April 14, 2014

Priorities and New Program Review Committee report to date for the 2013-2014 academic year.

Judy Ryerson, continues to be the committee chair, in order to have some continuity in the committee. Here is an outline of our activities for this academic year.

Here are the minutes of the first meeting.

“PNPRC Meeting Minutes 9/18/2013 1PM HFA 263

In attendance: Judy Ryerson (chair), Robyn Raschke, Katrina Harris, Harry Teng, Sue Mueller, Janet Dufek, Peter Gray, Tom Sommer, Gene Hall. Excused for prior engagement: Christine Springer. The Committee is still missing members representing Law, Science, and Hotel Admin.

The chair just arrived from a meeting with the new chair of the faculty senate - Paul Werth. At that meeting, some discussion was had concerning the mission/charter of this committee. In light of the seeming end of program cuts, the most recent mission of this committee, Judy asked for ideas on how to retool, revitalize, and reboot this committee. Paul and Judy agreed that it is helpful considering the current growth of the university that a make-work committee was not needed. However, a committee that can provide an objective third party viewpoint to the senate at large would be helpful.

With this in mind; Judy came up with a new mission for the committee that needs to be reviewed by Paul as Faculty Senate Chair. The thrust of the statement says that this committee will provide an objective third party recommendation on all appropriate issues or aspects of university governance brought to it, as these issues relate to University Priorities and New Programs. A complete mission statement will be forwarded to the committee members upon Paul’s review.

As there are only two continuing members on this semester’s committee, the history of the committee was reviewed. After further discussion about the mission Judy reinforced the desired collaborative work that she would like seen happen between other committees. Paul reinforced this idea with the stated desire to arrange a meeting of related Senate Committee Chairs. Gene Hall suggested that we as committee members could bring forward issues to discuss, and further present to Paul.

Old Business:

The committee was presented with a summary of last spring’s committee activity. They included a review and recommendation for a new Graphic Design Program and a recommendation regarding the process suggested and language outlining reviewing a program for low-yield per the NSHE By Laws. To date we do not know the university response to our recommendation.
Potentially New/ Upcoming Business:

- It was suggested, that given the President’s desire to initiate a Tier 1 plan, that this committee study the matter, as they may be involved in future discussions. The President may be bringing it to the Faculty Senate meeting October 22nd. It was encouraged that any committee member attend and report back. Unfortunately, we all were busy and have not done anything internally to further the discussion of Tier 1 status.

- It is suggested that this committee may be involved in a review of the program review process. Right now, the current process, as outlined in the NSHE code, is mechanical and does not provide an intellectual and appropriately provocative review of programs. We see where we succeed, but do not assess where and why we fail and constructively act on the results of the review.

- Along with this, it is suggested that this committee review the UNLV bylaws in regard to the NSHA bylaws regarding program review. Furthermore this committee might recommend a written procedure for said program review process. The committee might review those parts of the NSHE code, and ancillary materials that are made available to the committee by the chair in regards to this issue.

Upon review of the time availability of the committee to meet, early Wednesday afternoon seemed the best when all of us could meet. HFA 262, conference room, is a good location for everyone for future meetings. Since the charge of the committee is fluid with the needs of the senate and other constituencies, Judy reinforced the need for quick response from everyone to email notices she may send out to the committee. If we are all timely in this work, we may not need to get together all the time and we can have a “telecommeeting.” Judy thanked everyone for his or her fast and efficient response to setting up this meeting.

Meeting adjourned 1:45ish

JR “

Late in September, early October, The PNPRC committee chair was invited to sit on the differential tuition committee to review new applications. Knowing this was a very busy time, the application forms were forwarded to each PNPRC member to review and comment on. Nearly all members responded with some kind of opinion. I sent out the following email:
10/3/2013

Hello, We have been asked to review the HRH College of Engineering's Differential Fees Final Draft form and the Graphic Design and Media form, from the Differential Tuition Committee I am a part of earlier than I expected. This needs to happen before our meeting on the 16th. I am presenting my findings to the DT Committee next Friday at 9 AM. Please look over the attached Engineering Proposal PDF and send your comments to all of us ASAP. We can keep the discussion going up through about 5 on Wednesday, the ninth. I will collate and send out a summary of our ideas to you all on Thursday and present on Friday. There may be an additional proposal that needs discussion I will send it out as soon as I am able.

Judy Ryerson
Coordinator for MFA Design and Technology Programs
Resident Artist Nevada Conservatory Theatre
Associate Professor- Costume Design
Department of Theatre, UNLV
702-895-3348

This started a response chain letter developed between all of us:

From: Gene Hall/UNLV
Y'all: Being new to the Committee, I am not sure what I should be looking for in reviewing a proposal. I will be looking to see what you submit so that I can learn what we should be doing.

I have taken a quick look at the Engineering proposal. I like that it has provided so many comparisons and cost analyses. Three thoughts:

1. I am sure it is there, but I have not found what the new tuition number would be. Or, how it compares to the old number with all the fees.

2. I would think that there would need to be more increase in the graduate amount. $20 is not that much, and it is less than what is being requested for undergraduate. Why is it not more?

3. I am not one to look primarily at the dollars. I have other questions such as: How will something like this affect program quality, the caliber of students, graduation rates, being able to offer new courses and technologies, update curriculum, etc.?

I am responding early so that y'all can see

From Judy Ryerson

Gene, and all...

The point of your looking over the proposal is as a third, fourth, fifth, eye on this process. Ask these questions as you review it: Do you understand the proposal as is? Is there additional information you want to know before an approval or not of the request? The basic questions you ask at the end of #3 are all great and have been discussed in the DT committee as part of the broader question regarding the need, efficacy, efficiency, and effect of differential tuition on any program. If I may say about the committee, I think we all felt the idea of differential tuition was a good one and the benefits would outweigh the problems. These however are good questions and I will add them as a general note.

Judy Ryerson

The discussions continued…
Hi Judy and fellow committee members,

In looking over these additional two items, I raise a few items for consideration. Regarding the blank form, it looks generally fine to me. However, I wonder if it wouldn't make the most sense to have a few folks who have recently completed differential tuition applications to comment on it under the thought that they would more concretely be able to specify strengths and limitations in it.

As to the Graphic Design proposal, it seemed thorough and clear, with a few minor typos. I did wonder whether the amount ($156.75) per credit hour for 300- and 400-level courses is too high, particular when about 40% of the revenue generated would go toward a tenure-track faculty member. Is it acceptable protocol to use such fees to support tenure-track faculty hiring like proposed here?

Peter B. Gray, PhD

Christina said the same

The think the next two proposals are good. The second one (B.S. Graphic Design and Media degrees) was very well thought out. However, the idea of tying this differential fee to the creation of one of their new full-time faculty positions seems to cause a lot of concern for a few people. I would recommend that it be made clearer in their proposal that the students understand that this differential fee is paying for one of the new positions in the Department of Art. If they are OK with it and this is a common way to fund faculty positions within their college or department, then it looks like a solid proposal. A proposal that should go forward. I hope this helps.

Tom Sumner

Judy and colleagues,

This is the new program that presented to our committee last spring, correct? During their presentation I recall they did request additional faculty lines. I question whether it is wise (if even acceptable) to fund a tenure track line on differential tuition. One would expect the budget line for a tenure track position to be dynamic as the person moves through their academic career. What mechanism is proposed to deal with this?

I have no additional observations that have not already been raised.

Thanks,
Janet

Colleagues,
Consistent with Janet's comments, I also was struck with the perspective of funding faculty lines with differential tuition. In addition, the student support does not map directly towards the argument of direct benefit. I'm not sure if the students surveyed would buy into a faculty line as directly benefitting them; as quoted, "Students questioned how differential fees would be spent, and stated that the prospect of differential fees was acceptable provided that the fees, if approved, directly benefited students in the program." I would have liked to see the Department have a strong argument to this as well as a student survey that specifically asked if funding a faculty line thru differential tuition is deemed as a direct student benefit.

Robyn
Summary: The committee as a whole liked the idea and supported the idea of implementing differential tuition to these two programs, with minor changes to language on the form.

In mid-October, Judy Ryerson (PNPC Chair) met with the Paul Werth (Chair of Faculty Senate), John Farley (Program Review), and Jack Schobrowsky (Curriculum) to make sure the mission of this committee was defined. This is a continuation of the discussion outlined in the second and third paragraphs of the proceeding minutes. In order to best work with existing committees, and not create undo overlap, the mission was defined as:

“The Priorities and New Program Review Committee will act as a third party to review the viability of proposed new programs in regards to current university assets, that may include but not be limited to resources such as facilities, and faculty.”

“PNPRC Meeting Minutes on 10/16/2013 1PM HFA 263

In attendance Judy Ryerson, Peter Gray, Sue Mueller, Tom Sommer, Gene Hall, Janet Dufek.

The committee discussed the new mission with its focus on logistical issues for implementing a new program. Several members expressed their appreciation for clarity. We than went on to have a philosophical discussion about how the recently mandated goal for Tier I status could effect the consideration of a new program. There was a lively debate as to our responsibility in offering objective outcomes that may or may not reflect Tier I goals. Most felt we should wait and see what was asked of the committee and on a case by case basis include a Tier I paradigm to the conversation.

Summary:

- With the viewpoints of other senate chair members, came up with a better working mission and statement of purpose
- The Committee took part in reviewing differential tuition for the Engineering and Art programs
- The committee is willing to consider Tier I priorities when reviewing programs.
Currently, no additional actions have been requested of the committee. Although I have heard of a couple of certificate programs being vetted, nothing as of yet has come to the attention of the committee chair or its members.

Judy Ryerson
PNPRC Chair
April 16, 2014