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- Members are institutional representatives and not college or department representatives
- Members are tasked with identifying what they believe is best for the institution
- “This is not an opportunity for people to be assigned based on their title or their role. You need individuals with strong reputations, credibility within the institution, and a willingness to adopt an institutional, rather than departmental, perspective” (Goldstein)
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Why?
Why now: The need for reform

The budget reality and future enrollment trends require that we take a close look at our academic programs and courses to determine how the academic affairs community believes it should prioritize its resources.
Goals

- Shape the future of academic programming at ODU
- Use an evidence-driven process to prioritize administrative support and academic programs
- Identify opportunities for future investments
- Identify potential areas for resource reallocation
  - Consolidations
  - Potential program or unit closures
  - Course offerings
- Submit report to the provost, deans, and faculty senate
  - Inform application of Policy 1462 (Policy for the Review of Academic Programs, Departments or Colleges for the Purpose of Possible Curtailment or Discontinuance)
Tenets Guiding the Process

- Shared governance
- Transparent
- Future-focused
- Inclusive
- Use ODU faculty as experts
- Build on ODU Strengths
- Academic quality
- Community Oriented
- Evidence-based
- Student success and social mobility
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2020</td>
<td>• Discussed focus on academic affairs&lt;br&gt;• Reviewed draft rubrics&lt;br&gt;• Committees provided updates&lt;br&gt;• Discussed strategies for faculty to give feedback&lt;br&gt;• Recommended seeking feedback from attendees of forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6, 2021</td>
<td>• Reviewed feedback from faculty&lt;br&gt;• Discussed need to focus on investments&lt;br&gt;• Discussed revised rubrics&lt;br&gt;• Committees provided updates&lt;br&gt;• Certificate programs discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20, 2021</td>
<td>• Reviewed anonymous feedback&lt;br&gt;• Discussed feedback from chairs&lt;br&gt;• Discussed and approved certificate recommendations&lt;br&gt;• Discussed results of GPD and UPD surveys&lt;br&gt;• Data update provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2021</td>
<td>Preliminary report from subcommittees:&lt;br&gt;• Perry Honors College&lt;br&gt;• Strategic Comm. &amp; Marketing&lt;br&gt;• Center for High Impact Practices&lt;br&gt;• Center for Advising Administration and Academic Partnerships&lt;br&gt;• University Libraries&lt;br&gt;• Graduate School&lt;br&gt;• School of Continuing Education&lt;br&gt;• Academic Affairs Administration Committee updates provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17, 2021</td>
<td>Preliminary report from subcommittees:&lt;br&gt;• Center for Faculty Development&lt;br&gt;• Center for Global Engagement&lt;br&gt;• Office of Faculty Diversity and Retention&lt;br&gt;• Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment&lt;br&gt;• Regional Higher Education Centers&lt;br&gt;• Distance Learning&lt;br&gt;Committee updates provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 2021</td>
<td>Preliminary report from subcommittees:&lt;br&gt;• Engineering and Technology&lt;br&gt;• Business&lt;br&gt;Committee updates provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Updates

• Rubrics Completed
• Administrative Programs – Preliminary Reviews
• Certificate Programs – Recommendations
• Revised timeline

https://www.odu.edu/assessment/program-prioritization
## Administrative Unit Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential for meeting needs of groups</td>
<td>Student needs</td>
<td>Surveys of directors, chairs and deans, WEAVE report</td>
<td>Unit is essential, mostly essential, somewhat essential, and not essential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other unit’s needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency (25%)</td>
<td>Unit offers distinct services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds, meets, approaches, does not meet, unable to rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate number of personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Costs (30%)</td>
<td>Duties could be provided by others</td>
<td>Surveys of directors, chairs and deans and data provided by AA central.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget is appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services could be streamlined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs are aligned with other units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Spending (10%)</td>
<td>Spending by Unit</td>
<td>Data provided by AA central</td>
<td>Increased notably, remained stable, decreased over 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spending per SCH by Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Students</td>
<td>Future Jobs</td>
<td>BLS Data</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, Approaches expectations, Does not meet expectations, Unable to Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>20+ items from Senior Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Quality</td>
<td>Program Retention Rates</td>
<td>Alignment with univ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td>Assessment Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized accreditation or ranking</td>
<td>Web and Chair surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Concentrations</td>
<td>Enrollment data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Enrollment data</td>
<td>Increasing, stable, decreasing, unable to rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Student credit hours</td>
<td>ODU Factbook</td>
<td>Top 20%, Above Average, Bottom 20%, Unable to rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degrees conferred</td>
<td>ODU Factbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research funding</td>
<td>Office of Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Spending</td>
<td>Spending by Unit</td>
<td>AA Administration</td>
<td>Increased notably over 3 fiscal years, remained relatively same, decreased notably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spending per SCH by Unit</td>
<td>AA Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Salary by SCH</td>
<td>AA Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Response</td>
<td>Responses provided by deans to survey</td>
<td>Dean Survey</td>
<td>Identified as top and distinctive, as distinctive, or not identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair’s Response</td>
<td>Program distinctiveness</td>
<td>Chair’s survey</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations, Meets, Approaches, Does not meet, Unable to Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services or programs for the community</td>
<td>Chair’s survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Demand</td>
<td>State offers additional funding for programs</td>
<td>State data</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in certain fields. Is this program on that list?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Additional Items on Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Units</th>
<th>Administrative Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think ODU should invest additional resources in this program? Please explain why or why not.</td>
<td>What modifications to the unit might increase impact, efficiency, or costs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the size of the academic program’s curriculum, population, faculty, and current budgeting levels, are there opportunities to reallocate resources from this program to support other programs in the department or college?</td>
<td>What investment might be made to the unit to increase impact, efficiency, or costs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee members asked to make comments on each area.

Describe the opportunities for this unit to collaborate more with other areas on campus.

What is your recommendation for this program/unit?
- a. Consider providing support to the program/unit.
- b. Consider reallocating funds to other programs or areas.
- c. No action, keep as is.
Administrative Program Overview

Organizational Charts and Summaries of Administrative Units
Administrative Support Programs
Preliminary Discussions

• Efficient use of resources
• Reduce duplication of services
• Service level agreements
  • Mission,
  • Purpose
  • Responsibilities,
  • KPI’s
  • Evaluation methods
• Develop routine process for evaluating units similar to way academic programs and chairs and deans are evaluated.
Certificate Reviews
Certificate Review

- We have 67 certificates.
- Awarded 245 certificates in 2019-2020
- Across all certificates, average is 3.7 awards per year.
- 28 certificates had zero awards in 2019-2020
- Just seven certificates had 10 or more awards
Certificate Recommendations

- Discontinue any certificate that has existed for at least five years but has produced two or fewer certificate awards over the past five years.
- Discontinue any certificate that departments recommend cutting.
- When there is duplication, combine certificate programs and be cognizant of the overlap.
- For future new certificates, require that the respective Faculty Senate committees approve the creation of for-credit certificates.
- Submit an issue to the Faculty Senate for guidelines on what should be part of a certificate (e.g., how certificates should be structured).
  - Recommend to the Senate that future certificates that go five years averaging less than one certificate a year be terminated.
  - Ensure that there is no duplication.
  - Ensure the certificate is appropriately named.
  - Identify the strategy to develop the certificate.
  - Identify the workload for faculty.
Revised Timeline
Revised Timeline

• Preliminary reviews ongoing
• Additional feedback solicited
• Next forum – update in April
• Draft report released early May
• Feedback through September 1, 2021
• Task force review of feedback – September
• Submit to Provost, Deans, and Faculty Senate – October 1.
Feedback Process
Opportunities for Feedback

- Chair’s Survey
- Dean’s Survey
- Program Director’s Surveys
- Anonymous Forms
- Open Forums
- Unit Leaders Survey’s
Questions and Feedback
End With Why
Why now: The need for reform

The budget reality and future enrollment trends require that we take a close look at our academic programs and courses to determine how the academic affairs community believes it should prioritize its resources.