As a way of introduction let me say...

- I appreciate the hard work and diligence of the faculty, chairs/directors/deans and others throughout the process.
- Thank you to the members of the Academic Program Review Committee for their hard work and persistence, chaired by Dean Midha.
- This is not an easy step in the process, but it is well-informed and due diligence continues by receiving Faculty Senate input.
- I have become more informed and educated about our academic programs via the responses to the Academic Program Review recommendations submitted by the chairs/directors, conversations with the deans, and the dean of the graduate school and vice president for research.
  - Consequently, Faculty Senate can expect on our collective behalf, the cooperation and involvement of chair/directors and deans as Senate carries out its work.
- This is the “base-line” for a process that will continue in on-going cycles that will produce actionable recommendations.
  - Expectation of the Higher Learning Commission and the BOR RAGCS group.

What is Academic Program Review...

- Opportunity for the institution to examine academic programs from multiple perspectives: relevance, vitality, vibrancy, sustainability, and alignment with strategic direction.
- While on-going faculty-initiated innovative academic program adjustments reallocate resources within the program, an institution level review creates the opportunity for the reallocation of resources across academic units.

Academic Program Review is...

- About reviewing programs on a case by case basis considering criteria most relevant to each specific program.
- Being accountable to the state, our students and the institution about utilization of resources: human talent, space, equipment, and operations.
- About alignment with the University System of Ohio expectations of The University of Akron, from Strategic Plan for Higher Education 2008-2017.

The University of Akron, a STEM-intensive institution, has long focused on the industries that would transform Akron from the “Rubber Capital of the World” to a city and region brimming with potential in polymers, advanced materials and engineering. Over the last decade, it has significantly increased its research portfolio and gained national recognition as an exemplar institution for its productivity in technology transfer and commercialization. A continued strong focus on areas that integrate basic and applied research, entrepreneurial education, intellectual property law and technology transfer expertise is critical to the future of the city and Northeast Ohio.
Academic Program Review is not...

- About comparing one program to another program
- Limited to a consideration of only certain criteria such as enrollment, revenues, expenses, faculty number, availability of subsidy, (the doctoral program in History does not receive state subsidy), etc.
- Speaking about subsidy, it is appropriate to mention “Ohio Revised Code 3345.061 Sunset for state operating subsidies for remedial courses”

“(B) Beginning with undergraduate students who commence undergraduate studies in the 2014-2015 academic year, no state university listed in section 3345.011 of the Revised Code, except Central state university, Shawnee state university, and Youngstown state university, shall receive any state operating subsidies for any academic remedial or developmental courses for undergraduate students, including courses prescribed in the Ohio core curriculum for high school graduation under division (C) of section 3313.603 of the Revised Code, offered at its main campus, except as provided in divisions (B)(1) to (4) of this section.”

- Just about reducing expenses
- About eliminating faculty positions
- About closing departments
- About determining what will be enhanced as that will happen over time as suspended programs finish-out the students in those programs
- The result of institutional budgetary situation as it is an on-going and continuous improvement process

The Academic Program Review process was/is...

- Completed in 2010 without actions taken due to provost-level leadership transitions-many programs were flagged with concerns
- The current process beginning in 2010 is an inclusive, responsive, respectful, collegial, objective and transparent process
- For this cycle
  - Programs updated all academic program review materials and data and responded to observations and recommendations from the previous review
  - Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) considered updated materials and met with each chair/director to learn more about the programs and to address questions about the program
  - APRC transmitted to the provost its recommendations (April 2013)
  - All materials posted on the SharePoint site and made available to campus via a campus memo sent in early May 2013
  - I solicited written responses from departments/schools to the APRC observations and recommendations-transmitted via the dean of the college
  - I interacted with the dean of each college to understand and learn about programs in consideration of all the materials and documents
  - In the meantime, Dean of the Graduate School and Vice President for Research (DGS/VPR) released assessment of graduate programs that was taken into consideration in the process of developing proposals for program adjustments (provost discussed with DGS/VPR)
  - Provost/OAA transmitted list of programs proposed for suspension to the president for consideration by Faculty Senate
Board of Trustees passed a resolution recognizing the role of the Faculty Senate in the next step of the process to inform final recommendations that will be entertained at the BOT April 23, 2014 meeting, also expecting that appropriate interactions will occur with students who have applied to the programs and at the appropriate time those students who are in the programs

**Academic Program Review – a comment about the number of programs...**

- 55 includes counting all programs, program tracks, and concentrations
- This number decreases to 27 actual *degree programs*
- This number decreases to 19 programs if we subtract the programs that have faculty approved suspension of admissions

**Academic Program Review will result in...**

- Stronger focus on mission identified in University Rule and enhanced via *Vision 2020: The New Gold Standard for University Performance*
- Improved academic programs because of improved alignment with resources and completion and placement of students from those programs

**The remaining steps in the process are...**

- Receipt of input from Faculty Senate
- Present final recommendations to the Board of Trustees at its April 23, 2014 meeting

**My perspectives about Academic Program review are informed by...**

- As program coordinator and graduate studies chair, developing an action plan and executing the action plan based upon APR
- As a faculty member, participating in a college reorganization that moved the college from five departments and a school to three schools
- As a school director, reviewing academic programs annually for maintenance, possible enhancements, and deactivation of programs
- As vice provost, involvement in the final recommendations of a review of doctoral programs
- Now as provost, I am reflecting upon those previous experiences and acknowledging the anxiety and concern that are naturally being felt by those potentially effected and will promise to “listen closely” to the additional valued input to be received from the Faculty Senate
  - You will recall that I have said before, “Any university can to anything, no university can do everything.”
  - This is about fine-tuning that which we will continue to do

**Finally...**

I implore that we all keep in mind and remember as we continue this process, that it is incumbent upon us to do what is right for our students and what is accountable to ourselves, our students, and the State of Ohio