School of Education Program Review Process
Last Draft Update: September 23, 2023

<u>Campus-Level Context</u>

A primary component driving the success of UNCG meeting its mission is the extent to which UNCG's academic portfolio (i.e., the collective array of academic programs offered by UNCG) best serve the needs of our community, region, and state. Given the finite resources (financial and personnel) available to UNCG, the particular composition of UNCG's academic portfolio requires close attention, guidance, and shaping to ensure the campus is optimally meeting its mission. To this end, on a periodic basis, each UNCG academic program will be reviewed to evaluate the program's vibrancy, health, and impact (the frequency of review has yet to be determined). The results of this review process will be used in making a range of decisions pertaining to the overall academic portfolio of UNCG, including program changes, program expansion, and program discontinuation.

A newly formulated program review process will be implemented beginning the fall of 2023. This will mark the initial implementation of an ongoing process of program review that will be integrated into the annual administrative cycle. While the temporal cycle of the review process across campus has not yet been finalized (e.g., every four years, etc.), the fall 2023 semester marks the beginning of the cycle process.

Broad information about the information being used in the review (i.e., review rubrics, dashboards, and program-level contextual information) can be accessed at this link: https://innovation.uncg.edu/initiatives/academic-data-dashboards-admin-services-review/

The university-level timeline of the review process for 2023-2024 can be accessed at this link: https://provost.uncg.edu/uncg-academic-portfolio-review-timeline/

<u>School of Education Context</u>

As an active and supportive member of the UNCG academic community, the School of Education (SOE) will engage in the UNCG program review process. It is recognized that this can be an unsettling process that brings with it substantial concern and stress. This process is new for the SOE and we will be implementing this complex system of steps and decision rules for the first time while simultaneously striving to support our core institutional values. As the SOE navigates this process, the SOE Leadership Team is committed to upholding the following values:

       a) **Transparent Process**. Details of the process will be accessible and disseminated to SOE staff and faculty in a timely manner so that all staff and faculty in the SOE can have a clear understanding of our processes, how decisions will be made, and the outcomes of such decisions. Members of the SOE staff and faculty will have frequent opportunity to ask questions and share their views as we proceed through this process.

b) **Inclusive Process**. We will invite input from SOE faculty and staff on the processes used throughout the review. We will include opportunity for input throughout this process.

c) **Joint Commitment to the UNCG Mission and the SOE Mission**. Decisions stemming from the SOE-level review will be made in a way that jointly support the UNCG mission and the SOE mission. While the SOE mission may be finely intertwined with the specific properties of our teaching, research, and service, it is critical that the SOE mission be considered in unison with the broader UNCG mission as we engage in this process to support the future vibrancy of UNCG as an institution for decades to come.

While the campus-level review process will follow the general timeline managed by the Provost's Office (see timeline here: https://provost.uncg.edu/uncg-academic-portfolio-review-timeline/), each academic unit has latitude to tailor its own unit-specific review process within the general campus-level timeline. A current draft of the components and timeline of the SOE review process are detailed in Table 2.

The Review Materials

The program review will include several sets of materials.

a) **Rubrics**. In the summer of 2023, the UNCG Program Review Task Force (PRTF) developed a series of rubrics to present and aggregate data pertaining to metrics along four categories: (i) Cost & Revenue, (ii) Program Demand and Instructional Efficiency, (iii) External Grants & Contracts, (iv) Student Success. The data for categories (i) and (iii) only exist at the level of the department and thus these outcomes are identical for all programs within a given department. For each category there are multiple indicators scored as:

> 4 = Exceeds expectations
> 3 = Meetings expectations
> 2 = Approaching expectations
> 1 = Needs examination

Each category will receive a score ranging from 1 to 4, and then a total aggregate score (aggregating a weighted average across the four categories) will be computed.

b) **Contextual Data**. Each program may draft a narrative of up to 1,000 words detailing contextual factors to be considered in evaluating the program's heath, vibrancy, and impact.

c) **Additional Information**. Additional information about program characteristics may be requested as needed.

A General Overview of the Review Process

The review process for 2023-2024 will occur from September 2023 to February 2024. This process can be conceptualized around four stages, summarized in Table 1. More granular details of these stages within the context of the SOE are provided in SOE timeline shown in Table 2.

Table 1 General Overview of the Review Process		
Stage	Months	Description
1	August to October	**Program Review Information is Organized & Disseminated** (a) The quantitative information to be used in the review is collected centrally and imported into established rubrics (developed by the Program Review Task Force). These rubrics with imported data will be furnished to each department by September 16. (b) Additional program-specific contextual narrative information can be provided by the program.
2	October	**Initial Review of Program (Phase 1 Review)** An initial review of each program – referred to broadly as **Phase 1 Review** – is conducted using the information of the rubrics and contextual data submitted by the program. This review is conducted within the SOE by an SOE-level Phase 1 Review Team. The purpose of Phase 1 Review is to determine, based on data from the rubrics and contextual data, which programs require further examination. More information about this is provided in Table 2.
3	November to January	**Second-Level Review of Programs (Phase 2 Review)** Programs identified in the Phase 1 Review as requiring further examination will engage in a more comprehensive review, referred to as **Phase 2 Review**. This review will include (a) all of the information from the Phase 1 Review, and (b) additional information furnished by the department. This review is conducted within the SOE by an SOE-level Phase 2 Review Team. The purpose of Phase 2 review is to identify programs that are to be recommended to the SOE Dean for further examination, which in turn could lead to being recommended by the Dean to the Provost for a program continuation, expansion, changes, or discontinuation.
4	January to February	**Final Decisions Are Made** After reviewing the results of Phase 1 and Phase 2, the SOE Dean makes recommendations about program expansion, changes, or discontinuation to the Provost and Chancellor for their review. Final decisions are made by the Chancellor and implementation will follow.

The SOE Program Review Timeline and Process for 2023-2024

Table 1 presents the general four stages of the program review process. In practice, these stages include numerous steps that will be tailored to the specifications of each academic unit. A detailed listing of these steps for the SOE, along with associated timeline for the SOE, are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Components and Timeline of the SOE Program Review Process	
Date	**Action**
Aug 18 – Aug 23	Initial draft SOE Program Review Process document is disseminated to SOE Chairs and Associate Deans for input. The feedback is used to update the draft prior to disseminating to SOE staff and faculty. **Due Date**. Input from Chairs and Associate Deans due by August 23.
Aug 24 – Sept 15	Current draft of the SOE Program Review Process document is disseminated to SOE staff and faculty for input. Concurrently, several program review information sessions, open to all SOE staff and faculty, will be held by the Dean. **Due Date**. Input from staff and faculty is due to the Dean by Sept 15.
Oct 6	Final review rubrics, populated with the program-specific data, are available to each department.
Oct 6 – Oct 20	**Departmental Review of Data** Departments now have the completed rubrics containing the program-level information and will engage in a review of the data contained in each rubric for each program. Potential issues with data integrity that are identified are reported to the PRTF as soon as possible.
Sept 25 – Oct 20	**Nominations for Phase 2 Review Team** Nominations for faculty representatives (one per department) to serve on the Phase 2 Review Team are solicited. Final selections will be announced prior to the start of the Phase 2 Review.
Oct 6 – Oct 20	**Establish Decision Rules Used in Phase 1 Review** The initial review of programs (Phase 1 Review) will be based on thresholds established with respect to (a) the profile of rubric scores, and (b) contextual data narrative furnished by the department. Any program meeting one of the thresholds will be identified for further examination in the Phase 2 Review. Threshold standards will be established for programs that demonstrate evidence of (a) strong health and vibrancy, and thus warrant exploration for potential expansion; or (b) challenges to health and vibrancy, and thus warrant exploration for potential program modification or discontinuation. It is possible that these thresholds will need to align with campus-level criteria. The particular thresholds to be used will be proposed and finalized during this time period. **Due Date.** Final decision rules will be disseminated to SOE staff and faculty by October 20.

Sept 18 – Oct 18	**Draft Contextual Data Document (Optional)** Departments can draft the program-level narrative for the contextual data used in the program review using the guidelines specified by the PRTF. Note that this contextual data is optional; it is up to each program as to whether it wishes to provide the contextual data narrative. **Due Date**. Contextual Data document to the SOE Dean's Office is Oct. 18.
Oct 20 – Nov 7	**Phase 1 Review** The Phase 1 Review is used to determine which programs shall be identified to advance to the Phase 2 Review for further examination. The Phase 1 Review Team will evaluate the rubric scores and contextual data and, based on this information, will apply the established decision rules for identifying programs that require additional examination. Those programs identified to advance to Phase 2 Review may demonstrate evidence of potential for expansion, modification, or discontinuation. The Phase 1 Review Team consists of ten members, including departmental leadership, staff members, and deans: -Department Chairs (5) -Director of OSS -Assistant Dean for Educator Preparation -Associate Deans (2) -Dean **Due Date**. Results of the Phase 1 Review will be disseminated to the SOE staff and faculty by November 7.
Nov 8 – Dec 8	**Phase 2 Review** The Phase 2 Review includes the information used in Phase 1 plus the collection of more detailed information from the departments (e.g., expanded contextual information provided by the department, or other information the department deems relevant), Institutional Research, and any other resources on campus. Using this information, the Phase 2 Review Team will complete the following: (a) For each program advanced to the Phase 2 Review, the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) will be assembled and articulated in a program-specific SWOT report. (b) Using all available information (SWOT report, additional information from the departments, rubrics, contextual data, additional information from Institutional Research, etc.), the Phase 2 Review Team will then make a recommendation as to which programs of the Phase 2 Review process might be considered for removal from further examination by the Dean for expansion, modification, or discontinuation.

	The Phase 2 Review Team consists of 13 members, including departmental leadership, staff members, faculty, and one Associate Dean: -Department Chairs (5) -One faculty Dept. Representative from each department (5) -Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Student Success -Director of OSS -Assistant Dean of Educator Preparation **Due Date**. Initial results of Phase 2 Review, as assembled by the Phase 2 Review Team, are disseminated to the Dean by December 8.
Dec 11 – Jan 12	**Final Phase 2 Recommendations Drafted** SOE Dean, the SOE Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, and the SOE Associate Dean of Research will examine the Phase 2 Review information, the Phase 2 Review Team recommendations, and the associated SWOT reports. Based on the review of this information, along with corresponding deliberation among the Dean and Associate Deans, the Dean will generate a final set of recommendations to be sent to the Provost. The Chair of any department having a program listed in the final recommendations will be notified of the associated program-level recommendation being sent to the Provost. When the Provost provides approval for broader dissemination, the final recommendations will be disseminated to the SOE staff and faculty. **Due Date**. The Dean will submit the final recommendations to the Provost by January 12.
Jan 15 – Feb 1	**Final Decisions Are Made** Recommendations from the Dean are reviewed by the Provost and Chancellor. Final decisions are made by the Chancellor and implementation will follow.