

**Academic Policy Committee**  
**February 3, 2015**

Present: Sarah Ash, Montse Fuentes, Roy Borden, David Auerbach, Jim Knopp, Alton Banks, Jo-Ann Cohen

Guests: Duane Larick. Senior Vice Provost for Academic Strategy and Resource; Warwick Arden, Provost

--Topic: Issue of concern regarding program review process

**Provost Arden:** Faculty domain over curriculum is different from control of program inventory.

What generated this issue of concern is not program review, which happens on a regular basis and in which faculty are extensively engaged. This concern arose out of a low productivity review, which was established in 1995 by the BOG.

Academic programs establishment, consolidation, and dissolution rest with the BOG. Dissolution can start with the chancellor, the system president, or the planning committee of the BOG without any input from the campus. BOG does owe the campus a hearing; faculty/administrators can go before the BOG to argue their case.

Low productivity can fall into 3 different categories:

- Dips only just below limits; will be back up (e.g., philosophy)
- Enrollment is low and has been low for a while but will never change. However the program is seen as vital to the state; is an excellent program (e.g., poultry).
- Been low for a while, maybe going down, no hope for change (enrollment can be very low, e.g., 2-3 majors/year), no perceived benefit to the state.

Could this language be changed to just reflect what came in the UNC-GA letter i.e. With regard to those programs that are not and cannot be made productive the BOG will consider eliminating those programs in a manner that does not negatively impact upon the availability of educational opportunities for North Carolina citizens.

There is greater scrutiny now than before. Can't continue to delay decision.

**Duane Larick:**

Productivity = includes both # of students in program and # of graduates

Process: Data is generated and sent to the university and university is asked to respond. University currently leaves the decision to each Dean to decide how to engage the faculty.

**David Auerbach:** Still are concerns about how discussions re consolidation have been handled. Concern that a dean could decide to act unilaterally without significant faculty input. Should at least go to a college committee for review.

**Provost Arden:** In the end, faculty committees are advisory. Can have faculty input but hard to get faculty to want to dissolve/consolidate programs. Time line is also short, so need to avoid a complex process. Wants the university to be in control, taking an active role in its curriculum v. just allowing the BOG to make the tough decisions for us. BOG will be more accommodating if it appears that the campus has taken an active roll in its own curriculum management.

**Roy Borden:** This process is comparable to the RPT process. Upper administration ultimately makes the decisions, but faculty would still like consultation as a formal part of the process. Of course, whatever memo is distributed from the Provost's office should make clear to the campus that final the decision rests with upper administration.

**Montse Fuentes:** Need for transparency in the process.

Need for a regulation? Provost Arden would prefer this to be SOP v. regulation or resolution.

--Action: Duane Larick will send out a proposal for an SOP.