PNPRC Report for Spring 2015

This is the 2014-15 report for PNPRC. The members of the committee that participated this academic year include Judy Ryerson, Tom Sommer, Gene Hall, Christine Springer, Jonathan Anderson, Peter Grey, Tod Fitzpatrick, Janet Dufek, Robyn Rasche, Harry Teng, and Katrina Harris.

First Order of Business. Committee membership

The Chair has not double-checked to see if the committee is made up of the required number of representatives. However, the chair notes that everyone on this committee is involved and participates in assignments.

Charges for this academic Year

- Per Bylaw charge 6.11.1 Screen and review all programs, and make recommendations, regarding their priority, to the Provost, with copies to the president, after appropriate campus consultation. No New Programs were submitted for review this academic year

- 6.11.2 Criteria and procedures for program review shall be established by the committee. Bylaws were created first and then a discussion of the organizational procedures will take place, that will include criteria and procedures for program review. The committee has requested to increase the scope of their program analysis, which will certainly affect the organizational criteria and procedures for any review process. Please review the preamble to the new Bylaws, as well as the new Bylaws, outlined below in letter A.

- 6.11.3 Establish a Priority list of all professional positions for all colleges and academic supporting units and submit the recommended priority list to the Provost, with copies to the President. Please see the Report dated Feb 4, 2015 below in letter B

- 6.11.4 Criteria and Procedures for recommendations of positions shall be established by the committee. Once the title and scope of the committee is established, these criteria and procedures for vetting potential positions will occur naturally along with the vetting of any new program.

A) Discussion regarding charge 6.11.2

Meeting Attendees included Judy Ryerson, Tom Sommer, Gene Hall, Christine Springer, Jonathan Anderson, Peter Grey, Tod Fitzpatrick, Janet Dufek. Robyn Rasche, Harry Teng and
Katrina Harris participated via an email study of the minutes. Everyone reviewed the minutes, and a final acceptance was tallied electronically.

As a preamble to any discussion about Bylaws, the committee members felt two changes should be made to the committee’s charter.

1) Rename the committee to include the word *Undergraduate*, so that the specific classification of programs to be reviewed is specified. As the graduate college vets the new Graduate programs, a better distinction of review entities is warranted. They further feel it is redundant to have the word “committee” in the title. The new title for this committee is Priorities and New Undergraduate Program Review.

2) It is the understanding of the chair of the committee that the responsibilities of any vetting process be limited to the physical and faculty campus resources that may be required for any new program; that compliance to the mission of the university be vetted by another Faculty Senate Committee- the other Program Review Committee. The PNUPR would like to be responsible for all study and analysis of any new undergraduate program. They felt that it was unnecessary to split the work and that one analytical voice should be enough.

The Bylaws outlined below have both of these changes in mind.

**PNUPR Bylaws**

Priorities and New Program Review

Article I - Name

Old: name Priorities and New Program Review Committee

New: Priorities and New *Undergraduate* Program Review

Article II - Purpose

This committee functions in an advisory capacity to the Faculty Senate of UNLV. The PNUPR committee makes recommendations regarding the addition of undergraduate programs. PNUPR committee studies the mission compliance and resource viability of potential new undergraduate programs. It has no legislative, administrative or programmatic authority and is advisory only. The PNUPR committee is an integral part of the analysis and vetting of potential undergraduate program expansion of UNLV. This committee provides an objective analysis of the potential development of any proposed new undergraduate program.

This committee also functions as a research body to gather, study, and present data to the faculty senate regarding any mandate set forth by the Faculty Senate, as it concerns new undergraduate program expansion.
Article III – Objectives
The primary objective of the Committee is to analyze the viability and appropriate charge of any potential undergraduate degree program and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

1. The focus of the analysis may include, but not be limited to Top Tier goals, community impact, faculty, staff, facilities, library resources

Article IV – Membership
1. Membership
   1. The members of the Advisory Board shall be representatives from each educational unit of UNLV, as outlined by the University By Laws
   2. Terms of membership
      a. Members are elected by each college, and may be appointed, or can volunteer if an opening occurs not within the regular election cycle.
      b. Appointment will be for three academic years
   3. Officers
      a. The Committee membership shall elect a chair from the senior members of the committee.

4. Member Responsibilities
   a. Each member is expected to attend meetings and to participate in all mandated reviews and other duties as assigned.
   b. Each member is expected to study any program application and review materials and contribute.
   c. If a member cannot attend, the member can designate a proxy, given that person qualifies for membership, and is from the same unit as the member.
   d. A long term proxy can also be designated. A Long term proxy is for a member that cannot participate for a semester of their term.

Article V - Organization
1. Committee Operation
   a. Meetings will be held as necessary, but at least once a semester
   b. Chair will develop an agenda for each meeting.
   c. Meeting sessions will be limited to approximately one hour
d. Discussion to obtain consensus will be the prevailing procedure used at meetings.

e. Parliamentary procedure will be used when a decision is to be recorded and transmitted as a recommendation.

f. Any motions/decisions/recommendation requiring a vote will be based on a majority of the members present.

g. Additional meetings to facilitate the participation of all members of the committee may be arranged at the discretion of the chair. Meeting minutes will be recorded for each meeting and disseminated to all committee members.

h. All communications start with an email from the chair or any member of the committee and is sent to all members of the committee. Where appropriate, members will be invited to upload, share, and respond to materials posted electronically.

i. A compilation of an annual report will be submitted in May.

2. Sub Committees

a. The committee may be divided up and different tasks assigned, depending on the scope of the program assessment or task.

B) This is the resulting report concerning charge 6.11.3. To date, the committee has not received any feedback with the requested guidance.

“February 4, 2015

PNPRC Report to Faculty Senate Committee Chairs

Mandates:

A) Creating Bylaws: To Be addressed in Late March

B) Screen and review all programs, and make recommendations, regarding their priority, to the Provost, with copies to the president, after appropriate campus consultation.

As a starting point to gather information and collate potential faculty hires, the committee started gathering the Listening To Department Reports (LTD Reports) as a bouncing off place to gather and collate the information. However, it became clear that without certain parameters or
criteria to use as a gauge for collating and prioritizing the information gathered, a starting point could not be ascertained, especially as the material was four years old.

Perhaps due to the committee chair’s naiveté first in thinking that the LTD Reports would be a good place to start, and secondly hoping that a rubric would become obvious, we experienced some push back from some Chairs and Deans. Given the new stated goals for the university- Tier One- Research etc, the information on the LTD Reports appeared to be more a product of a campus wide knee jerk reaction to the recession and more a statement of what we needed to do in order to return to some pre-recession status quo, if at all possible. The information proved to be outdated in some cases and required updating. Some department chairs did update their information.

Each of the various hiring constituencies has different goals based on their current status and current university goals. Parameters included within the strategic plan for the university, for Tier One status, and undergraduate vs. graduate education are potentially all different.

A valiant effort was made, but we came up with more questions than absolutes. The committee would like to know what attributes of the potential faculty hire in relationship to which viewpoint of university health and growth should be considered. And the committee felt it was important to find out President Jessup’s viewpoint.

If this is intended to represent Faculty and Senate involvement in the hiring process, than perhaps the parameters and rubric we use to gather and collate the information should come from the Senate based on where the Senate feels the attention should be paid. Those parameters would potentially focus the report in a different direction. “

Minutes and Report approved electronically by all members of the committee by Friday, May 1, 2015

Report written by Judy Ryerson, Committee Chair
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