

Academic Program Review (APR)

Frequently Answered Questions – Last Updated 22 January 2018

1. When are the Deans Reports due?

15 January 2018. All reports have been received.

2. Who is on the APR Committee?

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| 1. Phil Allen, | BCAS, Co-Chair, Psychology |
| 2. Richard Londravage, | BCAS, Biology |
| 3. David Perry, | BCAS, Chemistry |
| 4. Harvey Sterns, | BCAS, Faculty Senate/University Council, Psychology |
| 5. Ann Usher, | BCAS, Music |
| 6. Ingrid Weigold, | BCAS, Counseling/Psychology |
| 7. Matt Wyszynski, | BCAS, Modern Languages |
| 8. John Zipp, | BCAS, Sociology |
| 9. Sukanya Kemp, | CAST, Applied General and Technical Studies |
| 10. Andy Milks, | CAST, Engineering and Science Technology |
| 11. Bill McHenry, | CBA, Management |
| 12. Melinda Newman | CBA, Finance |
| 13. Stacia Biddle, | CHP, Allied Health Technology |
| 14. Carolyn Murrock, | CHP, Nursing |
| 15. Ron Otterstetter | CHP, Sports Science and Wellness Education |
| 16. Andrey Dobrynin | CPSPE, Polymer Science |
| 17. Nicole Zacharia, | CPSPE, Polymer Engineering |
| 18. Teresa Cutright, | Engineering, Civil Engineering |
| 19. Shiva Sastry, | Engineering, Co-Chair, Electrical & Computer Eng. |
| 20. Marnie Saunders, | Engineering, Biomedical Engineering |
| 21. Dana Cole, | Law, Law-Instruction |
| 22. Bill Rich, | Law, Chair of Faculty Senate, Law-Instruction |
| 23. Gary Holliday, | LJFFCE, Curricular and Instructional Studies |
| 24. Tim Vierheller, | Wayne, Physics |

3. What was the Rationale for selecting APR Faculty Team Reviewers?

- Nominations from the Deans
- Representation from all colleges, not necessarily from every department
- Representation from Faculty Senate (Bill Rich), University Council (Harvey Sterns) and the AAUP (John Zipp)
- Gender representation
- Adequate coverage to review doctoral and masters programs review required by Ohio Chancellors Council for Graduate Studies; every doctoral program has at least one reviewer from another doctoral program and the other reviewer is at least from a program that grants Master's degrees

4. What is expected in the APR Report from the Faculty?

Part 1:

Department-level Quantitative Analysis: Please interpret the following data provided with a focus on Student Recruitment, Education, Graduation and Improving UA revenues in the context of your department/program(s).

1. **Teaching Outcomes Table 1:** UA Data, **Table 2:** ODHE Data
2. **Demographic Analysis Table 3**
3. **Graduate Assistantships Table 4** (where applicable)
4. **General Fund Centric Revenues/Expenses Table 5**
5. **Student Performance by Course Level Table 6**
6. **Graduate Student Exit Interview Data Table 7** (where applicable)

For each associate, undergraduate, master's, and doctoral program in your unit, please provide data from your unit and an analysis for the following two items:

7. Learning Outcomes

Please summarize your assessment activities and provide an analysis of your activities. You may include data from Tables 1-4 and Tables 6-7 to complete this item. You may also include departmental-level data that you have collected.

8. Market Demand

How many of your graduating students in the last three years have pursued a career in their field of study or a career commensurate with their educational qualifications? Please provide actual numbers and not percentages. How many graduates from your undergraduate programs are pursuing graduate studies? Please list key employers of your students and universities where your students pursue graduate studies.

Please provide data from your unit for:

9. Research and Creative Activity Outcomes: *Please provide the number of refereed publications, books, book chapters, art/dance/theatre exhibits or other scholarly or creative works in Table 8 for the last three years. You may also wish to note other measures such as number of citations.*

Part 2:

Department-level Qualitative Analysis: *Please address the following two sections for each associate, undergraduate, master's, and doctoral program in your unit.*

1. Areas of Strength and Distinctiveness: *What are the strengths of your program? Please address the number of degrees awarded in your program as it compares with other programs in the State of Ohio (Tables 1-2.1).*

2. Areas of Concern: Identify present areas of concern in your program and how you propose to address these challenges. Are there anticipated future areas of concern within your program?

Part 3:

Department-level Strategic Opportunities: From the perspective of your programs, where are our strategic opportunities? How do you see us capitalizing on these opportunities given the fiscal challenges that we currently face? Please discuss frankly the limitations and competitive threats that may be pertinent to your program(s).

5. What do the APR Review Forms look like?

The Individual Reviewer Score Sheet is:

Department _____ Program _____

Issue	Notes in Self-study Report	Your Observations from the data	Your Rating (C1, C2, C3)
Part 1			
Learning Outcomes			
Retention			
Market Demand			
Number of Majors			
Student CR (SCH)			
Revenue/Expenditure Ratio			
Degree Awards Compared to Ohio Schools			
Research Scholarship & Creative Activities			
Part 2			
Strengths/ Distinctiveness			
Number of Majors Compared to Peers			
Distinctive Market Niche			
Concerns			
Budget – Ratio of Revenues/Expenditures Compared to UA Average			
Faculty/Student Ratio			
Part 3			
Strategic Plan Highlights			

Your overall assessment: **Category** _____ **Priority** _____
 C1/C2/C3 P1/P2 (for C1 and C3)

Justification for Overall Assessment:

+++++

Department_____

Program_____

College_____

PROGRAM RATING

CATEGORY

PRIORITY

Dean of College

APR Team Rating

Comments

Highlights from discussion about the program by the APR team

Recommendations

Highlights from Strategic Plan and discussions by APR team

6. What the is APR Process going forward?

1. *Deans were invited to share the rationale for how they categorized and prioritized the programs in their colleges. This meeting was held on 17 January 2018 and all Deans presented.*
2. *Two individual Reviewers will be assigned to review programs in a specific department.*
3. *These reviewers are expected to independently complete the Program Review form based on their review of the Faculty Reports and the Dean Recommendations.*
4. *These reviews will be shared with the full APR team.*
5. *APR Team will discuss each program individually and arrive at a final rating by vote.*
6. *Deans have agreed to have someone available from their office "on call" when the programs from their colleges are being reviewed.*

7. What happens if the APR Classification and Priority (as determined by the APR Committee) are different from that of the Dean?

In designing the APR process, our aim was to ensure parallel reliability in the reviews. Thus, we view the Deans Recommendations and APR Recommendations as viewpoints that the APC will consider before they make APC recommendations.

8. What roles do the Deans have in the APR Process? (NEW)

The APR Executive Committee (13 December 2017) strongly endorsed inviting Deans to share their College-level Strategy with the APR Team before the programs in the college are rated by the full APR Team. We propose that the Deans focus these presentations on the issues they deemed as being important for Classification (C1, C2 and C3) and Prioritization (P1 and P2) of programs. This presentation is not mandatory for the Deans – however, the APR team strongly recommends that the Deans consider this invitation to participate.

All Deans participated and presented on 17 January 2018.

9. What happens if the APR Team has unanswered questions before they classify and prioritize programs?

The reviews of the programs will be scheduled ahead of time and the respective Deans will be informed of the schedule. The Dean or a designee will be invited to attend the session if the APR team has unresolved questions. This issue was already discussed with the Council of Deans and all of our Deans have expressed their satisfaction with this approach.

10. How will the APR Team rating process account for inherent differences across colleges and programs?

The responses from the Faculty reports to the six fields requested will be shared with the APR Team. The team will also have access to all the data related to the units (Table 1 – Table 9). These responses serve as a reference for the APR team.

In addition, we are going to rely on the narrative explanation and presentations from the Deans about how they have classified and prioritized the programs in their colleges.

The following items were identified by UA Leadership as being important for classifying programs: Number of Paying Students, Number of Graduating Students, Support offered from the program for General Education courses (e.g., English), Curricular support for other programs (e.g., Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry for Engineering, Mathematics and Statistics for Business), Cost of Delivery, Marketplace data and Outcomes.

The following items were identified as being important for Prioritization: Distinctiveness, Quality, Excellence, Potential for SSI, Attractiveness to students.

As noted above, these are not just hard numbers – but will be considered in the narrative context provided by the Faculty Reports and Dean Recommendations.

11. What do the Categories C1, C2 and C3 mean?

In general terms, the classifications C1, C2 and C3 refer to how the program is performing currently. One may consider these as being above average, average or below average, respectively. The important factor to know is that these ratings must be with respect to other similar programs in the State of Ohio as indicated in the data tables provided.

Programs that are currently distinctive may also compare their performance with other peer institutions nationally or internationally as long as they also provide verifiable data.

In cases where the programs are new, we expect the Deans reports to clarify the classification and prioritization.

12. What do the Priorities P1 and P2 mean?

In broad terms, these priorities should indicate where resource reallocations should be made to strengthen the academic mission of the university.

It is anticipated that the categories assigned to programs indicate how academic resource reallocation may be directed. The priorities offer more precision to steer the academic reallocation process.

13. When are the APR Team Reports Due?

Reports are due to the Academic Policies Committee by 1 March 2018.

14. What is the APC Process for Program Review?

The APR Team Co-Chairs are planning to meet with APC leadership in late January or early February to coordinate. Our plan calls for the APC to consider the Faculty Reports, Recommendations from the Deans and APR Recommendations to arrive at their own APC recommendations.

15. When will the APC Recommendations go to Faculty Senate?

Our timeframe calls for this to be presented at the April Faculty Senate meeting.

16. What happens after the Faculty Senate votes on APC Recommendations?

The President and Provost will review the recommendations, make final decisions and discuss their decisions with the Council of Deans, and the University community.