November 26, 2013

Academic Affairs, *20/20* Posting #2.

The **Deans with Faculty** met **Wednesday, November 13, 2013**.[1] The Agenda focused on three items:

    i.   Budget Workgroup Update
    ii.   Academic Portfolio Review
    iii.   Services Portfolio Review.

The majority of the meeting was devoted to a review and discussion of the following items related to the **Academic Portfolio Review** and, by way of an introductory discussion, the **Service Portfolio Review**:

A. Academic Portfolio Review

1. **Questions driving or guiding the development of the academic portfolio review process**, such as:
   a. What **evidence** do we have that we are preparing students to be global citizens in the twenty-first century? cf., Program Reviews and Annual Assessment Reports
   b. What is the **mission** of a particular program? What are its **outcomes**? What is the program's **distinctive value**?
   c. What is the **market** for the program? What does the program do well?
   d. What is the program's **financial margin**? What is the **program's income/cost ratio?** (What revenue is generated by each academic unit/department/school and what are its direct operational costs? And what potential savings can be rendered based upon a closer review of program specifics?)

2. **Considerations for Key Performance Indicators**:
   a. Enrollments:
      i. of departmental major degree programs and their respective constitutive courses
      ii. of service courses offered by a department
      iii. Graduation rates and trends in a degree program
      iv. 4-year plans of study

---

[1] The Deans with Faculty group membership has been modified for this series of meetings dealing with the academic portfolio review. The group now includes: the College Deans, the Honors College Dean, the Dean of Student Affairs, faculty representatives from Faculty Senate (Burnis Morris and Eldon Larsen) and Graduate Council (Traci Christefero), Sherri Smith (Director, Center for Teaching and Learning), the three associate vice presidents from Academic Affairs, and the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

      v. 4-year course rotation plans

      vi. Alignment of course and program learning outcomes with the Marshall University Degree Profile Outcomes

      vii. HEPC Performance Targets (see Academic Affairs, November 8, 2013, *20/20 Posting #1*)

3. **Program Review Elements: More questions**.
    a. <u>Curriculum review</u>: how is the program curriculum aligned with the Marshall University Degree Profile Outcomes.
    b. <u>Faculty Recruitment and Retention</u>: How intentional is the planning that goes into requesting approval to recruit for a faculty position made available by retirement, resignation, termination? What role does program need and development have in planning for future tenure and promotion considerations?
    c. <u>Admission requirements</u> to the program: How do we know secondary admission requirements are set at the right level?
    d. Enrollment trends and graduation trends
    e. Outcomes Alignment
    f. Course offerings Cycles
    g. <u>Graduates</u>: how well are we as an institution tracking the next professional development or career move of our graduates? Do we know what our graduates are doing following graduation—6 months from graduating, 1 year out, 2 years out, etc.?   If so, what is the mechanism for collecting that information? If not, why are we not tracking our graduates?

4. **Assessment Report Elements**
    a. <u>Program Assessments taken at two points</u>: Entry and Graduation
    b. <u>Other assessments</u>: Baseline assessment through CLA and WOW testing
    c. <u>Common First-Year Seminar Artifact assessments</u>
    d. Senior Assessment at Capstone experience (needed)

5. **Academic Program Elements to be Considered**:
    a. *Program Curricular Requirements*:
        i. <u>120 Hours</u> or more?
        ii. <u>A Course Inventory</u>: Of the courses required in a major, which courses are essential to program requirements, which are not, and which courses can be replaced with a different configuration or eliminated?
        iii. What percentage of the curriculum calls for students to participate in <u>internships, practica, co-op experiences, service learning courses, or other experiential learning</u>?
        iv. What <u>undergraduate research opportunities</u> are built into the degree program?
        v. What <u>research opportunities</u> are built into graduate degree programs?
    b. *Faculty: Workload*
        i. Percentage of time allocated to undergraduate teaching <in the major, service courses, other>
        ii. Percentage of time allocated to service <university, college, department, community>

    iii. SCH taught <departmental goals, expectations, actual, and trends>
    iv. Faculty/Student ratio< desired, goal, actual>
    v. Percentage of time allocated to graduate teaching <advising, research>
    vi. Percentage of time allocated to advising and/or versus mentoring
    vii. Percentage of time reassigned for research/creative works <funded and unfunded>
    viii. Percentage of time reassigned for administrative duties
    ix. Need for a better defined faculty workload policy

6. **Data and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)**
    a. Whatever data is called for, Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) will provide. Current KPIs include: enrollment data, graduation rates, persistence rates, as found on at the IRP website— www.marshall.edu/irp , for example, dashboard indicators on student profile, etc.
        i. Student entry data: High school GPA, ACT/SAT scores,
        ii. CLA results
        iii. First semester freshman GPA and number of credit hours completed
        iv. Progress toward degree in terms of completed core curriculum hours
        v. Progress toward degree in terms of completed required courses in the major; excessive hours; off-track hours
        vi. Student status after completion of X number of hours and progress toward degree completion.

    b. KPIs should be a small manageable set of indicators that can be monitored and used for the intended goals, cf., mission, market, and margin in item #1 above.
    c. What faculty KPIs should be included? cf., 5b above

7. **Departmental/Program Niche Statement as One way of conducting an academic portfolio review**
    a. Develop an outline for a niche statement
        i. A niche statement ***does not duplicate the details of program review documents or assessment reports*** but ***utilizes the results of those reviews to provide a statement of fact and value*** regarding each academic department and the majors/programs it offers and delivers
        ii. A niche statement addresses the question, among others: what is the role and place of this program/major in the college, the university, and the discipline?
        iii. A niche statement provides a rationale for sustaining the major/program, offers a plan or strategy for doing so, with reference to strengths and weaknesses of the program and how the program can be sustained given current or reduced resources.
        iv. A niche statement provides a statement of programmatic educational value.
        v. What programs do we not offer that could be added? How would that be done? What programs should be eliminated?

B. Services Portfolio Review

A **Services Portfolio Review** is the fourth action item listed in the October 11, 2013 20/20 Retreat action plan.

Services Portfolio Review – Create a process and analyze the entire services portfolio and processes of the University to determine their contribution(s) to the mission, their value proposition for MU and process improvement opportunities. This undertaking would outline the process, criteria, timelines, stakeholders, service beneficiaries and key questions to be addressed on a continuing quality improvement basis.

Lead Persons: Drs. Gayle Ormiston, Jan Fox, Karen Kirtley, Layton Cottrill, Mary Ellen Heuton, Shari Clarke, John Maher, Joe Shapiro and Mike Hamrick

Draft Process Development Deadline: January 10, 2014

There was a general discussion of the services academic units provide. There was agreement to return to this topic at the next Deans meeting.

The **Deans with Faculty** group will meet again **Wednesday, December 4, 2013, at 8:15 a.m. in the SRC conference room. These same topics will be on the Agenda for a joint meeting of the Deans and Chairs, Thursday, December 5, 2013.**