



Academic Affairs Committee
October 10, 2023
1:45pm

Discussion Item

AAC - 2 Portfolio Review Process (Wester)

Background Information

Dr. Kelly Wester, chair of the Portfolio Review Task Force, will provide an update on the Portfolio Review Process. She will discuss the process of the taskforce, their timeline, rubrics and open forums.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Debbie Storrs".

Debbie Storrs
Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

Academic Portfolio Review Task Force (APRTF)

Kelly L. Wester, PhD, LCMHC

APRTF Members

- **Staff**
 - Adam Landreth, Director of Online Programs & Advisor, Bryan School of Business and Economics
 - Valeria Caviness, University Program Specialist, Office of the Provost
 - Melissa Skillings, Assistant Director of Research Integrity, Office of Research and Engagement
 - Karen Blackwell, Director, Institutional Research and Enterprise Data Management
- **Professional Track Faculty**
 - Kristen Christman, Lecturer, Communication Studies, College of Arts & Sciences
 - Trisha Kemerly, Lecturer, Department of Consumer, Apparel, and Retail Studies, Bryan School of Business and Economics
 - Brad Johnson, Clinical Professor, Teacher Education and Higher Education, School of Education (also rep. the Graduate Council)
 - Wade Maki, Senior Lecturer and BLS Program Director, College of Arts & Sciences
 - Rachel Mills, Genetic Counseling, School of Health & Human Sciences
 - Kevin Wells, Lecturer, Media Studies, College of Arts & Sciences
- **Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty**
 - Sarah Daynes, Professor, Sociology, College of Arts & Sciences (also rep. Faculty Senate)
 - Mark Fine, Professor, Human Development and Family Studies, School of Health & Human Sciences
 - Heather Gert, Associate Professor and Department Head, Philosophy, College of Arts & Sciences
 - Justin Harmon, Associate Professor, Community & Therapeutic Recreation, School of Health & Human Sciences
 - John Lepri, Professor, Biology, College of Arts & Sciences
 - Stephanie Pickett, Associate Professor, Adult Health Nursing, School of Nursing
 - Debra Wallace, Professor, Senior Associate Dean of Research & Innovation, Distinguished Professor, School of Nursing (also rep. the Research Advisory Council)
 - Kelly Wester, Professor and Department Chair, Counseling & Educational Development, School of Education (chair of PRTF)
 - Ken White, Associate Professor and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, College of Visual and Performing Arts

APRTF Charge, April 2023

- Leave discipline and unit mindsets “at the door” and adopt a University mindset.
- Take existing 6 quantitative data categories and develop a rubric for program review, including
 - (a) consideration of potential weighting of the various data categories, and
 - (b) the identification of any differences in the evaluation criteria or weighting for undergraduate and graduate programs
- Review and assess established metrics and data sources, with insights from the data team
- Determine what contextual data should be assessed, including the quantity of materials
- Host open forums to provide faculty and staff engagement and opportunities for input

General APRTF Process

1. Developed the weighting of the rubric

- 1=Needs Examination (typically lower 15th percentile of programs)
- 2=Approaching Expectations (typically 16th to 45th percentile)
- 3=Meets Expectations (typically 46th to 85th percentile)
- 4=Exceeds Expectations (typically upper 15th percentile (>85th) of programs)

2. Garnered understanding of the data categories and items, overall quality of data

3. Made recommendations to and collaborated with Provost and Academic Council of Deans

Final Categories and Data Used in APR Rubric

Data Category	Undergraduate Weighting	Graduate Weighting
1. Cost and Revenue of Delivery	39%	41%
2. Academic Program Demand and Instructional Productivity	29%	31%
3. External Grants and Contracts	10%	10%
4. Student Success - Undergraduate	22%	NA
5. Student Success - Graduate	NA	18%
Removed data category		
6. Labor Market & Workforce Reliance		

Items within Categories, Differential Weighting (examples)

Categories and Items	Weighting
1. Cost and Revenue of Delivery (dept level)	
• a-d faculty/staff FTE/headcount and personnel spending	0%
• Revenue for dept	20%
• Credit hour production by faculty	40%
• Cost per credit hour	40%
2. Academic Program Demand and Instructional Productivity	
• Demand (applications 10%, admits 10%, yield 10%)	30%
• Headcount enrollment	20%
• Trend in headcount	25%
• Number of degrees awarded	25%

Contextual Information

- All programs can provide up to 1,000 words to contextualize the data and provide additional information as needed
- The purpose of the context statement is to provide relevant information specific to the program and to provide context about the program's rating on the rubric. In addition, the context statement also provides a growth-based perspective of the strengths and directions of the program in recent years.

Questions and Discussion



Items within Categories, Differential Weighting (all items)

Cost and Revenue of Delivery

- A-D items Faculty/staff FTE/headcount and personnel spending 0%
- Revenue for dept 20%
- Credit hour production by FT/PT faculty 40%
- Cost per credit hour 40%

Academic Program Demand and Instructional Productivity

- Demand 30% (applications 10%, admits 10%, yield 10%)
- Headcount enrollment 20%
- Trend in headcount 25%
- Number of degrees awarded 25%

External Grants and Contracts

- Total grant/contract submissions 10%
- Total grant/contract awards 20%
- Total annual grant expenditures 30%
- Salary savings 13.3%
- Indirect cost recovery 13.3%
- Grant related student support 13.3%

Student Success - Undergraduate

- First year course completion FTIC 25%
- Four-year graduation rate 65%
- Degree efficiency (total credit hours completed) 5%
- Degree efficiency (difference SCH completed versus attempted) 5%

Student Success - Graduate

- # students complete in 5 (MS) to 7 (PhD) years 40%
- % who complete within standard time frame 40%
- Ratio of students in program who take extension credits 20%