

Graduate Program Review Appeals Committee Summary Note #2: June 19, 2006

Attending: Adrian “Ed” Edwards (Academic Deans), Bruce Ferrin (College Curriculum Committees), Leigh A. Ford (Graduate Studies Council), John Jellies, chair (Faculty Senate), Mary Lagerwey (Faculty Senate), William Liou (Research Policies Council), Richard O’Hearn (Academic Chairs, Directors), David Reinhold (Undergraduate Studies Council), Gwen Tarbox (Graduate Studies Council) **Absent:** Lee L. deLisle (College Curriculum Committees)

Jellies called the meeting to order at 8:33 A.M.

1. **Agenda** was approved as written.
2. **Summary Note #1** (6.12.06) was approved with change: remove “It was decided ...” from page 1.
3. **Program Visit Guidelines** were approved as written.
4. Committee discussed **appeals process**:

Background. Committee discussed Graduate Program Review:

- Leadership failed to communicate decisions effectively.
- Absence of substantive documentation or rationale implied lack of respect on leadership’s part. This perception compounded by fact that programs submitted great deal of paperwork for GPR.
- Some programs increased enrollment but were targeted for closure anyway.
- Senior faculty promised junior hires that they’d have opportunity to teach graduate students.
- President needs to be aware of potential impact of closures on student population (financial as well as academic).
- In some cases, evaluation data contained errors.

President’s charge. Committee discussed scope of recommendations:

- Committee will respond only to factual elements of each appeal.
- Committee’s rationales must be consistent.
- Errors in data are valid reason for acting positively on an appeal.
- An argument based entirely on revenue/cost is ill-advised. Considerations such as a program’s national or international reputation or contribution to University identity are at least as important as dollar value.
- Most financial considerations are long-term managerial issues.
- Committee has latitude to include contingencies in its recommendations, e.g. to recommend a program’s suspension for a given period, followed by reassessment.
- Because mergers can’t take place until a program has been terminated (with contingencies) and undergone review by Faculty Senate, appeal representatives must be open and specific about longer-term plans.
- Programs are encouraged to illustrate their contributions to strategic vision of University.
- Committee has been given unique opportunity to help leadership learn from mistakes made during GPR process.

Process. Committee discussed decisions process and writing/dissemination of reports:

- President will review all appeals documentation prior to receiving committee’s recommendations.
- Voting procedures:
 - Numerical vote will be made public.
 - Jellies will vote only in event of a tie.
 - If a committee member feels compromised for any reason, he or she is expected to abstain.

- Committee's report on each program will:
 - Begin with brief summary of reasons for appeal.
 - Summarize program's strengths in relation to GPR criteria.
 - Assess program's contribution to strategic direction of University.
 - Be submitted simultaneously to President Bailey and main program representative.

- 5. **Next meeting** (Thursday, June 22, 8:30 A.M. to 2 P.M., Bernhard Center Board Room): First day of informational sessions.

Jellies adjourned the meeting at 10:57 A.M.