Program Prioritization Initiative
Open Forum

Division of Academic Affairs
The Task Force
Members of Prioritization Task Force

- 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 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 academic programs
• Identify potential areas for resource reallocation
  • Consolidations
  • Potential program or unit closures
  • Course offerings
  • Potential Investments
• Submit report to the provost, deans, and faculty senate
  • As appropriate, 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
- Evidence-based
- Community-Focused
- Student success and social mobility
Workplan

• Regular meetings of the task force
• Data review and presentations by stakeholders
• Data will come from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment and the Office of Academic Affairs
• Task force members will identify additional data gathering mechanisms
• Activities guided by Dickeson’s Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services: Reallocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance
Focus of Prioritization and Review

- Degree programs, majors, and certificates
- Frequency of university-wide course offerings
- Arrangements and functions of academic affairs units
- Organizational structures and administrative support units in academic affairs
- Task force will make recommendations to provost, deans, and faculty senate, not decisions
- Final decisions to be guided by shared governance with decisions made by authorized parties using existing practices and policies
- This is NOT general education review or program review
More on the Focus

• The reviewing is focusing on all programs in Academic Affairs:
  • Academic Programs
  • Administrative Support Programs
Factors to be considered for academic programs (identified in BOV policy)

• Relevancy and relationship of program to college/university mission and objectives
• Quality of academic programs
• Cost and revenues of academic units
• Student enrollment/productivity
• Current and projected relationship to other units
• Distinctive and unique features of units
• Impact on women and minorities
• Research implications
• Impact on student needs
• Placement and employment opportunities for students
Work of the Task Force:

- Started Phase 1 of the process:
  - Determined prioritization criteria for academic programs and administrative units
  - Reviewed national and institutional data
    - Trends, enrollments, degrees conferred, budget, etc...
  - Developed and distributed surveys to deans, chairs and administrative unit leaders (results are currently under review)
  - Identified additional groups to seek feedback
Phase 2: spring 2021

- Review survey results
- Identify additional information needed
- Make recommendations
Updates

- Website
  - https://www.odu.edu/assessment/program-prioritization

- Surveys
  - Deans
  - Chairs
  - Unit leaders

- Additional surveys to program directors forthcoming
### Significance of the Criteria Across Programs

#### Academic Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on students</td>
<td>Impact on women and minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality</td>
<td>Distinctive features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student enrollment</td>
<td>Relationship to other units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with mission</td>
<td>Future opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on research</td>
<td>Internal demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement and employment opportunities</td>
<td>Community engagement, needs/relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Administrative Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on students</td>
<td>Impact on women and minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program costs</td>
<td>Distinctive features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to other units</td>
<td>Placement and employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with mission</td>
<td>Future opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student enrollment</td>
<td>Internal demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic quality</td>
<td>Regional and Commonwealth needs and relevance, combination of units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report to Provost, Deans, and Faculty Senate

- The provost and deans will share the information with program directors and chairs.
- Opportunities for investments will be highlighted.
- Information, as appropriate, will also assist in deciding whether to initiate program closure process.
- Per Policy 1462, “the unit’s program director, chair, academic dean, or provost and vice president for academic affairs ("initiator") may initiate the action for possible curtailment or discontinuance.”
- If one of the decision makers decides to use the information to initiate program closure, the process will follow Policy 1462.
- Information may also be used to suggest consolidations, unit closures, frequency of course offerings, etc.
Report will include

• Identification of possible investments
• Recommendations for administrative units
  • Increase support, reallocate to, reallocate from, consider closing
• Classification of academic programs
  • Expand, retain, consolidate/reduce, consider closing
How is this different than SCHEV Productivity Review (SPR)?

- Future-focused whereas SPR looks only to the past.
- Investment orientation whereas SPR is about cuts.
- Institutionally focused to make the community stronger.
- Driven by Academic Affairs
- Creates a Bridge to the Future
Additional points

• Identify where additional resources are justified and where they might be reallocated from

• Budget is much better than it could have been, but significant amounts still needed to be cut/frozen

• Goal is to identify most efficient use of AA resources as we approach fiscal challenges and enrollment changes
Driven by Mission and Vision

MISSION

- Old Dominion University, located in the City of Norfolk in the metropolitan Hampton Roads region of coastal Virginia, is a dynamic public research institution that serves its students and enriches the Commonwealth of Virginia, the nation, and the world through rigorous academic programs, strategic partnerships, and active civic engagement.

VISION

- Old Dominion University will be recognized nationally and internationally as a forward-focused metropolitan university with a collaborative and innovative approach to education and research that spurs economic growth, focuses on student success, engages civic and community partners, and uses its connections with the military and maritime industries and its exceptional strengths and leadership in related areas to provide practical solutions to complex, real world problems.
Values Identified by Strategic Plan Committee

- Academic and Research Excellence
- Student Success
- Inclusion and Diversity
- Community Engagement
- Entrepreneurship and Innovation
- Integrity
- Quality of University Life
Opportunities for Feedback

- Chair’s Survey
- Dean’s Survey
- Anonymous Forms
- Open Forums
- Program Director’s Surveys
- Unit Leaders Survey’s
Institutional reps serving on subcommittees that do not include their home units/programs
Questions and Feedback
| Meeting One  
(10/16/20) | Meeting Two  
(10/28/20) | Meeting Three  
(11/11/20) | Meeting Four  
(11/20/20) | Meeting Five  
(12/09/20) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>Reviewed task force charge</td>
<td>Tisha Paredes provided data overview</td>
<td>Began to discuss certificate programs</td>
<td>Reviewed feedback from surveys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 500 years of experience | Feedback from survey of task force members provided. | - Discussed how to prioritize  
- Different criteria for academic and admin support programs  
- Support for expand, retain, etc. | Provided overview of administrative programs | Discussed rubrics for prioritization. |
| Task force process discussed | Budget overview from Nina Gonser | - Enrollment, tuition revenue, and budget  
- Funding likely to be for targeted degree production | Reviewed the university and academic affairs organizational charts | Preliminary feedback from initial review of evidence. |
<p>| Survey introduced | | Surveys reviewed and changes suggested | Created subcommittees | Identified additional groups to survey. |
|                 |               | Surveys distributed to chairs, deans, and unit leaders (11/16) | Discussed issues related to measuring cost. | Reviewed this PPT. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December Data/Evidence Review (12/9 and 12/18)</th>
<th>January Develop Preliminary Actions</th>
<th>February Draft Reports</th>
<th>March Final Report and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty forum (12/10)</td>
<td>Committees Report Back to Task Force</td>
<td>Faculty Forum (first week)</td>
<td>Faculty Forum (last week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee Gathers Feedback from Various Units and Programs</td>
<td>Phase 2. Additional Qualitative Data Collection -- Distribute or Administer Survey to Targeted Units and Programs Based on Selected Criteria.</td>
<td>Initial Recommendations for Administrative Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Data</td>
<td>Deeper Data Dive into Selected Programs and Units</td>
<td>Initial Recommendations for Academic Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Findings from Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2. Draft Questions for Targeted Groups Based on Agreed Upon Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>