UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Lone Star Room, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
1200 E. Anderson Lane, Austin, TX

Twelfth Meeting

Friday, February 27, 2009

Meeting Summary

Attending: Ahern, Bean, Bolch, Brown, Coleman, Eglsaer, Ekal, DeFranco, Garrett, Gilbert, Gunn, Hopper, Jones (for Thompson), Martinez, Lowery-Hart, Reynard, Peebles, Reina, Waggoner, Wiedemann

Absent: Hardin, Harper, Swain, Thompson, Student Representative Garcia

Staff: Parsoneault, Linkletter, Stephenson, Lemoine, Goeman, Ayala, Montiel

Guests: Patty Guerra, Sen. Ogden's office; Roberta Rincon (UT System)

The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Larry Garrett at 10:00 am.

I. Approval of Meeting Summary for December 5, 2008 Meeting

Approved by vote of the committee.

II. Discussion: Civic Virtue in the Texas Core Curriculum

Dr. Stephenson explained that Senator Ogden was interested in the core curriculum addressing civic virtue. He explained that there had already been discussions with Senator Ogden about how the core curriculum currently addressed civic virtue and what might be included in any reconstitution of the core. Since the core curriculum is already being discussed, this appears to be a good time to discuss Senator Ogden's interest. Ms. Patty Guerra, of Senator Ogden's staff, read Senator Ogden's letter and led discussion on what the committee's thoughts were on this issue.

III. Committee Business

a. **Introduction of New Committee Members or Update on Nomination Process for Committee Vacancies**
b. **Update on Finalization and Distribution of Committee Report and Recommendations, *Undergraduate Education for the 21st Century***

As there were many new members, the committee members introduced themselves and expressed their interests that led them to agree to serve on the committee.

Dr. Parsoneault stated that *Undergraduate Education for the 21st Century* was being distributed to the governor's office and to the legislature, and will be distributed to all higher education institutions across the state.

IV. Discussion of Report from Subcommittee on Existing Program Review, including Recommendations Regarding Criteria for Review of Existing Undergraduate Programs at Public Institutions of Higher Education

Dr. Peebles introduced the third draft of the committee's recommendations regarding criteria for review of existing undergraduate programs (attached). He noted the section on rationale, related to the purpose of the review, which is to assure that degree programs are effective in imparting knowledge and skills and are cost effective. He noted the section on accountability measures that are available to be used from existing sources. He also noted the suggested criteria for evaluation categorized under structure, participation, and process.

The committee broke into three subcommittees, each charged with producing one recommendation for the CB and one for the institutions related to their assigned areas of Purpose, Data & Information, and Process. They made the following recommendations:

Subcommittee 1, Purpose:

CB: Balance quality education with the efficient use of state funds.

Use: To educate the legislature with regard to the best uses of funds to achieve educational purposes.

1. Give feedback to institutions with regard to how to enhance and/or develop viable programs. Feedback = best practices, onsite visitation option, clearinghouse for all other assessment data (gathered in various assessments.)
2. Identify at-risk programs with a probationary status. At the conclusion of the probationary period, a decision will be made to maintain or eliminate the program. (Process & Data groups information is key here.)
3. Use program review in deciding whether to approve a new program.

Institution: Balance quality education with the efficient use of state funds.

Use:

1. Find strengths and weaknesses of viable programs to maintain and/or improve quality.
2. Identify programs warranting further investment and programs that should be combined or eliminated.

Subcommittee 2, Data & Information:

CB:

1. For each program, the CB should define data elements derived from Accountability System measures that are applicable at the program level. Individual institutions would identify those measures most relevant to their institutional mission to use for review purposes. CB could require certain measures that are applicable to all institutions.
2. CB should expect the institutions to engage in appropriate internal program review which adheres to established best practices. Internal review processes may be documented with SACS, VSA, program/departmental accreditation, and other similar documentation.

3. CB should consider institutional structure and mission in determining program definition.

Institution:

1. In conducting internal program reviews, institutions should include measures and analyses relevant to statewide objectives such as increasing STEM enrollment, for example.

Subcommittee 3, Process:

CB:

1. Require all state institutions to adopt a schedule, on a 5-year rotation, for academic program review, and submit it to the CB on a date determined by the CB.
2. Require all public institutions to send annual summaries of academic program reviews they have completed to the CB.

Institutions:

1. Address items under "Structure," "Participation," and "Process."
2. Include: self-study, internal (university) review committee administrative review, review report with recommendations for improvement, and follow up plan and results checked.

V. Consideration of Adopting Recommendations for Institutional Review of Existing Undergraduate programs (including criteria for review, best practices, and development of measurable program-level learning outcomes)

VI. Consideration of Adopting Recommendations for a Process to Conduct Statewide Reviews of Existing Undergraduate Programs

Items V and VI were discussed together as they consist of the results of the discussions in item IV. The committee was encouraged to think about the draft recommendations that will include the items in IV so that they may be discussed and approved at the next committee meeting.

VII. Discussion of Developing Standards for Associate Degrees and Certificates at Public Institutions of Higher Education

VIII. Discussion: Reconsidering the Texas Core Curriculum (initial review of existing statute and rules, and related documents; formation of sub-committees)

Items VII and VIII were discussed together. Dr. Garrett asked the committee to read a packet of materials with background information on these topics as homework in anticipation of discussing these items at the next meeting of the committee.

IX. Staff Report, Legislative Update, and Member Announcements (includes announcement of the date of the next committee meeting).

Dr. Parsoneault asked the committee to respond to the meeting scheduler notice and pick dates the committee would be available for the April committee meeting and a meeting in the summer.

X. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 3:22 pm.

CP
4-7-09