;
- (h) the ownership and use of intellectual property;
- (i) academic freedom and integrity issues;
- (j) criteria for honorary faculty status, including Emeritus status; and
- (k) other issues of traditional academic concern related to faculty expectations and responsibilities.

The Faculty Affairs Team does not negotiate or otherwise determine terms and conditions of employment. Any recommendations related to terms and conditions of employment will be forwarded to the UFF chapter leadership for consideration

The following workplan items appear to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws:

- Research search and screen guidelines at FGCU and compare to other SUS institutions (2011-2012)
- Provide input on recommendations for improving student retention. Drafted recommendation and sought input from Gen Ed Council (2011-12, 2012-13)
- Review proposed Undergraduate Research Mentor Award; provide recommendation to Senate (2012-13)

Recommendation: In all teams, facilitators and team members should be empowered by the Senate Leadership Team to identify work that does not fall under the scope of the team's governing by-laws and refer those tasks back to the Senate Leadership Team for resolution.

### **(c) Student Affairs Team**

#### **(i) Composition**

The Student Affairs Team consists of one faculty member representing each unit/college, one voting student member representing the SGA, and one ex officio member appointed by the Vice President of Student Affairs.

#### **(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

The Student Affairs Team collaborates with Student Affairs on behalf of the faculty to develop policies affecting the quality of educational programs. The team will **review and recommend policies concerning matters relating to student affairs**. These include, but are not limited to, (a) admission and readmission of students to the University, suspension of students, (b) withdrawal from courses and from the university, (c) academic status, (d) award of credit, (e) award of academic honors, (f) award of Student of the Year (SOTY), (g) student grievances, (h) educational equity, rights and responsibilities (including student code of conduct), and (i) review policies relating to academic integrity and student conduct. The team will work with Student Affairs to assure appropriate faculty representation on Student Services Committees.

The following workplan item appears to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws:

- Review process regarding student groups that travel for study abroad
  - o The team reported this was an administrative issue and not within the scope of the team

Recommendation: The review committee recommends a bylaw change. Student of the Year is now the responsibility of each college. C.ii.f should be removed.

### **(d) Undergraduate Curriculum Team**

#### **(i) Composition**

The Graduate Curriculum Team (GCT) shall consist of one faculty member with graduate faculty Member or Associate Member status representing each College; and one faculty member representing Library Services who is the liaison to a graduate program. Ex-officio members include one representative from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, one representative from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, and one graduate student representative (1-year term) appointed by the Student Government President. Other ex-officio members (1-year term) may be appointed by the Team's facilitator as appropriate to the Team's task.

#### **(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

The members of the UCT serve as a unified university entity to review and coordinate among the academic programs, schools, and colleges so as to (a) preserve and maintain the integrity of curriculum and course offerings, (b) review and resolve curricular issues, (c) assure public accountability to the university, (d) report to the Faculty Senate, and (e) collaborate with the General Education Council, Graduate Affairs Team, and Graduate Curriculum Team as appropriate. When the college representative to the Undergraduate Curriculum Team is not qualified or chooses not to present changes to the curriculum from other disciplines in the college they represent, the team may invite representatives from that discipline to present the changes and answer questions from the curriculum team.

The Undergraduate Curriculum Team is responsible for developing policies and procedures associated with the creation, maintenance and revision of undergraduate curriculum, academic policies and standards, and accreditation issues. The Undergraduate Curriculum Team will review proposed changes in, additions to, and deletions from the undergraduate curriculum, course descriptions and catalog information, and will forward recommendations to the Office of Academic Affairs.

No workplan items appeared to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws.

Recommendation: The review committee requests further explanation of the following:

(c) assure public accountability to the university

Questions from the committee:

- Is public is accountable to the university? What is the definition of “public” in this instance
- If there is an issue of accountability as relates to the general public, should that fall under administration or Faculty Senate?

**(e) Graduate Affairs Team**

**(i) Composition**

The Graduate Affairs Team (GAT) consists of one faculty member with graduate faculty Member or Associate Member status representing each College; one faculty member representing Library Services who is the liaison to a graduate program; one representative from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies and one representative from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction as ex-officio members; one graduate student representative and one graduate student alternate (both of whom may attend any meeting) appointed by the Student Government President (1-year term) to serve as ex-officio members.

**(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

The Graduate Affairs Team will review and recommend action to the Faculty Senate on all matters pertaining to university-level policies concerning graduate academic programs. These include, but are not limited to, (a) minimum requirements for graduate faculty eligibility, (b) admission to and completion of graduate programs, (c) final submissions of theses and dissertations, (d) the graduate grading system, (e) graduate research committees, (f) the distribution of graduate student assistantships and tuition waivers, and (g) the review of proposed changes to program-level policies to ensure compliance with university-level graduate policies. The GAT will review petitions from faculty members and graduate students appealing decisions based on university graduate academic policies and procedures as well as from applicants appealing for reconsideration of admission, and will forward recommendations to the Director of Graduate Studies. The GAT is not responsible for considering student appeals covered by other university or college committees including, but not limited to, grade appeals, appeals for reinstatement, appeals for residency reclassification, tuition and fee appeals, and withdrawal policy appeals.

The following workplan items appear to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws:

- Student misconduct and admission. The workplan item states the GAT is discussing the evidence necessary to deny admission based on past misconduct. It is unclear if this is a review of a standing policy
- Electronic Thesis/Dissertation Submission. The workplan item states the GAT conducted workshops to get faculty feedback. It is unclear if these workshops were designed for policy feedback or process feedback

Recommendations: In all teams, facilitators and team members should be empowered by the Senate Leadership Team to identify work that does not fall under the scope of the team's governing by-laws and refer those tasks back to the Senate Leadership Team for resolution.

#### **(f) Graduate Curriculum Team**

##### **(i) Composition**

The Graduate Curriculum Team (GCT) shall consist of one faculty member with graduate faculty Member or Associate Member status representing each College; and one faculty member representing Library Services who is the liaison to a graduate program. Ex-officio members include the Director of Graduate Studies; one representative from the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, and one graduate student representative (1-year term) appointed by the Student Government President. Other ex-officio members (1-year term) may be appointed by the Team's facilitator as appropriate to the Team's task.

##### **(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

The members of the GCT serve as a unified university entity to review and coordinate among the academic programs, schools and colleges so as to (a) preserve and maintain the integrity of curriculum and course offerings, (b) review and resolve curricular issues, (c) assure public accountability by the university, (d) report to the Faculty Senate and (e) collaborate with the GAT and UCT as appropriate. The GCT may invite representatives from programs proposing curriculum changes to present the proposed changes and answer questions from the GCT. The GCT is responsible for developing policies and procedures associated with the creation, maintenance and revision of graduate curriculum. The Graduate Curriculum Team will review proposed changes in, additions to, and deletions from the graduate curriculum, course descriptions, and catalog information and will forward recommendations to the Office of Academic Affairs.

The following workplan items appear to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws:

- Review of QEP proposals (2011-12)
- Academic Learning Compact, revision and review (2011-12)
- Research and recommend action, if any, regarding posthumous degrees; confer with UCT (2011-12)
- Review Student Grievance Policy and Procedure (2011-12) – Note: this was a request from Faculty Senate

Recommendation: In all teams, facilitators and team members should be empowered by the Senate Leadership Team to identify work that does not fall under the scope of the team's governing by-laws and refer those tasks back to the Senate Leadership Team for resolution.

#### **(g) Institutional Affairs Team**

##### **(i) Composition**

The Institutional Affairs Team consists of one faculty member representing each academic unit and one student appointed by the SGA, one representative of the Staff Advisory Council (SAC), and up to five (5) ex officio members to be appointed by the President of FGCU.

**(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

The Institutional Affairs Team functions as an advisory group and coordinating body with University administration, other nonacademic units, and the community on policy matters affecting the mission of the institution. The team will review and recommend policies concerning all matters relating to, but not limited to, campus planning and environmental concerns, institutional effectiveness and academic assessment; coordination of intern programs and community service activities; support of faculty research, scholarship, and service; academic calendar; and boundary-spanning activities and gifts.

The following workplan items appear to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws:

2012-13

- Provide first cut revisions to faculty handbook
- Confer with space utilization committee on space analysis plan
- Provide strategic leadership and guidance to faculty office space planning
- Continue exploration of options for additional seating for classroom hallways of Academic buildings

2011-12

- Attempt to obtain additional seating for classroom hallways or academic buildings
- Shared governance initiative
- Reserved parking for motorcycles and scooters
- Monitor the work of the newly formed SPBAC to assure effective communication between them and the IAT

Recommendation: The work of the team should either re-focus on the responsibility of policy review and recommendation, or “investigative” and action components should be added to the bylaws.

**(h) Library Team**

**(i) Composition**

The Library Team consists of one member representing each academic unit and the Dean of Library Services serving as an *ex officio* member.

**(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

The University Library Committee functions as an advisory group to the Dean of Library Services. The team will review and recommend policies concerning all matters relating to such matters as library instruction, service policies, collection development, and library technology development.

Note: This is the only Senate team advising an individual (Dean of Library Services).

No workplan items appeared to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws.

Recommendation: Though the review committee sees the importance of the team historically, the team is ineffective at this point. Consider disbanding team and monitoring for status changes.

**(i) Grants and Research Team**

**(i) Composition**

The Grants and Research Team consists of one faculty member representing each academic unit and a representative from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies as a non-voting, ex officio member and as the VPAA designee. The Team facilitator is elected by the Grant and Research

Team and must be at the rank of Associate Professor or higher, and have served at least one year on the Grants and Research Team.

**(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

The Grants and Research Team is a standing committee of the collegial faculty governance system, reporting to the Faculty Senate. It provides a direct faculty voice regarding all matters pertaining to the Office of Research and Graduate Studies. The team, at the direction of the Senate leadership, **reviews and recommends policies**, concerning matters relating to research and sponsored programs at the University. The Grants and Research Team **has specific responsibility for:**

- (a) Reviewing proposals for Center and Institute establishment and making recommendations;
- (b) Reviewing annual reports for Centers and Institutes and making recommendations regarding their performance and sustainability;
- (c) Reviewing Internal Grant proposals and making recommendations for funding;
- (d) Reviewing Graduate Research Assistantship proposals and making recommendations for funding;
- (e) Reviewing and selecting from multiple grant proposals where grantor imposes institutional submission limits;
- (f) Reviewing guidelines and providing support to university-wide research activities, such as FGCU's Research Day;
- (g) Advising the Office of Research and Graduate Studies on all policies, procedures, and matters related to research and sponsored programs, including items such as appropriation of return overhead funds and recommendations regarding support services to stimulate successful generation of sponsored research.

Note: The review committee found inconsistency within the bylaws. Initially the responsibilities state the team "...**reviews and recommends policies**..." Later the responsibilities are not related to policy but are action items. The appropriateness of the workplan is dependent on which aspect of the bylaws are viewed as the responsibility of the team

Recommendation: If items a-g are determined to be the responsibilities of the Grants and Research Team, the Review Committee recommends the bylaws be altered appropriately. If these are items that benefit from review/recommendation of policy/policy changes, the Review Committee recommends the workplan of the team reflect this. The Review Committee requests a review of the Senate's purview within the Office of Research and Graduate Studies as that will assist in the appropriate modification to the bylaws.

**(j) Technology Team**

**(i) Composition**

The Technology Team consists of one faculty member representing each academic unit and an *ex officio* member from academic computing

**(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

The Technology Team functions as an advisory group to academic computing and other University computing bodies. The team will review and recommend policies concerning all matters relating to University computing, including distance learning needs and requirements.

No workplan items appeared to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws.

**(k) General Education Council**

**(i) Composition**

The General Education Council (GEC) consists of three faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences; one faculty member from each of the other academic units; Director of General Education (*ex officio*); a representative of the Academic Advising Council (non-voting); and a

Student Government representative. Faculty must teach at least one undergraduate course per year or be a Librarian liaison to an undergraduate program, to be eligible to serve on the Council.

**(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

Members of the GEC serve as a unified university entity to (a) preserve and maintain academic integrity of general education curriculum and course offerings, (b) review and resolve curricular issues, (c) assure public accountability by the University, (d) report to the Faculty Senate, and (e) collaborate with the UCT when appropriate.

The Council will have primary responsibility for all curricular aspects of the General Education Program and is the unit-level review body for curricular proposals affecting general education and related university requirements.

The Council will collaborate with the Director of General Education on policy matters related to administration of the program.

When the college representative to the General Education Council is not qualified or chooses not to present changes to the curriculum from other disciplines in the college they represent, the team may invite representatives from that discipline to present the changes and answer questions from the General Education Council team.

No workplan items appeared to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws.

Recommendation: The review committee requests review of k.ii.c. "...assure public accountability by the University". Is this a Senate purview or an administrative purview? How can/should this be demonstrated? No workplan items were related to this bylaw statement.

**(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 exception of Library Services, which may choose to have only one, or to serve on an as-needed basis. Elected members from academic units will serve staggered 2- year terms. These members will be nominated and elected by the in-unit faculty members of their respective units. *Ex officio* members: Associate Vice President of Planning and Institutional Performance and/or designee.

**(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

a. 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 the seven-year University Program Review Plan.

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

The following workplan items appear to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws:

- Conduct Program Reviews: Process step 1
- Conduct Program Reviews: Process step 5
- Conduct Program Reviews: Process step 8

The Senate bylaws do not refer to an 8-step review process. The specific process steps referred to in the work plan are not available on the Senate webpage or on the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance webpage.

Recommendations:

- An "ad-hoc" program review team is referred to on the webpage for the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance. If the ad hoc team and the Senate team are intended to be one and the same the bylaws need to reflect that appropriately.
- If the Process steps consist of the items currently listed in the bylaws, in the interest of transparency a link to the process steps should be made available on the Senate webpage.
- The bylaws do not refer to the interaction between the program under review and the PRT. This Review Committee recommends including an invitation to the program chair/coordinator to discuss PRT questions/concerns prior to submission by PRT of the recommendation document
- This team ultimately provides program review feedback to both Senate and the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance. The connection of the team to both entities should be made clear within the bylaws.
- Please update l.ii.f. from "**Florida Department of Education's Division of Colleges and Universities**" to Board of Governors.

#### **(m) University Committee Appointments Team**

##### **(i) Composition**

The Appointments Team shall consist of one faculty member representing each academic unit.

##### **(ii) Responsibilities**

The Appointments Team functions as the group **responsible for generating nominees to fill faculty slots on all university-wide committees with faculty representation.** For each such committee, the Appointments Team shall be responsible for:

- Soliciting names of qualified faculty candidates, ensuring that all qualified faculty have equitable opportunity to volunteer for service;
- Selecting nominees from among the volunteers in the number requested for the committee slot(s). In the event the nominees for a particular committee are to be chosen by election, the team is responsible for compiling results of the election;
- Communicating the list of nominees to the appropriate authority responsible for the respective committee.

No workplan items appear to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws.

Recommendation: In the interest of transparency, this Review Committee recommends a statement be added to the bylaws related to actual procedure for selecting nominees prior to submitting the names to the appropriate authority.

**(n) Senate Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC)**

**(i) Composition**

The SPBAC is an affiliated committee of the Faculty Senate. The membership of the SPBAC consists of all in-unit faculty appointed by the President to represent faculty on the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) and its affiliated committees. The facilitator of the SPBAC will be elected by members at the committee's first meeting of the academic year and serves as a member of the Senate Leadership Team.

**(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

The membership of the SPBAC represents the voice and interests of the faculty in institutional planning and budgeting as carried out by the Planning and Budget Council and its affiliated committees (Budget; Safety and Facilities; Enrollment/Retention Management; Environmental Sustainability; Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness). The primary charge of the SPBAC is to provide input to the PBC process that will help ensure budgets and processes that support the mission and focus of the University and ensure the preservation of quality instruction. The SPBAC shall be responsible for:

- Coordinating regular communication and consultation between its members and the Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Leadership Team;
- Contacting and consulting with relevant Standing Teams of the Faculty Senate for input, feedback, or other comment when deemed necessary or prudent on issues associated with the University planning and budgeting processes
- Identifying from within its membership alternates for fellow members when they are unable to attend requisite meetings of the PBC and/or its affiliated committees.

No workplan items appear to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws.

**Program Review Team Response:**

**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 exception of Library Services, which may choose to have only one, or to serve on an as-needed basis. Elected members from academic units will serve staggered 2- year terms. These members will be nominated and elected by the in-unit faculty members of their respective units. *Ex officio* members: Associate Vice President of Planning and Institutional Performance and/or designee.

**(ii) Responsibilities and Duties**

- a. 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 the seven-year University Program Review Plan.
- 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. 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. 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. Provide information to Faculty Senate on how well FGCU program review procedures and products conform to current and future Florida Department of Education's Division of Colleges and Universities' directives (e.g. Academic Learning Compacts).

The following workplan items appear to be outside the scope of the team as described in the Senate bylaws:

- Conduct Program Reviews: Process step 1
- Conduct Program Reviews: Process step 5
- Conduct Program Reviews: Process step 8

The Senate bylaws do not refer to an 8-step review process. The specific process steps referred to in the work plan are not available on the Senate webpage or on the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance webpage.

Recommendations:

- An "ad-hoc" program review team is referred to on the webpage for the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance. If the ad hoc team and the Senate team are intended to be one and the same the bylaws need to reflect that appropriately.

- If the Process steps consist of the items currently listed in the bylaws, in the interest of transparency a link to the process steps should be made available on the Senate webpage.

**Comment [mcole1]:** This step is mandated in item c. i:  
i. Review guidelines for the selection of, and charges to external reviewers for each program under review.

**Comment [mcole2]:** This step is mandated in items c. ii, iii, and iv:  
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.

**Comment [mcole3]:** This step is mandated in item c. vi:  
vi. Track program review response meetings, their results, and one-year follow-up actions.

**Comment [mcole4]:** The Process step numbers are labels for internal use in the committee. They serve to organize record keeping and reference to the various components of the duties performed by PRT as established in the bylaws. The numbers are not for use by those outside of PRT who produce and or read the various documents which they indicate; the Process step numbers can easily be removed from the work plan, but if the work plan is for us, then it should be written in a way that helps us.

**Comment [mcole5]:** PRT has been conducting ongoing discussions of revisions to our bylaws. Faculty Senate is aware of this fact. Questions that Senate has about AA should be directed personally and professionally to that office.

**Comment [mcole6]:** --See Comment 4.

- The bylaws do not refer to the interaction between the program under review and the PRT. This Review Committee recommends including an invitation to the program chair/coordinator to discuss PRT questions/concerns prior to submission by PRT of the recommendation document

**Comment [mcole7]:** PRT regularly interacts with programs under review, as mandated by the various items under section c. of the bylaws. See Comment 5. PRT only comments on reviews; we do not make recommendations. PRT also struggles with bimonthly meetings, so adding an additional step to the process would be an extreme burden, already discussed by the Team and rejected.

- This team ultimately provides program review feedback to both Senate and the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance. The connection of the team to both entities should be made clear within the bylaws.

**Comment [mcole8]:** The recommendations being considered by PRT now may substantially change the bylaws. It is inappropriate for a work group to make recommendations such as these without consulting with the PRT. The work group violated its first charge.

- Please update I.ii.f. from “Florida Department of Education's Division of Colleges and Universities” to Board of Governors.

**Comment [mcole9]:** The decision about nomenclature should be referred to AA.

*In conclusion, this audit reflects an almost total lack of understanding by its authors of the purpose and function of PRT, despite the fact that the work produced by PRT adheres to the bylaws, as explained in comments 1, 2, 4, and 7. Thus, PRT considers the audit to be invalid and rejects it. We recommend that Senate Leadership express its deep concern to the authors of this document for failing to meet their charge to discuss their findings with the teams prior to publishing their report. We further recommend that ad hoc committees created by Senate Leadership be representative of the faculty at large and be vetted to ensure that they have the expertise to complete their assignment. In no case should one College dominate any committee such as this.*