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Institutional Overview

Ohio University is a public, state-assisted research university, one of 13 public universities in Ohio coordinated by the Ohio Board of Regents/University System of Ohio. There are six campuses in the Ohio University system, the main campus in Athens, Ohio and the five regional campuses located in the central, southern and eastern regions of the state. The five regional campuses are located in Chillicothe, St. Clairsville (Eastern), Ironton (Southern), Lancaster and Zanesville. The University also offers instruction at several "additional locations.” Ohio University was established in 1804 and is the oldest public institution of higher learning in the state of Ohio and the Northwest Territory. The university enrolls over 37,000 students, 17,000 undergraduates on the Athens campus, about 10,500 on the regional campuses and 5,500 in distance learning programs; over 4,200 graduate students and 500 osteopathic medical students. It offers over 500 undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs (majors) of study at the associate, bachelor, Master's, doctoral, and professional levels. It is divided among 13 academic units: Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Communication, Education, Engineering and Technology, Fine Arts, Health Sciences and Professions, Honors Tutorial, University College, and Osteopathic Medicine. Additional academic units include the Center for International Studies, Regional Higher Education, and the School of Leadership and Public Affairs. The University employs about 4,700 faculty and staff, and its annual budget is over $660 million. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has designated Ohio University as a "research university (high research activity).”

Mission Statement

Ohio University holds as its central purpose the intellectual and personal development of its students. Distinguished by its rich history, diverse campus, international community, and beautiful Appalachian setting, Ohio University is known as well for its outstanding faculty of accomplished teachers whose research and creative activity advance knowledge across many disciplines.

Vision Statement

Ohio University will be the nation’s best transformative learning community where students realize their promise, faculty advance knowledge, staff achieve excellence, and alumni become global leaders.

Values

At its August 2013 meeting, the Board of Trustees formally endorsed the University's core values as recommended by the president, after a year-long process of University-wide discussion:

- Excellence is our hallmark: outstanding people, ideas, and programs drive our educational mission.
- Integrity, civility, and diversity define our community: these values guide our leadership in a global society.
- Stewardship enhances our legacy: as Ohio’s first institution of public higher education, we are mindful of our accountability to the public trust.

Ohio University's AQIP Journey

Ohio University has been in AQIP since 2002, and this is our third Systems Portfolio. Previous Systems Portfolios and Systems Appraisals have highlighted Ohio University's strengths in the areas of shared governance, strategic planning, and availability of data. Opportunities have been identified in the areas of providing evidence that data are used systematically for process improvement and direct evidence that student learning objectives are being met. As of 2010, the year of the previous Systems Portfolio, the University had concluded a major strategic planning effort, Vision OHIO. Hundreds of faculty and staff participated, over the course of three years, in the identification and establishment of 130 strategic objectives. Most of these objectives had process-results-improvement cycles. Since then, Vision OHIO was determined to be unsustainable because of its enormous breadth, and it was condensed into four fundamentals and four supporting priorities (described in Portfolio categories five and eight). Even though Vision OHIO changed, the strong
culture of shared governance remains and is at work in the initiatives the University has undertaken since then. Since 2010, in addition to the strategic planning work, the University has accomplished a major academic restructuring of academic programs in four colleges, a transition from quarters to semesters (Q2S), a major PeopleSoft student data system implementation, growth in distance learning programs and enrollments, and responsibility centered management (RCM) implementation. Recent AQIP action plans have included Q2S, Academic Support Unit Program Review implementation, implementation of a Sustainability Plan, and general education assessment, among others. Ohio University's Action Projects have received positive reviews. We have found that the action project approach, with one to two year projects and discrete beginnings and endings, to be the most manageable component of AQIP. Action projects enable us to use AQIP to energize and bring attention to existing initiatives. Small groups of faculty and staff directly involved with those projects help frame the annual reports. However, we have found other elements of AQIP to be more challenging, such as the Systems Portfolio. Describing an institution of Ohio University's age, size, and breadth of offerings has been especially challenging, given the space limitations and structure of the Portfolio. Furthermore, Ohio University is particularly decentralized in its structure and operations. As has been found for other larger, complex institutions in AQIP, reporting on the diversity of the University's quality improvement processes and communicating the AQIP model across 5,000 employees and 37,000 students has been challenging.

With the 2013 Systems Portfolio Submission, we have taken a different approach than in the past. HLC’s change of the Criteria for Accreditation in January 2013, and the increased emphasis on the Criteria in AQIP elements, has enabled us to draw increased attention to AQIP and the information needs of the Systems Portfolio. As a result, the 2013 Systems Portfolio now provides much more of the evidence that previous reviewers were seeking. More faculty and staff participated more broadly and deeply than in previous Portfolios. Not only have we been able to report on quality initiatives since 2010, we are better able to describe the processes and evidence that existed at Ohio University but did not appear in previous Systems Portfolios. We have attempted to address the Portfolio questions generally initially, followed by providing examples that either are representative of many units or are unique in their approaches.

The new HLC Criteria for Accreditation, especially new Criterion Four, Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement, has brought new vigor to Ohio University’s assessment efforts. In addition, the recent (Q2S) transition required all faculty to examine and update learning objectives for every course. Academic program review has been revised to incorporate evidence of student learning. Academic support (administrative) program review has been revised to place greater emphasis on service to the academic mission. A new student learning assessment process is in development for all academic programs. Assessment of learning objectives is following a student success model. This form of assessment will build on the University’s existing assessment practices required by specialized accreditors as well as student evaluations and program reviews. All programs are updating their learning objectives and assessment plans. Assessment is a tool to help faculty and staff enable Ohio University to achieve this mission through helping our students succeed academically and personally. It is likely to be recommended as a new Action Project.
AQIP CATEGORY 1: HELPING STUDENTS LEARN
Ohio University's mission is the intellectual and personal development of its students, and its vision is to be the nation's best transformative learning community. The University's general education curriculum was established in 1984. Since then it has been modified incrementally to meet changing needs. In recent years its currency has been questioned, and several activities have occurred in anticipation of major revisions. Learning objectives were identified, described, and charted. The program was assessed in different ways, most recently with a comprehensive assessment over four years. Best practices of other institutions have been identified. Proposed revisions are being studied and discussed. Academic program innovations and changes are made by Ohio University faculty with input from specialized accreditors, advisory boards of alumni and employers, and students. Ideas for curricular innovations originate from faculty professional development activities, research and scholarly activity, program review outcomes, assessment action plans, and the University's mission to help students succeed academically and personally. Faculty governance and principles of academic freedom are strongly at work in these activities. Academic restructuring and the transition from quarters to semesters served as a catalyst for curricular improvements. Ohio University has a strong commitment to student success at all levels. Selective admission exists in some programs, but Ohio University maintains a strong commitment to access. Direct evidence of transformative learning is challenging to obtain, but evidence of the effectiveness in helping students improve their performance is present in programs such as Learning Communities, Supplemental Instruction, Bobcat Student Orientation, the College Adjustment Program, and college-based programs. Student Affairs is an active participant in students' personal development; its mission is to help students learn to be responsible citizens by offering enriching co-curricular educational programs and activities.

The University has a long history with assessment. Participation in AQIP has enabled Ohio University to focus its assessment energies on particular action projects, such as in the first year experience or in general education. The AQIP Task Force is being reconvened to help communicate to and enlist the entire University community in embracing the new Criteria for Accreditation, especially with regard to program review and assessment. Academic program review has been revised to include evidence of learning and action plans to improve teaching and learning. Academic support program review has been revised to support the RCM implementation and help ensure that these units work directly on academic support objectives. Having updated their course-specific learning objectives in the quarters to semesters transition, all academic units are revising the learning objectives for their programs, updating and implementing the gathering of evidence of the extent to which learning objectives are being met, and developing action plans to improve teaching and learning. A new AQIP Action Plan is in development to help this effort. We judge the maturity level of the University's approach to this category as aligned.

Processes (P)

1P1: COMMON AND SHARED OBJECTIVES FOR LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT
Addresses Core Component 3B
The Learning Outcomes pyramid was created in 2005 by a group of Ohio University faculty and illustrates the inter-related nature of our University-wide outcomes. The university-wide outcomes recognize that depth of knowledge, breadth of understanding, and appreciation of values are equally critical to a student’s education, and that all are dependent on the solid foundation of carefully and fully developed basic abilities.

The General Education Learning Outcomes Committee was appointed and charged with identifying common learning objectives expected of all Ohio University undergraduates. This committee consisted of faculty, staff, and students and worked throughout the 2006-07 academic year to accomplish their charge. The report from this
The General Education Program (Tiers I, II, III) sets objectives for student learning outcomes regarding proficiency in written composition, mathematics and logical thinking, breadth of knowledge, and interdisciplinary and integrative thought. The General Education Program and learning objectives from the program are monitored primarily by the faculty through the actions of the Educational Policy and Student Affairs (EPSA) Committee of Faculty Senate and the University Curriculum Council (UCC).

Following the 2007 report, three distinct University-wide activities occurred to build on this work. First, the General Education Assessment Committee was formed and carried out the assessment recommendations of the 2007 committee. It completed its work in September 2010. Second, a General Education Review Committee was formed in 2011 and was charged with identifying best practices in liberal education. It submitted its report in June.
November 2013

2012. Third, the EVPP charged a General Education Reform Committee with considering the work of previous committees and making specific recommendations about changes to the University's general education curriculum.

In 2010 the Faculty Senate passed a resolution, which the EVPP approved, that all courses should have learning objectives. As the University transitioned from quarters to semesters, the University Curriculum Council, through the Ohio Curriculum Enhancement and Approval Network (OCEAN) system, required that learning objectives be specified before courses would be approved in the semester curriculum.

1P2: ASSESSMENT AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIFIC LEARNING OBJECTIVES
Addresses Core Components 3B and 4B.

Learning objectives for general education and each academic program are developed by faculty and are posted online. Learning objectives originate in each academic program and incorporate contextual guidelines from college and department missions and goals. Faculty with expertise in the relevant courses and programs develop learning objectives for students. Every course is expected to include learning objectives. These objectives are included in the course proposal and are determined by the faculty proposing the course or program and are reviewed at each step in the approval process. This development of learning objectives is informed by faculty's knowledge of the field, trends in the disciplines, accreditation requirements, and feedback from employers and/or advisory boards. Faculty maintain contact with the industry/profession through professional associations and bring into the curriculum process the latest developments in their fields.

Some departments explicitly use learning objectives developed by their disciplinary national associations. For example, the Mathematics Department bases their learning objectives on a 2004 report of the Committee on the Undergraduate Program of the Mathematical Association of America. The Department of Modern Languages takes most of its directives concerning learning objectives from the Modern Language Association of America (MLA) and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). Education learning objectives are directly aligned to national, state, and College of Education standards and values. These are specifically included in each course syllabus and on most of the performance-based assessments.

For accredited programs in the College of Health Sciences and Professions (CHSP), learning objectives are based on specific accreditation standards. Faculty must have learning objectives that meet accreditation criteria and core competencies. During the quarter to semester transition, all course objectives for all courses were reviewed and updated for all programs. It was emphasized to all academic units that the learning outcomes must be measurable and observable (i.e., use of action verbs). Program coordinators in the College regularly seek feedback from other faculty members, professionals via field placements, service-learning and practicum experiences, and internships, as well as from alumni and current students. For example, in Communication Sciences and Disorders, mission and vision statements are periodically reviewed and discussed in faculty meetings to provide an overarching principle for developing and revising learning objectives.

In the College of Engineering and Technology, learning objectives are divided into two categories. First are the program educational objectives, which are statements that describe the career and professional accomplishments that the program prepares graduates to achieve. These are communicated publically to external constituencies, prospective students, employers, and student sponsors (parents, etc.). They are checked to make sure they are consistent with the objectives and mission of the institution and are reviewed at least annually by the program’s constituencies to determine if the program has in place a “good” set of objectives and whether the alumni meet the
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program’s educational objectives. Second, there are program outcomes, which are narrower statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate. These objectives relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire in their progression through the program. ABET programs are required to have 11 specific program objectives. Achievement of the Program Outcomes must be verified before certification for graduation. Determining that the program outcomes have been met is the job of the faculty. Faculty determine the outcomes and how to measure whether they were achieved.

On the regional campuses, learning objectives are determined by program faculty under the guidance of program coordinators and directors. Program Advisory Committees also play a role in determining learning objectives. All course and program learning objectives are developed with the intent of addressing the needs and expectations outlined by industry leaders and university faculty during the program design and development process.

Ohio H.B. 95 mandated that the Ohio Board of Regents establish policies and procedures for all public colleges and universities to ensure that students can transfer coursework and degrees to any other state institution of higher education without unnecessary duplication. A feature of this policy is the Transfer Assurance Guides (TAG). TAG's are groups of courses that represent a commonly accepted pathway to the Bachelor’s degree. Courses or course sequences identified as part of a TAG may be offered at any public college or university in Ohio. Core learning objectives have been developed for these courses by faculty committees, with approval by committee members representing different colleges and universities in the state. Many of Ohio University's courses are included in TAG's and therefore share learning objectives with other state universities.

A new student learning assessment process is in development. The assessment of learning objectives is following a student success and continuous improvement model. This form of assessment will build on the current assessment practices as well as routine student evaluations and program reviews. All programs are updating their program learning objectives and assessment plans. Student assessment is about documenting student success. At Ohio University, an assessment plan is a student success plan. Assessment involves documenting whether students are meeting the learning objectives that faculty and staff establish for them. Assessment is a tool to help faculty and staff enable Ohio University to achieve this mission through helping our students succeed. Three questions frame basic assessment of student success:

1. What are the programs' learning objectives?
2. What evidence do they have that their students are/aren't meeting those learning objectives?
3. What is their action plan for making any needed improvements to teaching and learning to help their students become more successful?

Faculty in each program are responsible for developing and implementing assessment plans. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) provides assessment support for all academic units and conducts university-wide assessments through surveys and tests. Other offices exist to provide student learning objective and assessment support in the colleges of Business, Education, and Osteopathic Medicine, as well as in Residential Housing, the Center for Teaching and Learning, eLearning OHIO, and the University Libraries.

**IP3: NEW PROGRAM AND COURSE DEVELOPMENT**

The Faculty Handbook specifies the process by which faculty develop and seek approval for new curricula. The Ohio University curricular process is lead by the University Curriculum Council along with the Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate. Faculty from individual programs propose changes or new courses and curricula within their own departmental/school curriculum committees. From there they move to
the academic college curriculum committees, and they make recommendations to the dean. Upon the dean’s approval, the proposals move to the UCC for final approval. The UCC employs a subcommittee structure to review new courses and academic programs, respectively, before presenting the proposals to the entire UCC body for consideration (see 1P13). Graduate courses and academic programs are also vetted through the Graduate Council, a university standing committee with similar functions as UCC but only for graduate education. Some new degree programs may need approval by the Executive Vice President and Provost (EVPP), the Board of Trustees, and the Ohio Board of Regents. New course curricula frequently are first developed as an "experimental course," evaluated on multiple factors, and if successful, are submitted through this process for permanent offering. eLearning OHIO has processes to assist the departments in moving courses and programs into a blended or online format.

Innovations in curricula may originate from different sources. National specialized accreditation or professional standards frequently are the impetus behind the development of new curricula for relevant programs. Input from external advisory boards or from potential employers also is used to make innovations. In all colleges, academic programs conduct regular faculty meetings in which curriculum is a recurring topic. Thus, curricular revisions and updates are ongoing.

Faculty engage in scholarly and creative activity outside of the classroom and are active in academic and professional organizations. These activities inform curricular decisions and help guide program innovations. Faculty monitor industry trends and graduates' success in order to anticipate future trends. New curricula may be developed based on anticipation of these trends. Outside speakers brought to the University by existing programs may spark an interest in developing new programs. In addition, conversations between faculty and students, either informally or through a formal exit interview process, reveal student-initiated ideas for innovations. Courses may be added as electives to address contemporary issues.

All academic programs and courses were reviewed and potentially updated as a result of the recent quarter to semester transition. Some programs held faculty retreats to discuss curriculum innovations. Following are some examples of recent curricular innovations in particular academic areas.

For a new Arts and Sciences “Curricular Themes” initiative, groups of faculty representing diverse fields of study are developing integrated sets of courses. This initiative aims to help students tackle the challenges of the 21st century by building interdisciplinary and team-taught courses around a set of themes that will provide students with the perspectives they will need as engaged citizens. By combining the perspectives of the social sciences, natural sciences, and the humanities, students will gain a broad but integrated intellectual experience that will give full and tangible meaning to the idea of the liberal arts. Sample curricular themes under development include: War and Peace; Making and Breaking the Law; Sustainability; Food Studies; Race, Gender, and Identity; additional themes are under discussion. In addition, the Department of Psychology is drawing upon existing courses in the college and university to develop theme-based modules to assist students with the completion of the university general education requirements and the College of Arts & Sciences distribution requirements. As noted by the Department of Psychology, “Too often our psychology students do not see the relevance and/or connection of these requirements to their overall education. . . . The goal of the module is to provide a framework around a culturally relevant theme that bridges, where possible, the university requirements and the requirements by the college.”
The College of Engineering and Technology is developing two new programs to begin in 2014-15. A Bachelor of Science degree in Technical Operations Management will be offered by the Department of Engineering Technology and Management, and a Bachelor of Science degree in Energy Engineering will be offered by the Department of Mechanical Engineering. In both cases the ideas for the new degrees came from the programs' advisory boards. After the decision was made to investigate the possibility of new programs, a faculty group was formed to articulate program objectives and a proposed curriculum. The programs then went through the standard approval process from the department, to the college, and then to the University Curriculum Council.

In the College of Business, recently added programs originated from ongoing faculty review of the field and feedback from advisory boards that led to faculty proposing changes/additions. These innovations include courses supporting a certificate in leadership and corresponding track in the management major; courses supporting a certificate in entrepreneurship and corresponding track in the management major; a new core course in Analytics; a new social media course in the Sales Certificate; and minors in marketing and finance.

1P4: BALANCE AND INTEGRATION OF LEARNING GOALS, CAREER, NEEDS, AND REALITIES OF THE EMPLOYMENT MARKET
Addresses Core Components 1C, 3A, and 4A.

The following statements from the 2013-14 Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs are intended to address Core Component 3A:

**Undergraduate Education**
Ohio University offers undergraduate instruction on both the Athens campus and the regional campuses. Undergraduate programs, designed to contribute to intellectual and personal development and career goals of students, emphasize liberal studies. Undergraduate major programs, pre-professional, and professional programs prepare students for employment in a variety of careers and for continued study. Two-year technical and associate’s degree programs, reflecting employment opportunities, as well as the general career interests of students, are taught primarily at the regional campuses. At the Athens campus, instruction is combined with residence life and other extracurricular programs in an effort to create a collegiate experience integrating learning and living.

**Academic Advising**
Ohio University recognizes academic advising to be a central element of the educational experience of its undergraduate students. Advising is a collaborative relationship for which advisors and students share responsibility and through which students create sound educational plans consistent with their academic, career, and personal goals. Advisors are responsible for being accessible and responsive to students, and for providing accurate, timely information. Students are responsible for being prepared for advising sessions, and for understanding University and major requirements.

**Philosophy of the First Year**
Ohio University believes that first-year students should be presented with a common set of curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities that introduce them to the intellectual skills, ethical norms, and civic values that will prepare them to succeed as scholars and citizens of the university community. Ohio University is committed to promoting academic, social, and personal engagement in that community and to ensuring continual improvement in the quality of the first-year experience through systematic assessment of student learning and involvement, academic practices and policies, and the availability and efficacy of support services.

**Graduate and Professional Education**
Ohio University offers graduate and professional education. The primary forms of activity are advanced and specialized courses of study, supervised practical experience, and research. The essential concentration
of faculty, material, and space resources dictates that the activity associated with graduate and professional education will be centered on the Athens campus. This activity is not limited to that campus; research and instruction are carried out at various locations.

**Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activity**
Ohio University is a center for scholarship, research, and creative activity involving the creation, testing, and dissemination of knowledge, understanding, expressions, and technique. As a public university, Ohio University has a particular responsibility to address societal issues and needs through such scholarship, research, and creative activity. The scholarly and artistic activity of the faculty enhances the teaching function at all levels of the student experience.

**Extended Community**
Ohio University serves an extended community. The public service mission of the University, expressed in such activities as public broadcasting and continuing education programs, reflects the responsibility of the University to serve the ongoing educational needs of the region. The regional campuses perform a critical role in serving this extended community. The University has state-wide responsibility for an extended university program using print based, blended and online course delivery. It is the purpose of these extended University programs to serve a diverse range of educational needs, from professional groups requiring continuing courses of study related to the practice of their professions to individuals desiring occasional or special interest study. Ohio University contributes to cultural and economic development, health care, and to other human services.

Refer to 1P10 for the University's diversity statement, which addresses Core Component 1C.

Curricular control is maintained by Ohio University's faculty. Ongoing, day-to-day curricular policy is governed by the University Curriculum Council (UCC) and through the Faculty Senate Educational Policy and Student Affairs committee. Changes and new policy are presented to UCC and the Faculty Senate and upon approval move to the EVPP for final approval. UCC governs program review and revision through the Program Review process. All academic programs are reviewed every seven years. The review guidelines recently were revised and updated and now include the following components:

- General Summary
- Faculty Profile
- Quality of Undergraduate Teaching and Learning
- Quality of Graduate Teaching and Learning
- Quality, visibility, and impact of the program's research, scholarship, and creative activity
- Service
- Infrastructure
- Action Plan for Areas of Improvement

This intensive institution wide review process ensures a balance between market driven course offerings and providing a sound general education component in new academic programs (1P13).

Academic programs are designed by faculty with expertise in those programs, informed by guidelines provided by relevant disciplinary and interdisciplinary professional organizations at regional and national levels, and by selected peer institutions. Each department has a faculty curriculum committee that is responsible for the courses and programs in that department. The faculty monitor advancements in the field. For example, International Studies has redesigned its programs toward "Global Studies" in response to the global migration of talent and ideas, and the interconnectedness of international studies for a new political age.
In addition to information provided by exit interviews, alumni surveys, and other sources of information, about 100 programs follow guidelines provided by over 30 accrediting agencies (see 9P5). For example, the Meteorology BS program must comply with NASA requirements; the Department of Psychology has an APA accredited Ph.D. program in Clinical Psychology; engineering programs follow ABET requirements; and nursing programs follow OBN requirements.

Visiting professionals, scholars, and artists are brought to the University for up to three year terms. These visiting faculty bring innovative ideas to the academic programs from their respective industry or origin.

Many departments have student advisory groups that provide input to the faculty about instances where they are having problems meeting their educational objectives. In other departments there may be significant emphasis placed on one-on-one meetings between students and faculty. There may also be end-of-year review sessions with students. These forums serve to provide faculty with direct feedback from students regarding their needs.

Liberal arts programs emphasize skills—oral and interpersonal communication, critical analysis of evidence and argument, etc.—that draw on both a liberal arts tradition and consistently gathered survey data that reveal skills desired by employers.

Departments in professional programs may have advisory boards consisting of recruiters and alumni that provide advice to the faculty on trends and needs of employers. Faculty in these programs are encouraged to supplement their classroom experience with professional work in the external sectors, thus enabling them to stay current with their fields. The College of Communication offers a faculty “externship” program that supports faculty returning to industry for a period to gain skills and insight, and bringing what they learn back to the classroom. There is a long history of Theater faculty working as professionals in New York, Los Angeles or Chicago before coming to Athens, and many continue to engage in creative activity in their respective professional fields. When the faculty is professionally engaged, they understand the requirements of working in the profession and adapt curricula and/or teaching approaches to meet the needs of the profession.

The College of Business has faculty curriculum continuous improvement teams for undergraduate and graduate programs that evaluate the common core courses and MBA curriculum. eLearning OHIO provides academic departments with relevant data about markets, employer desires, and community colleges. Some graduate distance learning programs work with third party vendors that provide continual design/redesign of the curricula offered online. The regional campuses rely upon faculty and staff teams to design program content and delivery options. New programs are vetted with community leaders and curricular authorities across the University.

The College of Education collects data from various internal and external sources of data to inform the development of responsive programs. The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) is a committee comprised of representatives from each of the educator preparation programs, regional campuses, P12 school teachers and administrators, students, etc. that is designed to design, evaluate, and implement new and current initiatives and communicate program requirements. In addition, the Communications and Connections group, formed in 2006, which includes superintendents, teachers, faculty, staff, and other educational groups, helps the Unit establish an aligned, agile, regional system of professional learning that meets the unique educational needs of children and the broader demands of a global society. This group was instrumental in creating and analyzing data from focus groups of graduates and employers. As a result, five design teams were
established: Design Team I- Clinically based educator preparation; Design Team II- Mentoring; Design Team III- Teacher Residency; Design Team IV- Technology; and Design Team V- Health and Wellness.

The academic units in the College of Health Sciences and Professions (CHSP) design responsive academic programs by means of evolving guidelines and competencies of accrediting agencies, capstone projects/experiences, preceptor surveys from internships, ongoing feedback from advisory boards and local professionals, employer surveys, ongoing contact with site supervisors, and review of course evaluations. In addition, faculty members regularly participate actively in national and international academic professional associations to stay current with ongoing trends and demands in the allied health disciplines.

Since 1981 Ohio University has been assessing the outcomes of its students. OIR conducts two follow-up surveys of graduates (one year and five years after graduation) that provide outcomes information to colleges and departments. The Career and Further Education Study measures short-term educational outcomes through a survey to all graduates of all degree levels of a given class. The questionnaire collects information on employment information (e.g., income, occupation, job satisfaction, first job lead, satisfaction with education at Ohio University, and length of time from graduation to first job). The second section requests information on further education after graduation from Ohio University (e.g., program of study, degree sought, financial assistance, satisfaction with education at Ohio University, and professional certification sought. The third section allows academic programs to design their own questions; about 50 different department-specific questionnaires currently are used. The Survey of Alumni is sent to bachelor's graduates five years after graduating. It collects information on a three-part questionnaire. The first part asks questions about types of jobs held, salary, employment satisfaction, and various competencies needed and developed. The second part of the questionnaire asks about graduates' programs of study and current satisfaction with their programs. Graduates are asked about additional degrees completed after leaving Ohio University, and graduates are asked to assess their experience with the general education program at Ohio University. The third part of the questionnaire allows each academic college to ask college-specific questions. Results are broken down by academic college and department and are given to each college. College- and department-specific results are also available on the Institutional Research web site. While both studies maintain anonymity of the respondents, individual job titles and names of employers, as well as academic programs and names of universities for graduates continuing their education are given to all colleges and departments to keep them informed about the outcomes of their graduates.

1P5: PREPARATION REQUIRED OF STUDENTS

Ohio University regularly studies the preparation required of students for admission based on probability of success. Undergraduate Admissions evaluates about 20,000 applications for admission based on the following criteria: strength of the high school curriculum; performance in high school courses; high school GPA and class rank; and ACT and/or SAT scores. These criteria are evaluated through studies regularly conducted by the Office of Institutional Research. OIR participates in ACT’s prediction/research service and monitors the predictability of high school GPA and ACT scores as predictors of first-year college GPA. OIR participates in ACT’s Class Profile Service, which provides detailed descriptive characteristics on incoming academic preparation of students for the Athens and regional campuses. OIR also has conducted studies on the effectiveness of high school GPA vs. individual course grades and ACT scores on college GPA and first-year retention. These studies are shared with the Undergraduate Admissions and three different enrollment management committees.

The University recommends a strong college-preparatory curriculum to help ensure success in college: four units each of English and mathematics, three units each of science and social studies, two units of foreign language, one unit of visual/performing arts, and four units of other electives.
The departments of Mathematics, Modern Languages (Spanish, French, and German), Chemistry, and English have developed placement assessments. These tests are given to students at matriculation, typically at Bobcat Student Orientation. Placement recommendations are based on studies done by either OIR or the departments themselves. Mathematics has determined that the ACT mathematics subscore is a better predictor of success in mathematics courses than their previously used placement exam. This decision was based on extensive analysis and deliberation by the department. Because decisions about course placement and performance of these service courses may affect the course offerings and curriculum of other departments or colleges, the decisions are vetted through the process described in 1P3.

On the regional campuses, first year students are placed in academic coursework based on standardized placement scores. All regional campuses utilize the Compass placement exam for students who do not have ACT or SAT scores. In addition, some programs have supplemental placement instruments. For example, the Associate of Applied Science in Nursing requires students to take an additional mathematics proficiency exam, and the Associate of Applied Science in Equine Studies assesses student’s horsemanship for appropriate placement.

Admission criteria for graduate and professional programs are established by each academic program. Programs consider applicants' prior academic performance and degree attainment, GPA, GRE or other test scores, English proficiency, and letters of recommendation. Each graduate program has a review committee, and applications are reviewed individually within each graduate or professional program.

Admission to different programs is based on criteria set by faculty in those programs. The colleges of Business, Communication, and Engineering practice selective admissions based on ACT/SAT and high school rank or GPA. TOEFL is used for international students to ensure they can communicate adequately to be successful. These criteria are based on long-standing selective admissions practices, using ACT prediction services, retention, graduation, and academic success rates as guides in setting the criteria. For prospective engineering majors, the student high school background should include a strong background in mathematics and science. In the College of Health Sciences and Professions (CHSP), appropriate academic preparation in various programs is determined by programs' goals and competencies identified by accrediting agencies, the use of internships and externships, employer feedback, advisory board input, graduate surveys, and analysis of employment trends.

In the College of Fine Arts, students audition for entrance to the BA and BFA programs. The audition establishes trainability (likelihood of achieving creative, physical and academic) and talent. Student grades, test scores, a student writing sample and letters of reference are also reviewed as part of the entrance process to identify academic promise. Preparation needed in professional programs is determined largely by the requirements of licensure in that profession. Additional requirements may come from accrediting agencies.

eLearning OHIO uses tools to assess students’ preparedness for online learning (the current tool is SmarterMeasure), and has revised the orientation for distance learning students which is required for all online students staring Spring semester 2014. The orientation includes training to use Blackboard and its tools.

The University maintains a practice of ensuring that students are progressing successfully academically. These decisions are initially made at the department/program level by the individual faculty who offer the courses required to complete the academic program. The identification of required prerequisites to ensure adequate student preparation for a particular class is submitted as part of the new course or course change approval process. Minimum GPA and other academic performance standards must be met. Students who fail to meet university
expectations of academic performance are removed from the institution in accordance with the probation and dismissal policy outlined in the Catalog. Students in good academic standing but who fail to meet defined program level performance expectations may be asked to change their major. Minimum course grades are used by programs to ensure that students have adequate preparation prior to taking more advanced courses or the next course in a sequence. Some colleges use a freshman drop policy that sets a specific GPA as a minimum expectation at the end of the freshman year. Students who fall below this level are flagged for intrusive advising and required to go through additional activities to assist them with study skills. Students are encouraged to enroll in a Learning Community in their freshman year where they join a cohort that takes some classes together and meets weekly with faculty and peer mentors to discuss strategies for academic success.

Some programs have specific requirements. For example, all teacher education students are required to maintain at least a 2.75 GPA both overall and in their content-specific courses. Furthermore, all Education and Counseling students are required to purchase and use LiveText to submit standards-based performance assessments. Faculty use rubrics to document student learning and then the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement runs aggregate data reports across the Unit as well as disaggregated reports for each individual program and campus.

**1P6: COMMUNICATION OF EXPECTATIONS REGARDING STUDENT PREPARATION AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES TO PROSPECTIVE AND CURRENT STUDENTS**

Addresses Core Component 2B.

Faculty regularly participate in Admissions-sponsored campus visit events and recruiting receptions and are available to meet with prospective students and parents. At these meetings, faculty communicate the requirements for academic preparation for specific disciplines at the undergraduate and graduate level. University admission officers also discuss academic preparation with potential students during high school visitation trips. Admissions publications communicate this information. Admissions guidelines are posted on University Web sites.

Ohio University also offers numerous summer programs for prospective students in disciplines such as business, communication, sciences and the arts to help students prepare for the rigors of these academic programs.

The Ohio University Undergraduate Catalog and the Ohio University Graduate Catalog clearly present expectations regarding student preparation for each academic program. Individual programs develop student learning objectives as part of their assessment plan. Furthermore, student learning objectives have been developed for each course, and faculty are required to include them in course syllabi. This information is also available on course web pages for students enrolled, or considering enrolling, in specific courses.

Academic advising is conducted by faculty and staff in specific programs, in University College for undecided students, and on each regional campus. The Office of Admissions, the Office of the Registrar, Bobcat Student Orientation staff, and student services offices in each college work together to effectively and consistently communicate information to students as they apply to the University. The orientation handbook, "My Ohio University Experience: A Guide to Academic Success," is given to new students at Bobcat Student Orientation.

With regard to Core Component 2B, The University communicates with its stakeholders as required by federal and state law, such as the Student Right to Know and Cleary Act laws. Departments such as Communication and Marketing, OIR, Undergraduate Admissions, Student Financial Aid, University Registrar, and Legal Affairs work collaboratively to ensure that the information provided to stakeholders is accurate, consistent, and effective.
1P7: HELPING STUDENTS SELECT PROGRAM OF STUDY THAT MATCHES NEEDS, INTERESTS, AND ABILITIES

Core Component 3D will be addressed in 1P15.

Help and guidance from faculty and admission advisors is available to prospective students when they visit campus or attend recruiting receptions. Academic programs are described in literature mailed to prospective student applicants and posted on university web sites as a means to help students decide on a major program. Once students enroll in the university, faculty and professional advisors work with all undergraduates. This facilitates students’ program selection as faculty help students match their abilities, interests, and needs to specific programs. The first advising session occurs at Bobcat Student Orientation where students complete placement testing and meet with advisors who guide them in completing their first schedule. Advising then continues each semester until graduation. The general education program ensures that students are exposed to courses in a variety of foundational-level courses, ensuring exposure to multiple disciplines.

The Career and Leadership Development Center, one of the units in Student Affairs, helps students select programs of study that match their needs, interests, and abilities. They offer drop-in and scheduled career coaching, interest assessment, and leadership development. They offer such services to students as “Need help deciding on a major?” They work with students to develop self-awareness that encourages career exploration. Students have the opportunity to complete various testing modules that provide them with information about their learning styles, abilities, interests, and compatible majors.

University College is the primary academic home for students undecided in their major. The college sponsors several one-on-one programs and an annual “Majors Fair” that helps undecided and other students at the institution choose or change major programs to best fit their interests and abilities. The Allen Student Help Center was created when the University’s new student center, Baker University Center, was opened in January 2007. This center provides assistance to all Ohio University students regarding academic matters. The center does not attempt to be a substitute for academic departments, but rather aids students in finding the correct person or office to address their academic issues and concerns. Most of the other academic colleges have undecided major designations, in which students may be admitted to the college, receive advising, and take courses reserved for majors while deciding on a specific major (e.g., undecided business and undecided engineering).

1P8: STUDENTS WHO ARE UNDERPREPARED FOR OU'S ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND COURSES

See 1P5 for the means by which Ohio University determines the preparation needed for students in programs and courses. Predictive examinations and MAPWorks are used to identify students who may be at risk academically. The University uses this predictive information in a proactive manner to direct students toward services they may need to be successful. Some of these services are directed toward underprepared students. There are developmental courses, study skills courses, supplemental instruction, learning communities, math labs, advising services, and tutoring services available through either the Academic Advancement Center (AAC) or the academic departments. The Academic Advancement Center and the Allen Student Help Center are devoted to assisting potentially underprepared students. The AAC offers a writing center, a science center, and a math center for individual help sessions, study skills courses in computing, learning strategies, and reading skills, tutoring, and the College Adjustment Program (CAP). CAP is a TRIO-funded program that provides services for at-risk students. The Allen Student Help Center uses MAPWorks and the Student Involvement Study to identify individual students who may be at risk. It also provides walk-in assistance and referral services for students who may be having academic difficulties. The Center for Teaching and Learning also provides individual student...
assistance with learning strategies. Students who are not performing well in English—many of our students have a language other than English as their first language—are closely monitored and may be asked to include courses from the ELIP (English Language Improvement Program) to address shortcomings.

**1P9: DETECT AND ADDRESS DIFFERENCES IN STUDENTS' LEARNING STYLES**

Based on an understanding of student's learning needs from direct feedback from students, the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) provides individual and group faculty and student advising on instructional and learning strategies to help engage students. CTL does Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SDIG) class visits and follow-up sessions with instructors to help them identify ways to promote active learning and help students learn. CTL offers students individual and group advising to help them identify learning strategies that will work for them, based on the VARK (visual, auditory, read/write, kinesthetic) theory.

CTL, Academic Technologies, and University Libraries' instructional staff work to help faculty develop instructional strategies that effectively engage students. The Libraries have 16 instructional librarians who work with students and faculty. Academic Technologies is promoting the "flipped classroom" concept that fosters active learning and frees faculty to work more productively with students. CTL provides workshops for instructors to help them better respond to students' needs.

Different tools and programs are available to meet different students' needs. MAPWorks is administered at Bobcat Student Orientation. MAPWorks is a tool for identifying at-risk students early in their first semester in college. A course on student learning strategies is offered by The Academic Advancement Center. Learning Communities are created for different groups of students in ways that acknowledge their different learning styles and needs.

**1P10: ADDRESS THE SPECIAL NEEDS OF STUDENT SUBGROUPS**

Addresses Core Component 1C.

**A Commitment to Diversity (statement from the 2013-14 Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs):**

*Ohio University is committed to promoting an atmosphere where understanding and acceptance of cultural and ethnic differences are ensured.*

President Roderick J. McDavis underscored the University’s ongoing commitment to promoting diversity by citing its importance in his 2004 inaugural address. A climate that represents and embraces different cultures enhances Ohio University’s ability to provide all of its students with the experiences necessary to successfully compete and achieve in an increasingly diverse and complex society. There is no better way to learn about the world than to create an environment where students of diverse backgrounds—and indeed, students from all over the world—study, live, and socialize together.

Ohio University is bound morally, emotionally, and intellectually to pursue the realization of a vision of real community. As a result, it is committed to equal opportunity for all people and is pledged to take direct and affirmative action to achieve that goal. In upholding its commitment, Ohio University will not tolerate racism, sexism, homophobia, bigotry, or other forms of violations of human rights. Such actions are inconsistent with, and detrimental to, the values that we hold essential as an institution of higher learning. All students, faculty, and staff of Ohio University are expected to uphold the University’s commitment to a just and diverse community and to take a leadership role in ensuring an atmosphere of equality.
Ohio University has several offices devoted to serving the needs of special populations. The Academic Advancement Center is the recipient of a TRIO grant for addressing the needs of first-generation or at-risk students. University College provides support for the veteran, commuter, non-traditional age, and transfer student populations. The Office of Multicultural Access and Retention provides support for multicultural students. International Student and Faculty Services provides information and assistance on immigration matters; acts as a liaison with sponsoring agencies and foreign governments; provides information on campus and community services available to international student and faculty; and promotes intercultural exchange programs between international students and the University community. The Women's Center serves and responds to the needs of OU women students, faculty, and staff, as well as members of the community. Founded in 2007, the center is dedicated to creating an inclusive and welcoming campus climate for all members of the community through programs, resources, referrals, advocacy, and education. Student Accessibility Services (SAS) monitors and assists students with specific needs identified through ADA.

SAS is the office centrally responsible for determining eligibility of self-identified students with disabilities, coordinating reasonable accommodations for academic and campus life, providing specialized support services, and advocating for the implementation of reasonable accommodations and accessibility for students. Beginning with the 2013-14 academic year, SAS is now centrally responsible for these domains of student access across all Ohio University campuses. An additional 2.5 FTE of staff was added in the form of two full-time and one half-time Accessibility Coordinator (AC) to serve specific campuses. Several specialized services are coordinated through SAS to support the access and learning for students with disabilities. They serve the unit to which students self-identify and ultimately determine eligibility for reasonable accommodations; provide notification of accommodations for instructors; coordinate the production of textbooks/course readings in an alternate format; coordinate the administration of exam accommodations that cannot be met by faculty; coordinate note taking services; coordinate ASL interpreting and captioning services; and provide adaptive equipment/assistive technology and basic training to effectively use technology.

1P11. DEFINE, DOCUMENT AND COMMUNICATE EXPECTATIONS FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING
Addresses Core Components 2D and 2E.
Ohio University subscribes fully to the Statement of Principles of the American Association of University Professors regarding academic freedom. The following is excerpted from the Ohio University Faculty Handbook:

- The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his/her other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
- All teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject.
- College or university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As men or women and as educational officers, they should remember that the public might judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence, they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not institutional spokespersons.
The Faculty Handbook also specifies the expectations of content of course syllabi, which should contain the following information:

- The instructor's name, the descriptive title, and the catalog number of the course;
- The intended learning outcomes or objectives upon successful completion of the course;
- The basis for grading in the course;
- The course attendance/absence policy;
- A statement on academic misconduct that includes definition appropriate to the discipline and possible sanctions;
- Information regarding accommodations in course work and assessment for students with a disability, and available resources offered by the University.

Expectations related to the ethical practices of students are governed by the Student Code of Conduct and the Office of Community Standards and Student Responsibility. Information is contained in the Student Handbook. Community expectations of students are first communicated at the Bobcat Student Orientation. In addition, the Student Affairs mission is to promote responsible and ethical behavior among students, including "Cultivating a caring and civil campus community that values responsible and ethical behavior, open and free exchange of ideas, and respect for all people."

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) encourages active and collaborative learning by providing instructors with professional development opportunities that promote best practices in teaching. The mission of the CTL is to:

- respond to the teaching and professional development needs of faculty, instructors, and graduate students at different points in their careers
- facilitate creation of mentoring relationships within the teaching and learning community
- promote leadership roles of faculty and other colleagues in teaching and learning initiatives, including helping graduate students prepare for careers as faculty (Preparing Future Faculty)
- strengthen linkages between the Center and other programs and units across the university that also are integral to the teaching and learning missions of the university
- promote collaborative initiatives in the scholarship of teaching and learning
- highlight excellence in teaching and learning at Ohio University

The CTL collaborates with the Bruning Teaching Academy, whose purpose is to promote mentoring and networking opportunities for faculty interested in sharing best practices in instructional strategies. CTL is involved with promoting best practices in instruction by overseeing the selection of recipients of the University Professor Award and the Graduate Associate Outstanding Teaching Award. Other teaching awards include:

- Jeanette G. Grasselli Brown Faculty Teaching Award
- Dean's Outstanding Teacher Award (for each respective college)
- Group II Outstanding Faculty Award
- Class of 1950 Faculty Excellence Award
- Distinguished Professors
- Charles J. Ping Professor of Humanities

CTL also promotes best practices in teaching by conducting course design institutes, Small Group Instructional Diagnosis, teaching portfolio workshops, graduate student (Preparing Future Faculty) instructional development, and consultation and advising services to faculty and staff.
The University has a number of university-wide structures and functions that are used to set expectations about academic quality:

- Participation in AQIP Accreditation and College/Program Accreditation
- University peer institutions, half of which are aspirational
- Academic Leadership Meetings among academic deans, regional campus deans, and EVPP staff
- University Curriculum Council
- University International Council
- Graduate Council
- Interdisciplinary Council
- Dashboard indicators on Four Fundamentals

In the academic units, expectations for effective teaching are set by multiple sources of information, multiple methods, and multiple data points:

- Course evaluations are used each semester by departments to evaluate students’ perceptions of individual courses and their learning experiences in each class. Quantitative and qualitative results from these evaluations are reviewed by individual faculty, department chairs, and by merit and promotion committees. Normative standards are set within programs and informed by college averages for selected course evaluation items. Information from course evaluations are utilized for promotion and merit consideration as well as for teaching awards.
- Peer teaching evaluations may be used for promotion, tenure, and merit raise consideration.
- Department chair evaluation of teaching for promotion, tenure, and merit raise consideration.
- Formal or informal peer mentoring programs for new faculty.
- Pre-fall orientations for new faculty offered by CTL and in individual colleges.
- Mentoring and formal or informal supervision for graduate students on effective teaching
- Regular opportunities for professional development in teaching on-campus.
- Incentives to attend professional development workshops/conferences off-campus.
- Faculty retreats focusing on teaching, learning, and assessment of learning objectives.
- Faculty standing committees on improving teaching and learning
- Instructional technology support.

Some of the colleges are implementing innovative approaches to set expectations for effective teaching. A teaching portfolio that documents a faculty member's teaching effectiveness may be used; the College of Business requires this of all faculty. Theater requires a yearly self-evaluation, which has a prescribed structure including teaching evaluations, service contributions, and creative activity. Faculty learning communities are increasingly used to promote, model, and discuss effective teaching. The College of Health Sciences and Professions recently instituted a College Report Card, which asks students across all programs to “grade” the College on major areas including instruction in classes, laboratory experiences, and opportunities to learn about and conduct research.

The College of Osteopathic Medicine has its own Faculty Development Office and Learning Resource Center, which help set expectations for effective teaching and learning in medical education, respectively.

In terms of expectations for student learning, students are frequently familiarized with the University's core values and standards. Each student is made aware of the importance of his/her knowledge and skills the chosen field. In orientation and advising sessions, each academic college strives to create an academic culture of high expectations.
and accountability and an academic climate that supports learning and achievement. Orientation sessions, training experiences, classroom and laboratory teaching-learning activities and routines reinforce these values.

As per University policy, student learning for each course is expressed in the student learning objectives listed in the syllabus. Assignments and assessments are related directly to the learning objectives. Evaluations of student progress are shared with students in advising meetings.

Expectations for effective learning are set by multiple information sources, methods, and data points:

- Providing orientation programs for new students
- Published student handbooks
- Providing learning communities for first-year students that are designed to help new students with their overall first-year transition and to establish connections with faculty and advisors
- Setting appropriate prerequisites for course and programs (which are discussed and approved at departmental/program, college, and university levels);
- Using appropriate learning objectives for individual courses and for students’ programs of study
- Conveying expectations for student learning through course syllabi and through print and web-based information outlining students’ programs of study;
- Ensuring that students meet regularly with academic advisors. Advising holds are placed on students’ registrations until they meet with their advisor.
- Introductory courses that outline program expectations.
- Introductory program courses that outline expectations for the entire program (e.g., BA 1100, Introduction to Business)
- College convocation sessions that focus on performance expectations.

eLearning OHIO works with Academic Technologies to establish expectations for teaching and learning across the institution and in particular is working with them to develop training for faculty. eLearning provides facilitator training and guidelines. Early in the semester eLearning OHIO provides a progress assessment to students enrolled in online courses to identify any concerns about services and to make sure there is a successful start to the course.

The increasing use of instructional technology at Ohio University facilitates the explicit setting of expectations for teaching and learning. Instructional technology staff in OIT and in the colleges collaborate with faculty in exploring ways that instructional and information technologies can enhance traditional, online, and hybrid classrooms. They work directly with faculty on course design and development; support multimedia projects; research and evaluate emerging technologies; assist with the integration of technology into teaching and learning; and facilitate and lead workshops and training that foster a culture of professional development that in turn advances student learning. The increasing use of distance learning necessitates an explicit a priori setting of learning expectations in online courses.

1P12: BUILDING AN EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT COURSE DELIVERY SYSTEM
Addresses Core Component 3A.
Faculty determine the best modes of course delivery (traditional, blended, online courses), in light of the course purposes and level (introductory, advanced undergraduate, or graduate) and students’ needs. Course delivery options are determined by evaluating the intersection of faculty expertise and experience, student learning objectives, and pedagogical appropriateness. The mode of course delivery depends upon the content of the course
(adaptability of course content into an online or distance environment), the student population, class size, course objectives, and the instructor’s competencies/strengths in modes of delivery.

Ohio University offers programs that have online courses, hybrid/blended courses, compressed video, independent study, and completely online. Faculty engage in dialogue about the best modes of course delivery, based on student evaluations, course evaluations, surveys, formal interviews, informal conversations, student cohort characteristics, etc. The mode of course delivery is based on the criteria of effectiveness, efficiency and appeal. For example, the Nursing curriculum committee determined the content and delivery methods appropriate for the material and the student population. Nursing is a very hands-on profession that requires unlicensed student nurses to take courses that have laboratory and clinical components, and thus the program needed a face-to-face delivery method in the on-campus BSN program. The RN to BSN online students are able to have the delivery via the distance format as they have more experiences and a greater knowledge base compared to the students in the on-campus program. Some course delivery is dictated by the nature of the discipline. For example, Management Information Systems courses are delivered in flexible lab settings where students can interact with a faculty member part of the time and then immediately switch to applying concepts on the computer. Another common delivery mechanism used across the curriculum and in the business cluster courses in particular is the use of projects as a vehicle for applying content. These projects are often done with live clients where students learn consulting skills as well as problem structuring and critical thinking. Many of the students in the College of Education require flexibly-scheduled classes to maintain their roles in the region.

For online programs, eLearning OHIO consults with faculty in the academic programs; shares insights from market analysis, helps the faculty examine the course content and the best delivery mode for the content. Learning objectives for Ohio University courses are the same regardless of location or mode of delivery. The goal of this consultation is to ensure that the same quality of instruction exists, that the academic rigor is comparable, that appropriate use of technology is employed, and that the learning experience is effective for distance learning students. Blackboard is the University’s learning management system. Alternative modes of curriculum delivery increasingly are used to promote active student learning and success. Four examples are noted below: two types of learning communities; peer-led team learning; and Scale-Up/“flipping the classroom.”

- In 2007, Arts and Sciences offered 27 learning communities for first-year students; in 2013 that number increased to 42 learning communities spanning ten departments and programs, and including learning communities for “General Arts & Sciences” students and one learning community for undecided majors in the college.
- As used by the Department of Biological Sciences, for example, students in the Learning Communities (offered in conjunction with BIOS 1100) meet as small groups (7-10) with a peer mentor (a trained student who previously completed the class) for two hours each week. During the sessions, challenging problems and activities directly related to the course material are discussed and carried out. The student receives one hour of credit (pass/fail based on attendance). This model removes the opportunity for students to be passive observers and encourages active learning. Student participants are expected to construct their own knowledge base and understanding of the scientific concepts and principles as well as to form community relationships. The community relationships also promote taking responsibility for one's own as well as fellow students’ success by continuing to work together outside the community. Students in the learning communities have a 20-30% higher rate of success in the BIOS 1100 course than students not in the learning communities.
• Peer-led team learning (PTLT) is used in departments and programs including Anthropology, Biological Sciences, Chemistry & Biochemistry, and Physics & Astronomy to increase active participation and student learning. In the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, for example, students in PTLT learning environments tend to do better on average in General and Organic Chemistry than those students who choose not to participate (e.g., the overall course average in CHEM 1510 in Fall 2012 was 2.34 (C+). The overall course average for students in PLTL was 2.59 (B-) where for those not in PLTL the course average was 2.09.

• Two years ago, the Department of Physics & Astronomy redesigned their General Physics sequence (Physics 2051 and 2052) to an active learning format known as “Scale-Up” in order to address an effective DFW rate of 40-50% for the first semester course. In this Scale-Up mode of curriculum delivery, students are put in groups of three. They are expected and encouraged to read ahead in preparation for activities in the classroom where the instructor is supported by teaching assistants. This method has been shown elsewhere to reduce DFW rates and improve conceptual understanding, and is one method of “flipping the classroom.” The department will be monitoring the DFW rate for the redesigned course, as compared to classes taught previously by the same instructors. Longitudinal data also will be sought from Institutional Research on the persistence and graduation rates of students who are taught in this format compared to students taught in the previous format. These data will inform the department’s decision-making as to whether to continue or modify this mode of course delivery.

1P13: PROGRAMS AND COURSES UP-TO-DATE AND EFFECTIVE
Addresses Core Component 4A.

Proposals for changes in programs and courses, as well as proposals for new programs and courses, are reviewed by curriculum committees at the department/program level before moving to college curriculum committees, and then to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). As mentioned previously, UCC is a broadly representative university standing committee that vets all curricular changes. The UCC is made up of three subcommittees (Individual Course, Programs, and Program Review). All curricular changes (additions, deletions, prerequisite changes, new programs and major programmatic changes) must first be approved by the department or school curriculum committee, the chair or director, the college curriculum committee, and the college dean before the UCC will consider the proposal.

The efficacy of program curriculum is monitored by the individual programs, with a comprehensive seven-year review occurring under the leadership of the UCC’s Program Review subcommittee (see 1P4). This review process requires the program to prepare an extensive self-study and includes a site visit by a member of the Program Review subcommittee and an external reviewer with a documented academic background and expertise in the discipline under review. Reports filed as a result of the review must be vetted and accepted by the college dean, Graduate Council, UCC, the EVPP Office and the Ohio University Board of Trustees. Program chairs and college deans are allowed the opportunity to respond to the review. Programs in which significant concerns are discovered must address those concerns in an action plan developed between the program and the dean of the college before the next seven-year cycle.

In addition, the recent transition of the Ohio University from quarters to semesters provided an opportunity for academic units throughout the university to evaluate their programs and courses. All programs made some modifications in this transition, and some curricular changes were substantial (see examples in 1P14). Programs and courses are evaluated on an ongoing basis by faculty in academic units and review committees, informed by internal and external guidelines and sources of information, including relevant disciplinary and
interdisciplinary professional organizations at regional and national levels, peer institutions, students’ evaluations of courses, exit interviews with graduating seniors, alumni surveys, alumni boards, and other stakeholders and data sources. Over 100 academic programs at Ohio University follow guidelines provided by 35 specialized accrediting agencies.

The College of Education illustrates the use of multiple sources of information and collaboration with a wide range of stakeholders to inform their curriculum. It has developed a Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP), which is a committee comprised of representatives from each of the educator preparation programs in the University, regional campuses, P12 school teachers and administrators, students, and other stakeholders. UPEP designs, evaluates and implements new and current initiatives and communicate program requirements. In addition, the Communications and Connections group, formed in 2006, which includes superintendents, teachers, faculty, staff, and other educational groups provides advice to the college about the educational needs of children and the broader demands of a global society. Education has multiple national accreditations (National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), Council On Rehabilitation Education (CORE), Council On Accreditation of Parks, Recreation, Tourism (COAPRT), Wilderness Education Association (WEA), and the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) to which their programs align, and include standards from which performance assessments are based. In addition, the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) and the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) have set certain standards that ensure the programs and courses are structured and assessed in a way that ensures students’ needs are met. The College conducts a biannual Student Satisfaction Survey, collects data from employers, and implements various performance-based assessments that inform their programs and courses.

The College of Business uses a model in which each department's advisory board consisting of recruiters and alumni provides advice to the faculty on trends and needs of employers. Curriculum continuous improvement teams for undergraduate and graduate programs evaluate the common core courses and MBA curriculum. Proposed changes to these programs are reviewed by these committees and are voted on by the faculty. The college maintains an Executive advisory board that serves the same function as departmental advisory boards but at the program level. Business accreditation standards specify knowledge areas that should be covered in undergraduate business programs and MBA programs.

As an additional example of involving multiple stakeholders to ensure that programs and courses are up-to-date and effective, the College of Engineering has advisory boards comprised of accomplished alumni, industry experts, and emeriti faculty and staff who provide advice and counsel on industry trends and needs to help keep the college curriculum current. There is a College Board of Visitors and advisory boards for the Departments of Aviation, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Civil Engineering, Engineering Technology and Management, Industrial and Systems Engineering, and the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. The College's undergraduate programs in civil engineering, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, industrial engineering, and chemical engineering are accredited by the Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET. The computer science program is accredited by the Computing Accreditation Commission of ABET. The engineering technology and management program is accredited by the Association of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering. The aviation flight curriculum is approved by the Federal Aviation Administration.
In addition to data obtained from current students, graduating seniors and alumni gathered by individual academic units at Ohio University, surveys conducted by the OIR help to guide curricular development and review, and can help to inform the creation of new programs and curricula. For example, the creation of the Arts & Sciences Scholars Program resonated with NSSE survey results, which found that first-year students felt less challenged in their coursework compared to juniors and seniors. A central purpose of the courses in this multidisciplinary program for high-achieving first-year students is to introduce students to some of the more significant ideas and controversies from the past that shape contemporary life. Students who are accepted into the Scholars Program take a writing-intensive seminar, participate in a student/faculty colloquium series, and have the opportunity to interact beyond the classroom with one another and with program faculty.

1P14: CHANGE OR DISCONTINUATION OF PROGRAMS AND COURSES

Programs and courses are evaluated on an ongoing basis by colleges, departments, schools, and programs, taking into consideration enrollments and student needs, faculty resources, developments in the field of study, feedback from alumni, advisory boards, and/or employers, and other factors to modify or redesign programs, or to recommend possible program discontinuation. Some changes are initiated based on accreditation compliance or by changes in the certification requirements of the associated degree programs.

Program reviews, facilitated by the UCC, include examination of the currency and viability of programs. Changes in program requirements are vetted through the Programs Committee of the UCC. Proposals to discontinue programs are presented to the UCC and the Board of Trustees, along with strategies for phase-out developed by the programs. Proposals to change or delete courses are vetted through the Individual Course Committee of the UCC.

For example, the seven year review for the Associate of Applied Science in Equine Studies documented declining enrollments and concluded that the curriculum was generic and lacked focus on preparing students for employment within the industry. The curriculum was subsequently redesigned to produce therapeutic riding instructors, farm managers, and animal care technicians. Following the redesign, program enrollments increased and industry certifications were achieved, further strengthening the program.

In a 2007 program reassessment, the Department of Political Science reviewed its enrollment patterns and faculty strength and decided to phase out the low-demand Public Administration program for undergraduates, while strengthening its offerings in the high demand areas of Law, American Politics, and International Relations. This move reflected a national trend in which the field of Public Administration was separating from Departments of Political Science. Shortly thereafter, the emergent School for Leadership and Public Affairs began work on developing undergraduate programming to offer a strong degree program for students in this area.

The Associate of Applied Science in Travel and Tourism was discontinued after a period of declining enrollments. The rise in online travel sites was a contributing factor in the reduction in employment opportunities for students. In response to this declining market and need, the program was phased out.

In 2009, the College of Education engaged in an internal review of undergraduate and graduate programs and based on various sources of data determined whether programs would be placed in moratorium, maintained with conditions, maintained, or enhanced. As a result of mixed reviews, the Master of Higher Education program was discontinued. Four years later, a stronger, blended online program was developed and is flourishing. Currently,
the College is engaging in another program planning process, which will involve reviewing programs, and making decisions about areas that can and should be enhanced.
With the recent transition of Ohio University from quarters to semesters (Q2S), all academic units throughout the university reviewed their programs and made major or minor changes in program foci, curricula, and requirements. For example, during the Q2S process, the College of Communication determined through extensive discussions with professional contacts and alumni that, in some cases, changes were needed in its program offerings. Also as a result of the Q2S review process, 22 bachelor’s programs, six master’s programs, and two doctoral programs were discontinued in Arts and Sciences.

**1P15: DETERMINE AND ADDRESS THE LEARNING SUPPORT NEEDS OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY IN STUDENT LEARNING, DEVELOPMENT AND ASSESSMENT PROCESSES**

**Addresses Core Component 3D.**

Ohio University offers centralized resources that support teaching and learning. Most notably, the Faculty Commons, Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), Graduate Writing and Research Center, and Center for Academic Technology offer new and continuing faculty teaching resources and sponsor a variety of opportunities for faculty to engage in teaching improvement programs and activities.

The Academic Advancement Center and the Allen Student Help Center, housed in University College, offer academic support services to students. These centers offer Supplemental Instruction, tutoring, math labs, coaching, technology and advising services such as Academic Progress eReports and MAPWorks to help inform university decisions regarding academic /learning support for the student body as a whole. Many of the First Year Experience initiatives such as the Common Experience Program, Learning Community Programs, and Bobcat Student Orientation activities are coordinated through University College. Students are made aware of academic success resources available to them starting with Bobcat Student Orientation. They learn more about these resources and are encouraged to use them in their first-term learning communities.

Each individual college interacts with the support offices across the institution in meeting the needs of their students. The colleges also work with the Academic Advancement Center (AAC) to make sure there are sufficient numbers of tutors available to students who request help. The AAC supports early math, science and engineering fundamental courses with Supplemental Instruction or peer led team learning sessions. Furthermore, colleges work with the Allen Student Help Center for support with Academic Progress eReport intervention, MAPWorks tracking and intervention of first year students, and academic probation workshops.

An example of collaborative effort between the College of Health Sciences and Professions (CHSP) and the Allen Student Help Center is MAPWorks. MAPWorks is a retention tracking program coordinated through the Allen Student Help Center. All undecided freshmen in the CHSP complete two transition surveys per semester (four total for the academic year). These surveys create a retention risk level for each student (green, yellow, red and red 2). The strategy in the CHSP is to meet with all of the students to review their survey results to communicate that the college staff are invested in their educational success. It is imperative to meet with all students with a red or red 2 risk level to identify what issue/s they are facing and if/how their issues can be addressed.

Another example of collaboration between the colleges and central student support resources is the Academic Progress e-report program. The Academic Progress e-report is coordinated through the Allen Student Help Center and is being used by several colleges. This program already exists at OU for other student populations (student athletes, students in the College Adjustment Program (CAP), first generation students, etc.). At the midpoint of
the semester (week 7) a report will be sent to the professors/instructors teaching the classes that these specific student groups are enrolled in during that particular semester (For example, if you are teaching UC1900 fall semester, you will have to fill out one of these as an instructor). The report asks the professor/instructor to assess how the student is currently performing in her/his class (attendance, participation, grades) and what recommendation the instructor/professor has for them for the remainder of the semester. Reports are generated back to the individual colleges’ Retention and Advising Coordinators and/or the Assistant/Associate Deans for Student Services. Upon reviewing these reports, meetings for students who have poor performance reports will be required to determine what steps can be taken to improve their academic standing before the semester ends.

Each regional campus has a student learning center, and many operate advising centers, that provide tutoring, supplemental materials, tutorial assistance, and counseling and academic advising. Campus libraries are staffed to provide students with assistance in finding and selecting materials. Regional campus faculty and staff make themselves available to students both during and outside of office hours. Students who find themselves on academic probation are assigned to a probation advisor. The probation advisor works with the student to identify and establish significant remediation activities and goals, for which the student is held accountable.

Individual student and faculty needs are identified at the department/school level. In many cases the dean of the college will employ advisory committees made up of college faculty to evaluate these needs and make recommendations. Colleges have significant flexibility in their budgets to allocate resources to support teaching and learning in various areas. Faculty serve as intermediaries in helping students find the help that they need from resources across campus. Academic advisors meet individually with students to help them select appropriate classes, and for students who may be struggling academically referrals are made to central university resources including the Academic Advancement Center and the Allen Student Help Center.

Recent examples of innovative strategies have been developed in Arts & Sciences (A&S) to address students’ learning support needs. A&S undecided students had a higher academic probation rate and a lower retention rate in comparison with freshmen who had declared majors. In an attempt to improve these areas, all A&S undecided freshmen were required to enroll in a Learning Community, have their advisor be the instructor of the Learning Community course, and use MAPWorks as an advising tool for the Fall 2012 semester to identify at-risk students earlier in the term and develop a plan for mitigating their risk areas. The success of this model will be assessed by comparing probation and retention rates with previous data.

Another A&S innovation involves Biology 1700. This introductory biology course has historically had a high DFW rate, as high as 54%. To address this problem, the Biology department, in concert with the Undergraduate Student Affairs office and the Health Science Professions Student Affairs office, developed a plan to identify struggling students very early in the semester so that appropriate advising, tutoring, and enrollment changes can occur before students fail the course. Students and advisors will complete and sign the BIOS 1700 Advising Intervention form that captures the information from these advising sessions. For assessment, the DFW rate in BIOS 1700 for Fall 2013 will be compared with DFW rates from previous years.

Ohio University Libraries' mission is to be a dynamic gateway for the discovery, creation, and exchange of knowledge, enabling students, faculty and staff to realize their promise and achieve excellence. The Libraries’ staff is committed to providing spaces where diverse learners can achieve their goals, connecting with faculty and students to deliver information and scholarship tailored to their research and learning needs, encouraging students to critically engage with information through curriculum-focused library instruction, and developing a virtual
presence that supports self-service and connects the learning community to library staff. Ohio University Libraries is a member of OhioLINK, a library consortium that leverages state and member funding to provide an extraordinary range of electronic journals and books to Ohio’s academic libraries. Librarians teach about 600 sessions to over 10,000 students on finding and using information. Librarians answer over 20,000 questions a year on finding and using information, and librarians provide robust self-directed and mediated help online for students away from the building. The Libraries’ investment in books, journals and other intellectual content in all formats ranks it among the top 100 academic research libraries in the country. Approximately 95% of the Libraries’ journal holdings are electronic and accessible anytime and anywhere on campus as well as off-campus for authenticated users. The Libraries holds nearly one million electronic books; again, these are accessible 24 hours on and off campus. In response to internal needs assessments, ongoing developmental activities are offered to librarians with teaching roles, such as developing and assessing learning outcomes, the relationship between critical thinking and information literacy, etc. Librarians regularly attend professional conferences with a focus on teaching, learning, and assessment in the academic library. A recent innovation is that librarians currently are engaged in a needs assessment of graduate student related to their research skills and teaching of research skills, with the results to be used to develop professional development opportunities for graduate students, including teaching. Libraries’ staff were collaborators on the proposal to fund the Graduate Research and Writing Center.

The primary mission and goals of Academic Technologies (AT) are: (a) to provide consultation services for faculty in instructional design, strategies, and implementation of innovative technologies to meet academic and curricular goals; (b) to create a collaborative environment for faculty colleagues in order to promote cross-discipline best practices for teaching strategies; (c) to collaborate with faculty and departments to make recommendations on educational best practices and provide instructional resources and technologies to support teaching and learning. AT has met with Deans and Departmental Chairs to better determine faculty support needs. AT facilitates events each semester in order to gauge faculty interest in new teaching and learning methods; based on faculty interest, consultations and studios may be developed. Additionally, faculty are encouraged to contact AT staff with any instructional design and instructional technology needs or requests. Current services for implementing best practices regarding technology and pedagogy to enhance teaching and learning include: Academic Events (brown bag lunches, faculty learning communities, etc); Course Design and Teaching Studios and Institutes; one-on-one course consultations; and Faculty Showcases.

1P16: ALIGNMENT OF CO-CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENT GOALS WITH CURRICULAR OBJECTIVES
Addresses Core Component 3E.
Goals related to student responsibility and behavioral expectations are communicated to incoming freshman during Bobcat Student Orientation, via electronic communication to students, through Student Affairs activities, Residential Housing programs, and the programs in the learning communities. Other programs sponsored by the institution also encourage students to respect themselves and others, display responsible behavior, and curb excessive consumption of alcohol. The institution believes that encouraging responsible behavior from our students also promotes learning and academic excellence in the student body. The university also fully supports cultural activities and events that enrich the lives of our students, faculty and the community. Ohio University offers an excellent Performing Arts and Theater series as well as numerous musical and dance performances. The “Arts for Ohio” program, sponsored by the College of Fine Arts and financially supported by the Office of the EVPP, allows Ohio University students to attend cultural events sponsored by the university free of charge. Nationally prominent speakers are brought to campus in order to enrich the educational experience of our students and community. Lectures are usually free to the public and students.
Opportunities within the academic units and academic support units for student involvement outside of the classroom include:

- Labs (e.g., Biological Sciences; Chemistry; Physics & Astronomy)
- Fieldwork (e.g., Geological Sciences; Anthropology)
- Research (most if not all departments offer undergraduate opportunities in research and/or creative activities; graduate programs require research for theses and dissertations). These opportunities may include industry-related work where curricular knowledge can be directly applied to practice.
- Internships
- Learning Community out-of-class activities
- Scholars programs that engage students with faculty engagement opportunities
- Over 400 clubs and student organizations within the Campus Involvement Center, many of which are directly affiliated with the colleges and have a faculty advisor
- Intramural and recreational sports
- Involvement in professional conferences and presentations
- Service learning opportunities
- Opportunities for engaging in leadership, advocacy, outreach, and service
- Peer leader positions on campus
- For eLearning students, there are campus visitation days, outreach to community colleges, and online communities
- Student employment related to academic interests

The Division of Student Affairs actively participates in the intellectual and personal development of Ohio University students. It supports the University's strategic priorities by providing exemplary student support services and integrative co-curricular activities. The Division of Student Affairs' strategic priorities are summarized below:

**Student Success**

Through their academic and co-curricular pursuits, Ohio University students will develop the knowledge, skills and character necessary to be committed citizens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong>: Services, activities and environments designed to maximize student growth and personal development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong>: Opportunities designed to foster connection and immersion with the campus and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Curricular Learning</strong>: Formal and informal out-of-class activities designed to promote student learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1P17: DETERMINE LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT OUTCOME ATTAINMENT

During the quarter-to-semester transition, all courses were required to have measurable and observable learning objectives as well as summative assessment. Course-based requirements for all programs are tracked with the assistance of a computerized audit document called the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS). External accreditation organizations and Alumni Advising Boards provide valuable feedback on the quality of many academic programs. Approximately 100 academic programs at Ohio University are nationally accredited.

OIR performs two different follow-up studies of graduates each year that track graduates’ educational outcomes in terms of jobs held, continuing education, satisfaction with their education at Ohio University, skills and competencies needed and used related to general education, and program-specific learning objectives.

Most programs across the colleges at Ohio University employ some type of culminating experience or assessment. These include capstone courses, national/licensing examinations, performance assessments, professional projects, theses, dissertations, pre-post test knowledge questionnaires, success in obtaining admission to graduate or professional school, or success in gaining employment tied to a student’s field of study.

Capstone courses provide students with the opportunity to apply the knowledge and skills they have gained in all the different courses in a particular program. In these courses students must demonstrate the full range of skills, knowledge, analysis, and synthesis necessary for employment or further education. These courses are excellent indicators of the kind of instruction that students have received and the knowledge base they have acquired during their four years at Ohio University, as well as for their future success.

For example, the College of Arts and Sciences has nearly 40 capstone courses. In the College of Fine Arts for the BFA, for another example, a capstone project is required in choreography and performance that includes a written summation of the choreographic/performance/production process and their results. Other programs in the College of Fine Arts include capstone thesis exhibitions, candidacy reviews, thesis projects, creative portfolios, and final juried performance on a musical instrument.

Clinical and research internships/experiences are common across the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Health Sciences and Professions, College of Education, and College of Communication. In the College of Fine Arts, Music Education requires the completion of a teaching internship that is supervised by faculty. During these internships, students’ skills and knowledge are assessed frequently to assure they have met their learning objectives.

Several programs use national or comprehensive examinations to determine whether students receiving degrees have met their learning objectives. There are several such examinations in the College of Health Sciences and Professions, College of Osteopathic Medicine, and International Studies. Students in many of the technical associate degrees on the regional campuses are required to pass external licensing exams or equivalent practices exams in order for them to complete required coursework within their major.

Some programs track students’ success in obtaining admission to graduate and professional school, or successful employment in their field of study. For example, an assessment conducted by the Department of Geological Sciences (in the College of Arts and Sciences) found that nearly 100% of students earning the BS or MS degrees in Geology are working in the field within a year of graduation.
The College of Business (COB) uses the Assurance of Learning program to determine that students receiving degrees have met learning objectives. COB began its formal assessment and assurance of learning in 2007, under the direction of the Undergraduate Program and Curriculum Continuous Improvement Team, which includes faculty representatives from each of the core disciplines as well as the Associate Deans. This group developed learning goals for the BA program as well as specific objectives to meet in reaching each goal. The assessment of each objective was assigned to a specific course in the core curriculum where a substantial part of the course could be associated with the assessment of the outcome. The detailed report of this process and its results can be found in the AOL Annual Report 2012 Final document. The same structure is used to assess learning in the MBA programs; this is outlined in the AOL Graduate Report 2012-13 document.

**1P18: DESIGN PROCESSES FOR ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING**

Addresses Core component 4B.

See answers to 1P2 and 7P1, which add additional context to address this question. Ohio University strives to follow the assessment guidelines established by the Higher Learning Commission and specialized accrediting agencies. The academic departments/schools and individual faculty directly involved in the academic programs are charged with identifying appropriate measures for student assessment. Some programs will utilize guidelines from their external accreditation organizations to accomplish this task. OIR and CTL provide support for development of these processes. The academic program review process now requires evidence of learning through assessment.

Accredited programs design their process for assessing student learning according to guidelines established for them. In the College of Business this process is overseen by faculty-appointed Assurance of Learning directors who manage the assurance of learning continuous improvement team in establishing a body of evidence for AACSB. Ohio University’s Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) spans three colleges (Education, Fine Arts, and Arts and Sciences), and the Assessment Council (AC), which is a subcommittee of UPEP, work to design unit-wide assessments used to gauge student learning as it relates to national and state accreditation standards. The College of Engineering and Technology’s programs are accredited by ABET, which specifies eleven learning objectives for its programs and assessment guidelines. College and department professional advisory boards also provide guidance in designing processes for assessing student learning. For many programs across the university, accreditation competencies and standards require the measurement of student learning through a systematic method that can be reported to an accreditation agency. For online courses, faculty members are encouraged to do alignment in course design based on the Quality Matters (QM) standards.

Faculty members are responsible for designing appropriate assessment tools based on the content and objectives for the course that they are teaching. Processes for assessing student learning begin with identifying central goals for student learning and developing learning objectives that align with these goals. In the university curriculum review process, all new courses are required to include measurable and observable learning objectives, which are determined by faculty members in connection with the mission, goals, and learning objectives of the academic program. Faculty members at Ohio University have the autonomy to create course-specific assessments to measure student learning. Programs engage in discussion about data collected from courses to determine if modifications are needed. Also included in this process are faculty activity reports, student evaluations, committee reports, and outcome surveys, in combination with external accreditation reports, all toward the end of gaining the best understanding of the value and delivery of educational programs.
While the College of Health Sciences and Professions (CHSP) has course and program learning outcomes, the college is currently undertaking extensive efforts to ensure the use of effective processes for assessing student learning. Every program is revising/updating its program learning outcomes. As part of this update, each program will create a curriculum map, which maps the program courses and experiences to the learning outcomes. Several meetings and workshops with program directors and coordinators have already taken place on these topics. Similar work is in progress for the colleges of Arts and Sciences, Communication, and Fine Arts. The goal is for all academic programs to have updated learning objectives and student assessment plans by the end of the 2013-14 academic year (see 1P2).

OIR has held university-wide responsibility for student outcomes assessment since 1980. OIR provides assessment support for all academic units and conducts university-wide assessments through surveys and tests. OIR also breaks down these survey results for all academic college and/or department/school so that they have access to their own students' data. The following timeline shows Ohio University's history with student outcomes assessment.

**Ohio University Assessment Timeline**

- 1980: The College of Health Sciences and Professions (CHSP) begins setting and assessing student learning outcomes.
- 1985: OIR reviews and approves the university-wide assessment plan.
- 1990: OIR conducts a university-wide survey to assess student learning outcomes.
- 2005: OIR conducts another university-wide survey to assess student learning outcomes.
- 2010: OIR conducts another university-wide survey to assess student learning outcomes.
- 2012: OIR conducts another university-wide survey to assess student learning outcomes.
- 2014: OIR conducts another university-wide survey to assess student learning outcomes.

Results (R)

**1R1: MEASURES OF STUDENT LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT THAT ARE COLLECTED AND ANALYZED REGULARLY**

Ohio University collects data on student learning objectives using direct and indirect measures. Centrally, the Office of Institutional Research collects data on many indirect measures and some direct measures. OIR tracks
student grades, probation rates, and retention and graduation rates. OIR surveys students on academic involvement and engagement, satisfaction with academic services, and it conducts two follow-up surveys of graduates. One of them, the Survey of Alumni, asks extensive questions that have been mapped to the University's general education learning objectives. The other, the Career and Further Education Survey, tracks graduates' employment and continuing education experiences. About 50 academic programs have added their own program outcomes questions to this survey. These data are collected by the Office of Institutional Research and made available to academic units. OIR also conducts a direct measure of learning, the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Achievement. In addition, many departments also collect data on their students in order to track quality and preparation.

Direct measures of student learning utilized in the colleges and academic departments include the following:

- Locally designed examinations
- Writing samples (e.g., Department of English)
- Capstone, senior project evaluations
- Research experience (e.g., Physics & Astronomy).
- Team projects and presentations
- Oral presentations/examinations (e.g., Modern Languages' oral proficiency)
- Observations of student performances and post-performance critiques (e.g., Fine Arts)
- Study abroad evaluations
- Laboratory experience evaluations (e.g., Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry)
- Internship, service-learning, and coop evaluations by students and supervisors
- Portfolios (e.g., Education)
- Course-embedded assessments (e.g., Communication)
- Passage of licensure (e.g., Osteopathic Medicine, Nursing) or state (e.g., Education) exams
- Competency/skill demonstrations
- Clinical skills labs, clinical rotation evaluations (e.g., Osteopathic Medicine)
- Formal cohort (e.g., first-year, second-year) reviews of student work to date (e.g., Film)
- Comprehensive exams (e.g., all doctoral programs)
- Thesis and dissertation review (e.g., Honors Tutorial College, Master's and doctoral programs)
- Specialized accreditation assessment measures that are specified (e.g., Engineering; Social Work; Physical Therapy)
- Assurance of Learning process (Business) and curricular mapping to AACSB goals. The formal process of assessing and assuring learning in the Bachelor of Business Administration program follows AASCB’s recommended cycle of developing learning goals and objectives, designing measures, collecting data via these measures, analyzing the data, implementing continuous improvements derived by a review of the results, and collecting data to evaluate the improvements’ efficacy.

Indirect measures of student learning include but are not limited to:

- Course grades and GPA
- Pass rates, DFW rates
- Completion and graduation rates
- Number of students entering graduate school or professional careers upon graduation
- Course evaluation items related to the overall course or curriculum quality.
- Exit interviews/surveys of graduating students
- Honors, awards, scholarships
- Surveys of alumni and advisory boards
- Feedback from business and industry leaders who employ regional campus graduates.
1R2: PERFORMANCE RESULTS FOR COMMON STUDENT LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

The General Education Assessment Working Group spent four years conducting a comprehensive assessment of general education that concluded in 2010. This was an AQIP action project. Sources of data included the Survey of Alumni; ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) standardized tests of English writing, mathematics, and critical thinking; and structured interviews of students. The Survey of Alumni revealed high levels of satisfaction with the different components of the general education program (Tier I freshman writing; Tier I junior writing; Tier I quantitative reasoning; Tier II breadth of knowledge; and Tier III synthesis). Students indicated the greatest satisfaction with Tier II. Graduates were also asked to rate 15 different competencies in terms of their perceived need five years after graduation and also the University’s effectiveness in helping them develop them. The following chart summarizes the most recent findings:

![Chart showing competencies rated as needed and developed at Ohio University: 2004 & 2005]

The Interview Project asked samples of seniors and freshmen questions about their general education experience at Ohio University and a sample of freshmen about the expectations they held for their Ohio University education. Following is a small excerpt of selected findings:

- As reflected in the quantitative analysis on Survey of Alumni results, students in different academic programs demonstrate different outcomes. These differences indicate that students in different fields of study will, by the nature of that field of study, graduate with slightly different general education learning outcomes. This analysis does not prove that some students are not receiving the skills, knowledge or learning outcomes, but rather that due to the nature of their chosen field of study, the focus may be more prominent on certain outcomes than it is on others.

- Seniors expressed a desire for a greater variety of general education courses. Students indicated that they wished they could have taken a different mix of courses or at different quarters. This theme was related to the choice of major. Students discussed changing their major as a result of choosing their first major.
prematurely and reported that general education gave them opportunities to explore other majors. Choice of electives was related to these themes, with students expressing a desire to take courses that were not required. Students expressed dissatisfaction with instructional methods that did not engage them in learning. Students expressed frustration with courses that were poorly taught, not challenging, or presented with an apparent bias. A few students indicated that they would make no changes at all. Students wished they would have taken a greater variety of courses in and beyond general education, and they expressed a desire for greater engagement in the classes they did take.

- During the interviews students were asked questions on sets of learning objectives, which were mapped from Ohio University's general education program to questions on the NSSE instrument. Seniors were asked how much Ohio University contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in each one. A relative ranking of learning objectives was done in terms of the skills and types of knowledge the students felt they had gained most and least. The learning objectives identified most frequently by seniors as those they have gained most from their education include core liberal arts skills in analytic thinking, written and oral communication; job or work-related knowledge/skills and the ability to work effectively in teams; and several learning objectives related to lifelong learning and personal development. The learning objectives that seniors most frequently identified as those they have gained least include community and civic engagement; voting in local, state, or national elections; liberal arts skills in the areas of artistic/creative expression and appreciation, numeracy, applying scientific methods to understand the natural and physical world; understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds; and oral communication. The following chart summarizes this analysis.

Seniors' Ratings of Ohio University's Contribution of Learning Objectives from NSSE

![chart showing students' ratings of Ohio University's contribution to learning objectives from NSSE]
In an effort to continue with the assessment of the general education learning outcomes as well as to be compliant with the VSA requirements, OIR administered both the CAAP Critical Thinking Test and the CAAP Writing Essay Test during the 2012-2013 academic year. The method for testing is prescribed by ACT and VSA. Freshmen must be tested early in the fall term, and seniors must be tested within 6 months of graduation. Following are summary charts from the CAAP testing:

The English Department has conducted two targeted assessments on the Tier 1 / General Education first-year writing course, Writing and Rhetoric 1 (ENG 1510). The first study on the writing program focused on student growth in the ability to use the skills of summary, thesis creation and support, logic, organization, and mechanics. A pre-and post-assessment method was used on a sample of randomly selected essays. In all categories there was significant growth. Most growth occurred in summary and organizational skills. The least growth was in the category of logic. The second and most recent study conducted in the spring and summer of 2013 was designed to assess to what extent the final e-portfolios of randomly selected students from the new curriculum of Writing and Rhetoric I (English 1510) demonstrated proficiency in eight course outcome goals. The findings were disappointing but instructive. Overall, the evidence suggested that students were not meeting the eight learning objectives. This resulted in a change in course assignments as well as in Teaching Associate teaching development. Teaching Associates teach the majority of ENG 1510 sections.

1R3: PERFORMANCE RESULTS FOR PROGRAM LEARNING OBJECTIVES
Each academic program has its own performance results. At Ohio University, the academic colleges are responsible for ensuring that the programs in their departments and schools assess learning objectives. Following are recent examples of results, and some of usage, from each college:

College of Arts & Sciences
English 250 (Introduction to Critical Analysis) was the required introductory course for all majors, serving as the gateway into the undergraduate program. A major outcome was for students to be able to do a close, analytical
reading of a text and understand and employ literary terms by the end of the quarter. An assessment of final exams across all of the courses where students were asked to demonstrate their ability to meet these objectives indicated that students were not meeting this learning objective. Based on the data, the department created new courses with a different approach to address this learning outcome since it is a pivotal learning objective for all further work in the major. The Department of Modern Languages implemented an exit exam for Oral Proficiency done by an accredited outside agency in 2009 for Spanish and in 2012 for German. Students perform a blind oral telephone interview with an examiner. The interview is double rated. Success rate has varied between 85% and 69% in Spanish, depending on the given year. (German has not yet conducted this test.)

College of Business
The College of Business began its formal assessment and assurance of learning in 2007, under the direction of the Undergraduate Program and Curriculum Continuous Improvement Team (CIT), which includes faculty representatives from each of the core disciplines as well as the Associate Deans. This group developed the learning goals for the BBA program as well as specific objectives to meet in reaching each goal. The assessment of each objective was assigned to a specific course in the core curriculum where a substantial part of the course could be associated with the assessment of the outcome. The criterion for the learning objectives is that 85% of students will meet or exceed expectations on assessment of the learning objectives. The following table depicts an average of the assessment data for the 2011-2012 process cycle, including the steps of development, measurement, and closing the loop for the college. Individual reports for each learning objective under each goal are available on the College of Business Assurance of Learning web site.

Summary Data for 2011-2012 Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Below Expectation</th>
<th>Meets or Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Acquire</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Integrate</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Demonstrate</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College of Communication
Beyond scores on tests, evaluations of papers, behavioral changes from experiential learning, and attitudinal changes from presentation experience, capstone experiences are used to measure performance:

- In the School of Media Arts and Studies, students in the production programs demonstrate their ability to produce a professionally qualified music recording, film, television, show, animation or digital game by working with skillful talent in a fully equipped working environment.
- In the School of Visual Communication, senior design and photography students each year complete the “Soul of Athens,” an online collaborative multimedia project. This project explores the Southeast Ohio region through in-depth stories and technological innovation.

College of Education

- Over the past 5 years, the School Counseling program has had a 100% pass rate for the state license.
- In 2012-2013, the average score on the Professional Internship Final Evaluation was a 2.57 on a 3-point scale.
- In 2012-2013, 95% of candidates either met or exceeded the standard of evaluating their lesson plans, including two or more performance assessments or task requiring the integration of knowledge, skills, and reasoning abilities.
As of fall 2013, all Education programs have received either National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions from the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)’s Specialized Professional Associations, which require programs to implement performance assessments aligned to professional standards and demonstrate data-driven program improvements.

**College of Fine Arts**

The core keyboard requirement for all music majors involves comparing annual results of the Keyboard Proficiency Exam (KSP). Is there a trend toward completion or non-completion of this requirement for music majors? Should adjustments be made to the content of the KSP, or the timing of the exam during the students’ degree programs? Some students in both the MFA and MA track serve as teaching assistants and standalone instructors. Their performance is assessed through faculty classroom visits and teaching evaluations. Strengthening teaching skills is part of the mission of the Film Division.

**College of Engineering and Technology**

Alumni serving on the two advisory boards and attendees at the annual alumni breakfast are surveyed annually on whether they believe the program is achieving the program educational objectives (PEO). These results are summarized in the following chart. All responses regarding PEO 1 are at the highly effective or effective levels. Over 70% of respondents marked effective or highly effective for meeting PEO 2. Perceptions regarding PEO 3 declined this year, compared with the previous two years, but was still near the performance criterion. Responses for all years on PEO 4 met the performance criterion.


*Figure 2-38. Results of surveys of alumni and board members regarding OUCE Program’s effectiveness at 2006-2010.*

Each course has learning outcomes that are mapped to program objectives. Course learning outcomes are used to assess program outcome attainment. An excerpt from a course report assessment matrix for ChE 408 is shown in Table 3-6 as an example. As seen in Table 3-6, one of the course learning outcomes for ChE 408 (Engineering
Experimental Design) is that students should demonstrate the ability to fit linear and nonlinear model equations to data by least-squares regression. This course learning outcome supports Program Outcome 1d2, which states that students should demonstrate the ability to complete experimental studies, including formulating mathematical models. This course learning outcome for ChE 408 was assessed using two questions on Exam 2, Homework 4, and one question on the Final Exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.6. Excerpt from Course Report Summary Matrix for ChE 408 – Engineering Experimental Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChE 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S =$ at least 75% of class demonstrates proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E =$ at least 90% of class demonstrates proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Yes # % Yes Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d2. Fit linear and nonlinear model equations to data by least-squares regression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam 2 Question 2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 # 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d2. Fit linear and nonlinear model equations to data by least-squares regression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam 2 Question 3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 # 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d2. Fit linear and nonlinear model equations to data by least-squares regression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 # 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d2. Fit linear and nonlinear model equations to data by least-squares regression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 # 83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College of Health Sciences and Professions
Examples from the College of Health Sciences and Professions (CHSP) include pass rates on national examinations, performance on clinical field experiences, and pre-/post-test comparisons.

- Objectives based on pass rates on national licensure/certification exams.
  
  - Long-term Care Administration: Licensure Boards (Federal Exam) Pass rates: 2008 (80%), 2009 (80%), 2010 (70%), 2011 (70%), 2012 (67.8%). To address the pass rates, three classes in the curriculum were evaluated and reconfigured.
  
  - Communication Sciences and Disorders: Praxis examination for speech-language pathology and audiology: 100% pass rate (2007-08 to 2012-13).
  
  - Athletic Training: Board of Certification pass rates: 2012-13 (84.6%), 2011-12 (89.5%), 2010-11 (71.4%) (3-year aggregate = 81.8%)

- Objectives based on performance on clinical field experiences (internships/externships). Extensive evaluation is conducted for student performance.
  
  - Athletic Training: The preceptor evaluates student overall performance for the areas of professional and affective traits, skill development, and communication. Data collected from spring semester (AY 2012-13) are as follows: Sophomore class – midterm average = 87.8%, final average = 91.73%; Junior class–midterm average = 89.2%, final average = 93.2%. This evaluation is related to the student's Practicum course (AT 2921, 2922, 3921, 3922, 4921). The overall course grade must be a ‘C’ or better.
  
  - Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD): CSD uses KASA (Knowledge and Skills Assessment) to evaluate student performance in clinical experiences. Student performance can be
evaluated as independent (7-8), competent (5-6), emerging (3-4), beginning (1-2). Benchmark scores are established throughout the timeframe of the graduate program. For the 4th semester for the graduating class of 2014 the average scores as assigned independently by two supervisors were: 7.74 and 7.65.

- Program learning outcomes based on performance on Points of Distinctiveness
  o Athletic Training: The Athletic Training program in the School of Applied Health Sciences and Wellness has pre- (incoming) and post-test (upon graduation) assessment data based on Points of Distinctiveness which include rural health care, evidence-based practice, professional issues in athletic training, identification of elements fundamental to the research process, instrumentation and measurement used in data collection, analysis and application of published research, development of therapeutic interventions and strategies to provide athletic training services in a medically underserved region, and interpretation of epidemiological data. In a recent analysis, a significant difference was found in pre- and post-test scores with post-test scores significantly higher than pre-test scores.

Regional Higher Education
Several Regional Higher Education majors use internal and/or external exam validation to assess overall student learning. Three examples include: associate degree in nursing (NCLEX-RN results), deaf studies and interpreting (pre-practicum assessment), and equine studies (PATH results).
- Associate degree in nursing: students seeking licensure as a Registered Nurse must pass the NCLEX-RN exam following completion of their associate’s degree. Ohio University offers this degree on three regional campuses: Southern, Chillicothe, and Zanesville. The pass rate for each campus is tracked and compared to national testing averages. In 2009, the OHIO pass rate was 6.5% below the state average. Given the continued pattern of low performance, the nursing faculty changed practice exam providers and mandated supplemental instruction for those who performed poorly on the practice exam. In 2010, the OHIO pass rate went up 6%. Since 2010, the pass rate has continued to either meet or exceed state averages.
- Deaf studies: students enrolled in the deaf studies and interpreting major must successfully complete practicum requirements prior to earning their degree. In fall 2011, the program implemented a pre-practicum assessment to determine appropriate practicum placement for students. The pass rate of the first cohort of students was 73%. Faculty used the pass rate information to implement improvement strategies. As a result, the pre-practicum pass rate increased for the 2012-2013 cohort to 82%.
- Equine studies - Professional Association of Therapeutic Riding (PATH): during the 2012-2013 academic year, 20 equine studies students were eligible to sit for the PATH certification. Of the 20 students, 1 student chose not to test and 1 student failed one section of the exam. For this cohort, there was a 90% pass rate (18 of 20).

College of Osteopathic Medicine
The College of Osteopathic Medicine has an extensive assessment program and collects performance data on multiple indicators, tracks students’ progress, and publishes dashboards. Students are required to pass the Comprehensive Osteopathic Medicine Medical Licensing Exam (COMLEX) Level 1 CE, COMLEX Level 2 CE and COMLEX Level 2 PE of the National Board of Osteopathic Examiners (NBOME) in order to graduate from the College of Osteopathic Medicine. Following is an example of how the College tracks COMLEX Level 1 pass rates:
1R4: SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT RESULTS RELATING TO PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Students successfully complete required curricula as evaluated and assessed by faculty. In addition, assessment evidence from various OIR assessments and department-based assessments inform this answer. Surveys of graduates one and five years after graduation are designed to capture indirect, self-report measures to provide feedback on the importance of learning outcomes and the extent to which their education provided graduates with knowledge and skills required by stakeholders.

Following are examples of the types of evidence typically used by academic programs to ensure that graduates possess the knowledge and skills required by stakeholders:

- Placement statistics for rates of employment and average salaries.
- Successful completion of internship and research experiences. Internships include employer feedback components to provide information on how well our students are prepared, and advisory boards that include both alumni and recruiters provide feedback on student preparation at the time of graduation.
- Successful performance in capstone courses, demonstrating students’ integration of knowledge and skills in their program(s) of study.
- Successful performance on final exams that are linked to external standards. For example, the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry uses the American Chemical Society (ACS) standardized exams as the final exams for several of their courses.
- Oral presentations/examinations. For example, the Department of Modern Languages implemented an exit exam for Oral Proficiency done by an accredited outside agency for Spanish and German.
- Students’ success in obtaining admission to graduate and professional school.
- Exit and employer surveys. For example, employer survey results indicate that 93% of employers were satisfied with College of Education graduates’ content knowledge in the subjects they taught.
- Pass rates on national licensure/certification exams. For example, the overall pass rate for the state licensure tests for all education majors across colleges is 94%.
The following Regional Higher Education programs provide outside opportunities for students to gain credentialing that supports evidence that they have acquired the necessary knowledge and skills for their field:

- Office Technology: Microsoft certifications
- Deaf Studies & Interpreting: Ohio interpreters license
- Nursing: Registered Nurse license
- Equine Studies: licensed therapeutic riding instructor
- Human Services Technology: social work assistant or chemical dependency assistant license exam

The degree of Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine is granted to students who are in good standing as determined by the CSP, have successfully completed all required coursework, have successfully completed the year three Objective Structured Clinical Exam, and have passed the COMLEX Level 1 CE, 2 CE, and 2 PE exams of the National Board of Osteopathic Medical Examiners (NBOME).

See 1R2 and 1R3 for additional examples of evidence that learning objectives of knowledge and skills have been met.

Because many academic programs rely on job placement and further education rates, OIR regularly surveys all graduates and reports on their success. Following are University-wide employment status and further education rates. These data are given to each academic program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time (% of total Employed)</td>
<td>(83%)</td>
<td>(86%)</td>
<td>(87%)</td>
<td>(85%)</td>
<td>(84%)</td>
<td>(78%)</td>
<td>(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time (% of total Employed)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(22%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (in School)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (not in school)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1R5: PERFORMANCE RESULTS FOR LEARNING SUPPORT PROCESSES
6R2 describes the First-Year Student Satisfaction Survey in detail. Following is a sample of students’ ratings of information about academic advising. Most students rated advising positively, between treatment by advisors (most positive) and the process of advising (least positive). College-specific results are shared with advising faculty and staff in each academic college.
During 2012-13, Academic Technologies (AT) staff conducted over 300 face-to-face meetings with Ohio University faculty members. According to a faculty survey, 95 percent of faculty were either satisfied or strongly satisfied with the teaching support services provided by AT and would recommend AT to their colleagues. Faculty comments were recorded and analyzed. For example, “Every meeting with them was productive and conducted in a professional manner. The workshop was well-organized and provided valuable information.”

Performance results on learning communities, the College Adjustment Program, Bobcat Student Orientation, Supplemental Instruction, Residential Housing, etc. are presented elsewhere in the Systems Portfolio. Of particular note, however, is the Libraries’ participation in LibQual. Every three years the Athens campus participates in LibQual, a comprehensive survey of library stakeholders. Following is a sample of results from the 2012 LibQual survey. The Libraries has incorporated LibQual results into its strategic plan, to improve 5% from these results in its commitment to stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library as a Place</th>
<th>Minimum Mean</th>
<th>Desired Mean</th>
<th>Perceived Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP-1 Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-2 Quiet space for individual activities</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-3 A comfortable and inviting location</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-4 A getaway for study, learning, or research</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-5 Community space for group learning and group study</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1R6: COMPARATIVE RESULTS

Comparative data are available from two of Ohio University's learning assessments: the ACT CAAP and the NSSE. Both of these assessments are included in the University's VSA College Portrait. In 2008, Ohio's public universities joined the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). VSA is a national initiative by public four-year universities to supply basic, comparable information on the undergraduate student experience to stakeholders through a common web report called the College Portrait. Ohio University's participation in VSA aligns with the University's commitment to identify student success measures, track outcomes, and make the results publicly available. In becoming a VSA institution, the University agreed to capture and post online a wide range of standardized performance data that anyone can readily compare with that of other participating VSA institutions. This includes a standardized test of general education knowledge and skills. Ohio University chose the ACT CAAP for this purpose.

In an effort to continue with the assessment of general education learning outcomes, as well as to be compliant with the VSA requirements, OIR administered both the CAAP Critical Thinking Test and the CAAP Writing Essay Test during the 2009-2010 and the 2012-13 academic years. The most recent of these test results are summarized below. For both tests, Ohio University seniors scored higher than freshmen, and both classes scored higher than the National averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT CAAP Writing Essay Benchmark Comparisons</th>
<th>ACT CAAP Critical Thinking Benchmark Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Comparisons</strong></td>
<td><strong>Benchmark Comparisons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Freshmen</td>
<td>Ohio University Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NSSE created five “Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice.” Ohio University's most recent comparative data on these benchmarks are presented in the table below. Ohio University's scores were above the comparative means for its selected peer universities on all benchmarks except for Supportive Campus Environment.
### Level of Academic Challenge (LAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Ohio University Mean</th>
<th>University Peer Inst Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
<th>Carnegie Class Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
<th>NSSE 2011 Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Ohio University Mean</th>
<th>University Peer Inst Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
<th>Carnegie Class Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
<th>NSSE 2011 Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Ohio University Mean</th>
<th>University Peer Inst Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
<th>Carnegie Class Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
<th>NSSE 2011 Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Ohio University Mean</th>
<th>University Peer Inst Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
<th>Carnegie Class Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
<th>NSSE 2011 Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Ohio University Mean</th>
<th>University Peer Inst Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
<th>Carnegie Class Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
<th>NSSE 2011 Mean</th>
<th>Sig b</th>
<th>Effect Size c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III: IMPROVEMENTS IN THIS CATEGORY AND SYSTEMATIC AND COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE RESULTS

Improving teaching and learning begins at the department/school level. Course evaluations completed by students and peer evaluations by colleagues are used in the annual evaluation for faculty to assess teaching effectiveness. Faculty and staff create opportunities for improvements in teaching and learning through the following means:

- Providing orientation programs for new students
- Providing learning communities for first-year students
- Setting and adjusting appropriate prerequisites for course and programs (which are discussed and approved at departmental/program, college, and university levels)
- Using appropriate learning objectives for individual courses and for programs of study
- Conveying expectations for student learning through course syllabi and through print and web-based information outlining students’ programs of study
- Ensuring that students meet regularly with academic advisors. Advising holds are placed on students’ registrations until they meet with their advisor
- Implementing new technologies in the classroom
- Coaching, mentoring, and leading working groups

Alternative modes of curriculum delivery increasingly are employed to promote active student learning and success. eLearning OHIO has implemented a required student orientation program and an online student support center, enhanced training for instructors, and established a quality assurance and review process using Quality Matters.

Seventy-five percent of Athens campus first year students are enrolled in a learning community and each completes a pre- and post-test to measure the learning outcomes associated with their experience. The learning strategies courses all incorporate the same type of measurement of learning. As used by the Department of Biological Sciences, students in the Learning Communities (offered in conjunction with BIOS 1700) meet as small groups (7-10) with a peer mentor (a trained student who previously completed the class) for two hours each week. During the sessions, challenging problems and activities directly related to the course material are discussed and carried out. This model limits opportunities for students to be passive observers and encourages active learning. Student participants are expected to construct their own knowledge base and understanding of the scientific concepts and principles as well as to form community relationships. The community relationships also promote taking responsibility for one’s own as well as fellow students’ success by expecting students to continue to work together outside the community. Students in the learning communities have a 20-30% higher rate of success in the BIOS 1700 course than students not in the learning communities.

All academic departments/schools used the transition from quarters to semesters as a catalyst for updating programs to match industry needs and to evaluate rigor and learning objectives. Specific examples of innovations and improvements in teaching and learning follow.

Starting in 2012-13, the College of Business established a new faculty learning community in which two of the most talented teachers led a group consisting of all newly-hired faculty and facilitated weekly meetings where topics related to teaching were discussed, resources were shared, and participants created a support network of colleagues. This was created to establish a college culture dedicated to improving teaching efficacy and to ensure that all faculty, from the beginning of their association with the college, understand that effective teaching is a key priority.
The College of Education is implementing a new clinically based teacher preparation paradigm. Candidates will be spending much more time in clinical experiences, work to co-teach with mentor teachers, reflect and evaluate their teaching in an authentic way, and video record their performance to be nationally assessed. This is intended to more directly connect theory and practice for educator preparation.

In January 2010 the majority of the classroom instruction of the College of Engineering and Technology moved to the brand new Academic and Research Center. The classrooms were outfitted with the latest instructional technology and configured to allow active learning activities. The facility has project bays for student project and 12 smaller team rooms to provide good space for student collaboration.

A new “curricular themes” initiative in the College of Arts & Sciences seeks to provide students with a broad but integrated range of opportunities for building the critical skills and knowledge they need for successful careers, engaged citizenship, and fulfilling lives. To develop these themes, Arts & Sciences faculty are building interdisciplinary and team-taught courses involving collaborative discussions about course design and pedagogical strategies. Arts & Sciences has expanded professional development opportunities for faculty including advising workshops, a faculty mentoring event, faculty learning communities, and more. Additional new events offered this year include promotion dossier workshops for Group II faculty and a “Taking Risks in Teaching” seminar to be offered by faculty members in the Department of Classics and World Religions and the Department of Modern Languages.

Peer-led team learning (PTLT) is used in departments and programs including Anthropology, Biological Sciences, Chemistry & Biochemistry, and Physics & Astronomy to increase active participation and student learning. In the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, for example, students in PTLT learning environments tend to do better on average in General and Organic Chemistry than those students who choose not to participate (e.g., the overall course average in CHEM 1510 in Fall 2012 was 2.34 (C+). The overall course average for students in PLTL was 2.59 (B-) where for those not in PLTL the course average was 2.09.

The Department of Physics & Astronomy redesigned their General Physics sequence (Physics 2051 and 2052) to create an active learning format known as “Scale-Up” in order to address an effective DFW rate of 40-50% for the first semester course. In this Scale-Up mode of curriculum delivery, students are put in groups of three. They are expected and encouraged to read ahead in preparation for activities in the classroom where the instructor is supported by teaching assistants. This method has been shown elsewhere to reduce DFW rates and improve conceptual understanding, and is one method of “flipping the classroom.” In many courses across campus, content delivery is being moved outside the classroom ("flipping") to emphasize the application of content to projects.

The School of Journalism is using TopHat interactive tools in survey courses to increase feedback for students and Twitter as a feedback tool in other large courses to facilitate student interaction during the lecture.

### 112: CULTURE AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost oversees the University infrastructure responsible for academic quality and its improvement. The following chart identifies the organizational components of this infrastructure. The EVPP and the academic colleges use the Four Fundamental priorities to select areas in which to focus improvement efforts.
Relying on this infrastructure and prioritization, each academic planning unit uses different processes and tools to make improvements in its programs. In general, student feedback, teaching evaluations, faculty discussion, assessment of learning objectives, alumni and advisory board feedback, and employer feedback are tools that are used. Student evaluations of courses and instructors are conducted and reviewed each semester. The colleges are adopting uniform teaching evaluation items, but departments and programs still can include additional items as desired. Course evaluations are reviewed at the instructor and departmental/program level.

In 2012, Ohio University was selected to participate in Learning to Improve: A Study of Evidence-Based Improvement in Higher Education, a NSSE project funded by the Spencer Foundation. Ohio University was one of a small number of institutions that was identified because of its "impressive record of improvement" in student engagement, as measured by NSSE. A case study site visit by NSSE scholars revealed further evidence of Ohio University's commitment to undergraduate education. A primary finding at Ohio University was a perception of OIR staff as "collaborators, supporters of institutional change, and being at the table for important educational discussions."

In the case of distance learning programs, eLearning OHIO assists the colleges and individual programs through the results of the formative assessments. Regional Higher Education programs determine areas of improvement in three ways: through course evaluations, seven year program review, and passage rates of external licensing exams.

Two colleges, Arts and Sciences and Fine Arts, have instituted annual program reports. Accomplishments of the past year are communicated and assessed, and priorities and goals are set for the year ahead. Reviews of all faculty and staff are conducted annually, including reporting of accomplishments and goal-setting. Chairs in these colleges submit an annual report that details the accomplishments of the students and faculty in each discipline. One section of that report requests information about areas for improvement.

Feedback from surveys, conducted either by OIR or by the individual units, is reviewed and discussed. OIR surveys of graduates reveal outcomes and experiences of graduates that are used to guide improvements in the colleges. The College of Education conducts a biennial Student Satisfaction Survey that asks students their perceptions on academic quality, advising and support services, and infrastructure. The college uses these data
along with other sources of data to review and revise its academic programs and unit operations. In response to the advising feedback from the Alumni Survey, the College Arts and Sciences conducted a student advising survey of current students during Spring Semester 2013 to help improve advising efforts.

The College of Communication relies on relationships with alumni, recruiters, and professional colleagues for advice and to gather feedback from companies where students intern or graduates gain employment. Internally, student course evaluations are monitored, and feedback from faculty is sought to identify necessary improvements. The results of student capstone projects are assessed to identify the areas in which weaknesses in student performance and learning exist.

The College of Business identifies areas that need improvement through the Assurance of Learning Process. Specifically, members of the Assurance of Learning (AOL) continuous improvement team refine the learning objectives and/or define new learning objectives, refine measures, improve the process, collect data, analyze data, disseminate results to faculty, and identify and implement improvements to enhance the process and the program. Assessment results are given to the entire faculty of the college annually. Further, pertinent data analyses are reported to each department and to the Undergraduate Continuous Improvement Team (CIT). Input is gathered for improving the AOL process and/or BBA program curricula, as suggested by the data analysis. Faculty AOL CIT champions work with faculty teaching the respective courses to implement curricula changes. The Teaching CIT also assists in implementing teacher effectiveness training to enhance faculty pedagogical performance across the program.

The College of Health Sciences and Professions (CHSP) uses assessment findings to know which areas need improvement by means of alumni/advisory board feedback, monitoring student performance on core competencies, internship preceptor/supervisor feedback, performance on capstone projects, exit/employer surveys, course evaluations, student feedback, and performance on national exams. To guide teaching improvement, each faculty member receives an annual evaluation of his/her achievements which is based on the assessment of the professional goals the individual established a year earlier. The review is shared in writing and during a scheduled meeting with the director. The Annual Review Committee studies evidence of faculty performance; their work incorporates student evaluation of teaching obtained through anonymous surveys conducted by the College. Faculty members are observed in the classroom as part of the tenure review. Peer evaluations are obtained at designated intervals depending on rank and status (renewal of contract, promotion, etc.). Every year, each faculty member presents a teaching portfolio as part of the pre-tenure evaluation.

In the College of Osteopathic Medicine, faculty have the opportunity to give feedback regarding their teaching to the Office of Faculty Development and the Office of Information Technology, via focus groups and peer evaluations. Students give feedback to the Office of Academic Affairs through the use of focus groups. This creates a continuous improvement process throughout the academic year. A process for review and action has been implemented for both COMLEX and COMAT results. COMLEX discipline scores are analyzed to determine how students are performing compared to all other osteopathic medical schools. This shows both areas of strength and weakness.

In the College of Engineering and Technology, the departmental assessment processes required by ABET identifies areas of weakness that need to be addressed by the faculty.
AQIP CATEGORY 2: ACCOMPLISHING OTHER DISTINCTIVE OBJECTIVES
Ohio University has a long history of service, especially to the southeast Ohio region. University facilities, such as the Athens campus library, are available to the local community. Research and creative activities of faculty and students, technology transfer, and business incubation provide knowledge and opportunities beyond the region. Health services are provided to local communities and throughout Ohio. Within Ohio University itself, administrative units are called "academic support," reflecting their purpose in serving the University's academic mission, especially as Responsibility Centered Management is implemented. A review process, Academic Support Program Review (now called Academic Support Improvement Committee), was developed in recent years to help each academic support unit identify and/or refine its goals to provide improved service in relation to the University's mission. The involvement and engagement of students outside the classroom continues to be a hallmark of success. We judge the maturity level of the University's approach to this category as systematic.

Processes (P)

2P1: DESIGN AND OPERATE KEY NON-INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESSES
Ohio University's major non-instructional (i.e., "academic support") processes have long traditions of service to the University and its stakeholders. It is expected that each academic support unit at Ohio University operate and set goals in accordance with the major institutional goals and four fundamental components in the strategic plan. These processes complement the University's mission and vision. Research and creative activity of faculty and staff as well as technology transfer complement the graduate curricula. The University's standing as a Doctoral/Research Extensive University enables the University to enjoy national and international prominence in recruiting and retaining qualified faculty and students. The University's NCAA Division I athletic status enables the University to increase its national prominence while providing co-curricular activities for athletes and spectators. Health services provided to residents of the local communities by the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine and Therapy Associates of the College of Health Sciences and Professions provide valuable services to stakeholders and community residents while providing learning opportunities for professional (osteopathic medical, physical therapy, and audiology) students. The Athens Community Music School provides local musical instruction by faculty of the University's School of Music. The College of Fine arts sponsors many performing arts opportunities for stakeholders and community members. The Ohio University's Office of Sustainability’s mission to achieve carbon neutrality by 2075 is accomplished by providing services and support to the campus community; advocating for innovation and research; and ensuring fulfillment of institutional commitments to environmental, social and economic well-being.

By statute, Ohio University's Alden Library serves as the Athens City public library. The collections of the Ohio University Libraries include more than 3.3 million print and electronic volumes, 57,000 current serials, and 38,000 videos. Approximately 95% of the Libraries’ current serial titles are electronic and accessible anywhere. Through Ohio’s academic library consortium, OhioLINK, students, faculty, and staff at Ohio University also have easy access to nearly 50 million books and other library materials held by 89 other Ohio libraries. Alden Library has ample individual and group study space available on its seven floors. During the semester, Alden Library is open 96 hours per week.

Alden Library's Learning Commons is a student-focused space, well-equipped with nearly 100 PCs, 13 high-end Macs, scanners, printers, photocopiers, and multimedia production tools. Computers and other equipment here and in other parts of the library are maintained and replaced regularly. Other services in the Learning Commons include: Technology Services, offering assistance from a full-time IT specialist and multimedia assistants; the G. Lynn Shostak Adaptive Equipment Room, providing equipment and software for visually impaired and learning-disabled patrons; and the Student Writing Center, offering tutoring for any student on any paper in any subject area. The Learning Commons is staffed by
nine professional reference librarians and three associates. Librarians and associates provide general reference help and referral at the desk or by telephone, email, and online chat.

A partnership with the Division of Student Affairs, University College, the College of Health Sciences and Professions, the College of Arts and Sciences, the Voinovich School of Leadership and the Provost’s Office has recently created the “Center for Campus and Community Engagement.” This center has been created to be a central clearinghouse to provide administrative and educational support services to students, faculty and members of community based organizations who wish to employ community –based engagement practices for the better of students and the community.

The Ohio University Alumni Association offers many volunteer opportunities that invite alumni to stay connected, engaged, and involved with Ohio University. Through Alumni chapters, societies, special events, mentor and legacy programs, former students can advance the mission of the institution.

**2P2: ESTABLISHMENT OF NON-INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES AND INVOLVEMENT IN SETTING THE OBJECTIVES**

All non-instructional units, including those providing services to external stakeholders, are expected to go through the Academic Support Unit Program Review (now Academic Support Improvement Committee, ASIC). This review process includes exercises in identifying and refining service objectives. Relevant units would include Alumni Relations, University Libraries, Student Affairs (Athens and regional campuses), WellWorks (Emp. Wellness Program), Therapy Associates (physical therapy and speech and hearing therapy providers), Ohio University Press, Kennedy Museum of Art, Intercollegiate Athletics, Child Development Center, and WOUB Center for Public Media. Each of the academic support program reviews involves the unit itself and its supervising planning unit head (dean or vice president).

In some cases, objectives for external stakeholders are established by their supervising or external funding authority. Examples of these would be ROTC, Americorps, the Voinovich School for Leadership and Public Affairs, and Ohio Board of Regents line-item-funded programs such as Access Challenge or Research Challenge.

The University's Board of Trustees help the University set non-instructional objectives for external stakeholders. Trustees include governor-appointed state members, national members, and representatives of the University's alumni, students, and faculty. The Board of Trustees approve policy changes and initiate/develop major objectives for the University. The Board has been instrumental in encouraging development of strategic and long-range plans, such as capital plans that reduce the University's deferred maintenance.

**2P3: COMMUNICATE EXPECTATIONS REGARDING OBJECTIVES**

Communication of expectations is done via many different means. Communication and Marketing's University-wide electronic newsletter is the official University communication medium. The University's governance committees are based on a model of representation; members are expected to represent their home units or stakeholder groups. University Web sites regularly are updated with current information regarding University priorities and initiatives. Frequently throughout each academic year, public meetings are held in order to solicit feedback from stakeholders. Recent examples include public forums on implementing responsibility centered management and the transition from quarters to semesters.

**2P4: ASSESS AND REVIEW APPROPRIATENESS AND VALUE OF OBJECTIVES AND INVOLVEMENT**

Each area typically has its own means for assessing its effectiveness. ICA tracks attendance at athletic events, ticket sales, athletic team records, student grades, and student graduation rates. Research activity is assessed through tracking sponsored research performance and within each academic department through the promotion and tenure process. A plan
for assessment or evaluation of program effectiveness typically is included in new program development. The Academic Support Unit Program Review provides a framework for regularly reviewing the appropriateness and value of externally-serving objectives. Internal reviewers and outside evaluators are called upon to make judgments about the programs’ service commitment in relation to the University's mission and vision.

2P5: FACULTY AND STAFF NEEDS RELATIVE TO OBJECTIVES AND OPERATIONS
The University values faculty and staff input. The shared governance model the University employs gives faculty and staff formal opportunities to make their needs known. Faculty annually evaluate their deans and department chairs/school directors. Large-scale all-employee surveys have been conducted and are planned again for the near future. The annual performance review process allows individual employees to set goals and to formally address needs of individuals and individual units.

2P6: READJUSTING OBJECTIVES OR PROCESSES TO SUPPORT FACULTY AND STAFF NEEDS
The charge of the Academic Support Improvement Committee is to assure that Ohio University’s academic support services (administrative and co-curricular units) provide continuing value to the University community by ensuring that university-wide service level and cost allocation decisions are transparent, by aligning service activities with the institutions’ mission and vision and by working to meet unit objectives for achieving ongoing service effectiveness, efficiency and excellence. In addition, the ASIC stimulates proactive planning and achieves outcomes that support university strategic planning goals and RCM guidelines, creates efficiencies that can lead to new resources for priority investments and perpetuates a culture of continuous improvement and organizational renewal.

The Committee monitors metrics used by support services to ensure alignment with stakeholder interests and compliance with appropriate standards and adequate stewardship. As needed, the Committee directs improvement efforts of academic support service units. The Committee conducts and reviews both internal and external assessments as well as assessments from stakeholder/customer groups. Approximately one fourth of the academic support service units will be reviewed each year. The Academic Support Improvement Committee reports to the Executive Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Finance and Administration.

Results (R)

2R1: MEASURES COLLECTED AND ANALYZED REGULARLY
Measured related to some of the objectives discussed in 2P1 - 2P6 include graduation rates for athletes, the numbers of and variety of sponsored activity, students’ involvement in co-curricular events is monitored annually through OIR's Involvement Study, to name a few. Alden Library regularly assesses its services to stakeholders through the LibQual process, by addressing stakeholders' suggestions one-by-one, and by measuring usage of various its products and services. Ohio University has a two-year requirement for students to live on campus, and Residential Housing administers the EBI (Educational Benchmarking Inc.) survey every two years to measure climate, learning outcomes and satisfaction with the residence halls.

2R2: PERFORMANCE RESULTS IN ACCOMPLISHING OTHER DISTINCTIVE OBJECTIVES
Following are examples of results for measures mentioned in 2R1. Refer to 9R2 for summary tables of Ohio University's sponsored research activity. In compliance with the Student-Right-to-Know law, OIR compiles graduation rates of student athletes receiving institutional aid. The graduation rate for student-athletes recently increased to 68%, which is higher than the University-wide rate. The graduation and transfer-out rate is 88 percent.
Each year OIR conducts the Student Involvement Study, a survey of all freshmen on the Athens campus, and again four years later when they are seniors. Questions ask students to report on various dimensions of their academic and personal involvement on campus. One question in particular asks students to report their involvement in co-curricular activities, both the incidence of participation and the number of hours spent each week in each activity. The following table presents the most recent results, which combines five years of the most recent freshman and senior data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First-year</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recreation</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productions/Performances</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Life</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Clubs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Activities</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>141%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Activities</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Activities</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2R3: PERFORMANCE COMPARISON WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS
Since President McDavis assumed the presidency in 2004, Ohio University has committed to comparing itself to ten peer universities. The ten universities were updated in 2012-13. The updated study took into consideration available data from US News College Rankings Guides, IPEDS, and other sources, and asked the University's academic and academic support leadership to rank the importance of 72 data points in terms of their importance to the University's mission. The following variables were rated most important: graduation rate, average ACT score, freshman retention, freshmen in top 10% of high school class, freshman acceptance rate, and undergraduate and graduate FTE. Ten universities were selected whose data most closely matched Ohio University's, with several of them being selected because their scores were higher, or "aspirational." The president's expectation is that Ohio University would be able to improve its standing among these universities in the next few years by having those responsible learn what functional processes (i.e., what works well) exist.

The University's dashboard includes measures from the 4 x 4 strategic plan's supporting priorities. Comparative data with institutions in Ohio is included, where available. For example, among faculty compensation, Ohio University is slightly below the state average for professors but above the state average for associate and assistant professors.

2R4: RESULTS STRENGTHEN THE OVERALL INSTITUTION AND ENHANCE THE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE COMMUNITIES AND REGIONS SERVED
Providing services to the University's stakeholders and to its service communities strengthen Ohio University in many ways. Increasing opportunities for student involvement helps students succeed academically and personally. Increasing sponsored research and other sponsored activity helps advance knowledge for faculty and students while increasing Ohio
University's prominence throughout the state and nationally. Serving an increasingly diverse student body through an increasingly diverse delivery system of traditional, distance, and blended delivery enhances access to higher education throughout the state and nationally.

Partnerships are expanding with local and state governments and organizations through the work of Ohio University. For example, The Diabetes Institute works to serve patients and providers with clinical care and continuing education opportunities, respectively. The Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs provides support for start-up businesses which creates economic opportunities for citizens in the surrounding Appalachian region which is economically disadvantaged.

**Improvement (I)**

**2I1: RECENT IMPROVEMENTS IN THIS CATEGORY AND LEVEL OF SYSTEMATIC AND COMPREHENSIVE PROCESSES AND PERFORMANCE RESULTS**
Graduation rates for athletes have improved from below the University average to above the University average. The numbers of and variety of sponsored activity has increased. Students' involvement in co-curricular activities has sustained at high levels.

The implementation of responsibility centered management prompted the University to examine the services that academic support units, such as Information Technology, Human Resources, Finance, and Facilities Management, are providing the academic units. The Service Alignment Initiative has revealed service deficiencies in these areas, and plans are in place to streamline processes. A specific example from the Service Alignment Initiative is where the University combined functions of the Purchasing and Accounts Payable departments into the Procure to Pay function in 2012. Part of this realignment was the implementation of "Bobcat Buy," which initially was not received well by University users, even though the intent of the implementation was to improve efficiency. However, this unit continues to work on implementing many of the recommendations that came from the review report from the Huron consultants. Many of those recommendations were directly from University users, and Procure to Pay made it a priority to address those issues first. The Vice President for Finance and Administration publicly communicates about this scenario as an honest attempt to improve services that should have solicited user input before implementing, but has then gone back and corrected problems based on customer feedback in an evolving continuous improvement environment.

**2I2: CULTURE AND INFRASTRUCTURE HELP SELECT PROCESS AND IMPROVE TARGETS**
As a result of the Service Alignment Initiative, the University created a Project Portfolio Management Office. This office combined several functions across the institution that manages end-to-end project management, including implementation and training/communication needs. Resources were combined from Finance, Human Resources and the Office of Information Technology to create an office that:

- Initiates large scale university projects (like the Oracle Finance and HR System upgrades and enhancements);
- Assists academic support units in continuous improvement initiatives;
- Partners with the Academic Support Improvement Committee to ensure that feedback provided by academic units as it relates to the service offerings and performance, are actively incorporated into the daily service delivery of academic support units to ensure they are being responsive to customer needs and feedback.
As defined in its mission statement, Ohio University's students are its primary stakeholder group. Understanding their needs is based on information collected and analyzed at all stages of the student experience. From University-wide and college-specific environmental scans to individual programs' needs assessments, Ohio University continuously tries to understand its students' needs and adapt accordingly. Fostering student success by being a transformative learning community is Ohio University's primary mission. An enrollment management plan was devised to help frame the University's student enrollments, in order to recruit and retain students who most closely match our offerings. Bobcat Student Orientation has been redesigned to communicate realistic expectations to entering students early in their college experience. Learning communities have been developed and expanded to meet different student groups' needs and help them be more successful to graduation. Ohio University's retention and graduation rates are among the highest among public universities in Ohio, reflecting its commitment to retain and graduate students. An active and engaged co-curricular environment helps students develop personally as well as academically and helps them become responsible citizens through the "5 C's": community, character, civility, citizenship, and commitment. We judge the maturity level of the University's approach to this category as integrated.

Processes (P)

3P1: IDENTIFY THE CHANGING NEEDS OF STUDENT GROUPS AND SELECTING A COURSE OF ACTION REGARDING NEEDS

Addresses Core Component 4C.

Ohio University identifies its primary stakeholders in its mission and vision statements:

**Mission:** Ohio University holds as its central purpose the intellectual and personal development of its students. Distinguished by its rich history, diverse campus, international community, and beautiful Appalachian setting, Ohio University is known as well for its outstanding faculty of accomplished teachers whose research and creative activity advance knowledge across many disciplines.

**Vision:** Ohio University will be the nation's best, transformative learning community where: students realize their promise to an excellent education; faculty advance knowledge; staff strive to achieve excellence; and alumni become global leaders.

Ohio University exists primarily to serve its students, undergraduate, graduate, and professional. Needs of students are identified through well-established traditions and processes of providing student services. These processes occur at all levels of institutional life – individual programs or services, academic department/school, academic colleges, academic support units and institution-wide. Identification of student needs begins with the admissions process, continues during students' educational experiences, and extends past graduation when students become alumni. Ongoing interactions among students and faculty and staff provide a forum for continuous need assessment and enhancement of services.

Formal needs assessments occur through regularly-conducted assessments conducted by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), in partnership with other University units. First year experience studies done on a rotating three year cycle are the Cooperative Institutional Research Project (CIRP); National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE); and ACT Advising Survey). In addition, the ACT Class Profile and Student Involvement Surveys provide data on changing needs of students. Two Follow-Up Studies of Alumni--one year after graduation and five years after graduation--are done to identify students' needs once they graduate. OIR provides updates to the university community to inform them of new significant findings or changes in needs from these studies. The results from studies are made available via an open-access website. OIR provided the First-Year Council with substantial data about first year students so they could implement improvements in the experiences of first-year students. Student success research, particularly for first-year students, has been a priority for OIR for many years.
Stakeholders communicate their needs to others in the University through channels and systems established for that purpose. Student Senate, Graduate Student Senate, Faculty Senate, Administrative Senate, and Classified Senate all participate in University governance in a variety of ways. Each Senate communicates regularly and directly with respective University leaders through regularly-scheduled meetings. Two student and one faculty representatives, as well as a representative of the Alumni Board, sit on the University's Board of Trustees. All senates are represented on the University's primary planning decision body, the Budget Planning Council.

Regular program reviews are designed to incorporate stakeholders’ needs assessments. Individual programs, services and departments routinely assess the needs of students and evaluate the quality of their unit’s programs delivery or services to students.

With regard to Core Component 4.C, the institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs. The following is intended to provide evidence germane to this criterion. As part of its strategic planning efforts, the university established a strategic enrollment plan. This plan includes a section on ambitious and attainable retention goals for the Athens campus, which has a selective admissions policy:

**4.7 Retention Goals at the Athens Campus**

Ohio University's retention rate is already above 80%, which means a significant level of effort will be necessary both to maintain that rate and ideally increase it. Current freshmen to sophomore retention projections for Fall 2010 are on a downward trajectory by approximately 0.5% after increasing by 3% over the past three years. This trend must be reversed if the university is to achieve its overall enrollment goals and realize its vision of being a truly transformative institution, but it will require a focused effort and continued investment in human and material resources. Because of initiatives such as the First Year Forum, the Student Success Network, Learning Communities, and the increased quality of first year student enrollments, Ohio University has been able to make progress on this metric over the past few years. These kinds of targeted, strategic efforts and resources specifically tailored to improving retention are responsible for our current success but will need to be maintained and strengthened if we hope to see our retention rate increase by 0.5% each year.

In terms of completion, the numbers of degrees granted and the cohort-based graduation rates are considered extensions of the retention goals and are profiled in the University's dashboard and included in OIR's Web site, which is accessible to the University community. A portion of the data regarding retention and graduation rates is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Cohort Number</th>
<th>Retention Rates</th>
<th>Graduation Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 2 year (Freshman)</td>
<td>2 - 3 year (Sophomore)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,165</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,985</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4,072</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,883</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows that the University considers persistence an ongoing year-to-year phenomenon rather than just first-year retention. However, the preceding table shows that attrition occurs most frequently in the first year and, for this reason, first-year experience programs focus on this crucial stage of student development. OIR produces annual updates to these data and other information on retention, persistence, and completion. Breakdowns in the data are completed and given to each academic program and each of the five regional campuses. In compliance with the Student Right to Know law, graduation rates are made available to prospective and current students on the University's Web site. OIR conducts regular and ad hoc studies on factors associated with attrition and retention, using data from the student registration system and data from its ongoing student assessment surveys.

Various units across the University make use of these data and studies to make improvements in their programs. The strongest example of this use is the First Year Experience Council, which compiled a list of action items necessary to improve first-year success and persistence. The following represent implemented action items:

1. Appoint an Assistant Dean focused on First Year Student Success and Persistence
2. Draft academic advising statement and incorporate it within key university documents
3. Draft FYE Philosophy Statement and incorporate it within key university documents.
4. Define the term "At Risk" as regards student retention and develop targeted programs.
5. Implement an FYE Assessment Plan
6. Develop Academic Honesty Program
7. Enhance the advising tools available within the new student information system
8. Increase number of Learning Communities, which includes the number of first year seminars
9. Continue to implement the new strategy to reduce high risk drinking
10. Expand Attrition Intervention Programs
11. Redefine the Common Reading Program as a theme-based Common Experience Project
12. Support the Majors Fair with base funding
13. Enhance coordination of communication to admitted & matriculating students & families
14. Incorporate Learning Goals and Outcomes on Tier 1 and Tier 2 Course Syllabi
15. Develop a central point of contact to respond to parent/family issues
16. Identify First Generation Students
17. Incorporate First Year program funding into base budgets
18. Ensure the new SIS system can create a “Student Success Profile” on each student
19. Distribute “The OU Experience,” a comprehensive academic guide, at Bobcat Student Orientation

Furthermore, in 2012-13, the Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) changed the funding of its public universities from student course enrollments to student course enrollments and completions. Another change was that 50 percent of instructional subsidy has to be allocated based on degree completion. These changes were made as a result of national and state interest in degree completion. Ohio University’s relatively high retention and graduation rates in the state have enabled it to regain nearly $10 million in lost state subsidy earnings.

3P2: BUILDING AND MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS

Relationships are built and maintained with students in many ways, in many places, and by many different individuals and groups over time. High school students are first exposed to Ohio University through special programs and activities hosted by the university, as early as their sophomore year. During the summer, many camps and conferences are held, and these often give children/youth a first look at the campus. The Admissions Office cultivates initial student interest in Ohio University and builds relationships with prospective students via high school visitations and individualized written and interpersonal contact, publications, website, and media exposure (paid and free). Additional relationship building occurs through viewing day visitation programs hosted throughout the year and through focused yield programs once students apply and are admitted.
The day-and-a-half long Bobcat Student Orientation (and other targeted orientation programs for minority, relocating, transfer, and international students) provides a significant opportunity for relationship building during the summer or semester prior to students’ matriculation. These activities expose students to key personnel, offices, programs, and resources within the university community including faculty and peers in addition to creating opportunities to bolster students’ relationship with the university.

Once a student matriculates at the university, relationships are further developed through:

- Participation in Welcome Weekend, which includes meeting the dean and faculty from their respective colleges and a First Year Convocation hosted by the President
- Engagement in the curriculum (attending class, meeting faculty, advising sessions with faculty, undergraduate research, working with advisors)
- Interaction with a comprehensive peer education network that spans Residence Life, the learning communities, leadership of student organizations, etc.
- A residential program with a high ratio of staff to students that requires all first- and second-year students to live on campus (for Athens campus students)
- Delivery of services (career, counseling, health, registration, financial aid, housing)
- Participation in campus life (attending events, using recreation facilities, volunteering, working)
- Membership in a structured program or activity (peer staff, athletics, club sports, student organizations, Greek life, learning communities, advisory groups, student government)
- News and messages delivered via campus media (newspaper, radio, television, social media)
- Social and academic relationships with peers (structured via class, project or organizational membership or unstructured via social).
- Experience of the physical environment and campus culture (living, studying locations)

Many of these relationship-building programs evaluate their own efficacy and make programmatic adjustments based on results. For example, Bobcat Student Orientation, which conducts annual evaluations, discovered that transfer students were dissatisfied with a specific session. In 2013 that session was modified to include a transfer student panel, which allowed transfer students to tweet in questions regarding their transition or questions about campus and receive advice from students who have successfully transitioned to Ohio University.

One of the most successful examples of Ohio University’s commitment to build strong relationship with its students is the Learning Communities program. Learning Communities (LCs) for first-year students began at Ohio University in Fall 1999, with a pilot implemented in four first-year residence halls. Through a series of internal funding awards, LC’s grew steadily from serving 40 students in 1999 to 3300 students in fall 2013. Beginning fall 2007, University College required all undecided students to enroll in a learning community. The LC program has five objectives:

- Create learning-based peer networks
- Improve the academic success of first-year students
- Improve student retention from the freshman to sophomore year
- Increase student satisfaction with Ohio University
- Increase student-faculty interaction outside the classroom

The objectives are met through the following programmatic elements:

- Students are enrolled in two to four thematically linked courses, including a learning community seminar, in the Fall Semester. The courses, with the exception of the seminar, count toward students’ general education requirements or major requirements.
In some LCs, students live in a shared living environment for a common residential experience.

An administrator or faculty member from the college teaches the introductory course.

Students participate in out-of-class activities, in most instances organized by a peer mentor, which include involvement of faculty members from the linked courses.

All University College learning community seminars are taught by an instructor who also serves as the students’ academic advisor; approximately 25% of all first-year students begin in University College.

Positive results have been found through studying retention and grade point averages of LC participants/nonparticipants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Retention Rate %</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>81/80</td>
<td>3.00/2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>82/80</td>
<td>2.98/2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>81/81</td>
<td>2.87/2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>81/77</td>
<td>2.88/2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>80/79</td>
<td>2.89/2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning communities at Ohio University are a collaborative effort among University College, the Office of Admissions, the Office of the Registrar, Institutional Research, the Office of Information Technology, the Division of Student Affairs, the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business, the College of Communication, the College of Education, the College of Engineering and Technology, the College of Fine Arts, and the College of Health Sciences and Professions.

3P3: IDENTIFYING CHANGING NEEDS OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND SELECTING COURSE OF ACTION

Addresses Core Component 1D.

Ohio University is a public state university governed by an independent board of trustees who are appointed to nine-year terms by the governor of the state of Ohio. Ohio University receives public funds distributed to public colleges and universities by the Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR), a coordinating board led by the Chancellor of the Board of Regents and the University System of Ohio. As a public university, Ohio University responds to public education needs as directed by state education policy through OBOR. The University reports data to OBOR on student enrollments, graduation rates, degrees granted, facilities, finances, financial aid, and academic programs. Approval for new academic programs must be granted by OBOR. Approximately one-third of Ohio University's general operating revenues are allocated by OBOR, based on student enrollment, course completions, and degree completions.

The division of Student Affairs works to impart this public mission of responsible citizenship to its students through the "5 C's" of Community, Character, Civility, Citizenship, and Commitment, all of which are tied to specific student expectations. For example, Community refers to the expectation that all students embody the values of the OHIO community by acting responsibly and showing appreciation for diversity in all of its forms.

Ohio University proactively seeks information on the changing needs of its stakeholders. An understanding of changing needs is gained through the following methods:

- Assessments conducted by OIR, such as the Student Treatment/Satisfaction Study, Student Involvement Study, the two follow-up studies of alumni, faculty and staff salary and productivity
- Organizational structure and function defined in ways that facilitate ongoing communication about students' needs (Assistant Deans meetings, Student Success Network, Student Affairs Assessment Committee, Strategic Enrollment Management Committee, each of which can make recommendations to the University administration)
- Academic Program Review and Academic Support Unit Program Review
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- Input from campus and college advisory boards
- Participation in formal advisory activities (many offices have Advisory Committees, for example, Learning Community Programs, the Allen Student Help Center, and the Academic Advancement Center)
- Daily monitoring of national and state trends, such as high school demographic trends
- Individual units’ strategic plans (e.g., Student Affairs, University Libraries)
- University-community advisory committees
- University-wide and college-specific environmental scans.

The University leadership (President, Executive Vice President and Provost (EVPP), Vice Presidents, and Deans) monitor these information sources and select action according to the recommendations and plans that they advance. Formal presentations of these recommendations and plans are made several times per year to the University's Board of Trustees.

The EVPP uses the following entities to monitor the quality of student services:

- First Year Experience Program, including orientation, learning communities, peer mentoring, seminars, Common Experience Project, and Majors Fair
- Academic Advancement Center
- Allen Student Help Center
- University Undergraduate Advising Council
- Academic support for veterans and commuters
- First Year Council
- Student Organizations
- Multicultural Student Expo, Black History Month, Women’s History Month
- Undergraduate Research Fair
- Student Accessibility Services

3P4: BUILD AND MAINTAIN RELATIONSHIPS WITH KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Relationships are built and maintained with stakeholders in a number of ways. University officials are assigned responsibility for developing and maintaining relationships with specific stakeholder groups and, through these relationships, maintain an ongoing understanding of emerging needs. Responsibilities in this vein vary widely in the degree to which they are centralized, and many of the relationships are maintained simultaneously via different units and modes. For example, the Career and Leadership Development Center maintains relationships with employers of students in a centralized fashion, while individual academic colleges/departments/schools and regional campuses maintain relationships with employers of students drawn from their disciplines or geographic areas. Internship coordinators within academic units maintain relationships with entities that host interns which are often also employers. University Communication and Marketing is the central unit charged with internal and external communication. "Compass" is the internal University electronic newsletter distributed to stakeholders at least semi-weekly. It contains University news and information designed to reach out to students, faculty and staff and to keep them informed about events, changes, and essential information. "Perspectives" is a semi-annual publication produced by Office of the Vice President for Research that describes the scholarly and creative activities of Ohio University's faculty and staff.

Alumni Relations maintains relationships with alumni who are often employers, and Advancement maintains relationships with donors who may also be employers. Academic colleges and campuses develop relationships through advisory boards, internship programs and other activities. Most academic colleges and some administrative support units have communication officers, whose job it is to communicate relevant information to internal and external audiences.

3P5: DETERMINING NEW STUDENT AND STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

Addresses Core Component 1D.

In 2010, the Executive Vice President and Provost commissioned a formal environmental scan for the University as a whole and for each of its 28 planning units. These environmental scans were the beginning of the next phase of strategic planning following Vision Ohio.
The purpose of the university scan, and the academic and academic support unit plans done concurrently, was to help University leaders identify strategic opportunities to guide budgeting and resource allocation in the near future. The scans are to be updated regularly.

3P6: COMPLAINT PROCESS, ANALYSIS, AND RESOLUTION COMMUNICATION
The responsibility for handling complaints from students and other stakeholders rests with the University Ombudsman. The Ombudsman serves as a university-wide resource by assisting community members with issues internal to Ohio University and by providing a proactive voice regarding issues that are arising throughout its various campuses. The Office of the Ombudsman is a confidential service open to all students, employees, alumni, parents and community members at Ohio University. The overarching mission of the Office of the Ombudsman is twofold: to ensure that every member of the university community receives equitable and fair treatment and due process; and to support and facilitate a positive working and learning environment. The Office of the Ombudsman prepares an annual report that documents and classifies issues brought to its attention.

In meeting the Department of Education regulations, eLearning OHIO has created a complaint website, http://www.ohio.edu/ecampus/about/complaint.htm, which is accessible from the bottom of every eLearning Web page. The site also lists the states in which Ohio University is authorized to offer online programs.

The University has established a Whistle-Blowing and Retaliation Policy, which lists internal avenues for directing complaints:
- Reports on alleged misconduct toward employees and students that is harassing or discriminatory in nature can be made to the Office of Institutional Equity.
- Complaints on any matter that alleges a violation of federal law, state law, governmental regulations, or Ohio University Policy can be made to the Office of Legal Affairs.
- Reports or complaints about inappropriate workplace behavior, work conduct, or violence related to the workplace can be made to Human Resources.
• Complaints about fiscal matters, fraud, conflict of interest, or other concerns about the mismanagement of University resources can be made to the Office of Internal Audit.
• Allegations of criminal conduct that occurs within the geographic jurisdiction of Ohio University should be made to the Ohio University Police Department.
• Complaints about student-to-student misconduct or alleged violations of the Student Code of Conduct should be made to University Judiciaries.
• Ethics Point is an anonymous, free, 24 hour, 365 day a year electronic and phone reporting service. Ethics Point will accept complaints and reports of misuse, mismanagement, mistreatment, or conflict of interest concerning any matter related to or affecting the administration of Ohio University and treatment of its assets, resources, or people.

In addition, the Dean of Students has established a Student Review & Consultation Committee, the purpose of which is to "to ensure a timely and coordinated university response to students whose behavior is disruptive to others around the student by way of raising alarm, fear or other concern, or reflects a credible potential for harm to self or others."

Faculty and staff have outlined processes through Faculty Senate, Administrative Senate, and Classified Senate for filing grievances, as do the unionized employee groups (FOP and AFSCME).

Results (R)

3R1: DETERMINE THE SATISFACTION OF STUDENTS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS/MEASURES OF SATISFACTION COLLECTED AND ANALYZED REGULARLY
Student and other stakeholder satisfaction are determined by a variety of means. All of the mechanisms described above that seek to maintain relationships with stakeholders also serve as vehicles for assessing satisfaction. Student satisfaction is assessed directly via:
• Course evaluations (provided on each course taken each quarter, in a form developed and administered by academic units)
• All academic units go through a comprehensive self-study and review every seven years; student assessment results are now included in this process.
• All academic support go through a review process every four years, in which stakeholder satisfaction is a component.
• OIR's Career and Further Education Study is based on data collected from alumni one year after graduation and includes items that assess satisfaction with Ohio University.
• OIR's Survey of Alumni is based on data collected from alumni five years after graduation and includes items that assess satisfaction with Ohio University.
• OIR's Student Involvement Study is the core survey that supports a series of related studies that evaluate student involvement on campus and students’ satisfaction with their involvement. In addition to an annual survey, reports are developed on changes over time and changes within given cohorts of students.
• National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is a national study that tracks student engagement and includes items that assess student satisfaction.
• OIR's First-Year Student Satisfaction (Treatment) Study is a survey of Athens campus first-year students that assesses student perceptions of treatment by University personnel, information, and services.
• OIR's Survey of Leavers is a survey of freshmen who left the University.
• OIR's retention and graduation rate studies present analyses on student characteristics and academic performance that correlate with retention and completion.
Individual programs and units assess satisfaction—Libraries, Learning Community Programs, Academic Advancement Center, Bobcat Student Orientation, Allen Student Help Center, et al.

3R2: STUDENT SATISFACTION

Responses to 6R2 address this question. The First-Year Student Satisfaction Study was developed to assess students' perceptions of treatment by University personnel. Students rated how they felt they were treated by people, the quality of the information they received, and the quality of service they received. The following units are rated:

- Academic Advising
- Admissions
- Baker Center Information Desk
- Bursar
- Campus Care
- Campus Recreation
- Counseling & Psychological Services
- Diversity
- Faculty
- Financial Aid
- Getting Help
- Libraries
- Registrar
- Residential Housing
- Student Experiences & Involvement
- Breakdowns on faculty and advising for each academic college

Typically, each unit received 60 to 70 percent extremely high (e.g., very helpful) ratings, and only five to 10 percent negative (e.g., very or somewhat unhelpful) ratings. Individual students' comments are shared anonymously with each unit. Oftentimes, complaints or areas for improvement are recorded along with the negative ratings. These comments are shared with the "front desk" staff and reveal positive and negative student reactions, which lead to identification of poor treatment and opportunities for improvement.

The Student Involvement Study asks many questions related to building relationships. Freshmen and seniors were asked to rate how important each of the following relationship items was to them and then to rate how satisfied they were with them. The 2012 results in the table below present the percentages of students indicating "very" or "somewhat" important and "very" or "somewhat" satisfied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Item</th>
<th>Freshman % Important</th>
<th>Senior % Important</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Personal Relationships with Peers at OU</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Close Friends at Ohio University</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with International Students</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with People of Different Races</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Availability Outside of Class</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Contacts with Faculty</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3R3: RESULTS IN BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS
Ohio University strives to build relationships with its students that help them develop intellectually and personally. Among the units attempting to reach out to students are Bobcat Student Orientation/Allen Student Help Center, Learning Community Programs, Academic Advancement Center, and Student Affairs (which includes Residential Housing.) Following are examples from these units that show their performance results in building relationships with students.

Each year, students and parents evaluate their Bobcat Student Orientation (BSO) experience. Approximately 2,600 students and 500 parents completed the evaluations in 2013.

- 93% of first year students felt that BSO prepared them to get involved on campus.
- 91% of first year students felt that BSO helped them understand their major academic requirements.
- 89% of transfer students felt that BSO prepared them to locate helpful academic resources.

Learning Communities tracks program performance in a variety of ways. In 3P2, retention rates and GPA's are tracked, with comparisons made between participants and non-participants. Participation in different learning-community-related programs is tracked. Learning community participants have evaluated their experience through an extensive questionnaire that has been administered since 2009. Following are some highlighted responses from fall 2012:

- 93% indicated their peer mentor was responsive or very responsive to questions and concerns
- 96% agreed their LC instructor demonstrated enthusiasm for working with new students
- 93% agreed the LC increased their knowledge of resources on campus for getting involved
- 92% agreed the LC course provided information regarding academic expectations at OU

In addition, participants rated their most valuable experiences from the learning communities:

- Meeting new people and making friends (80%)
- Small class size (74%)
- In-class discussions (61%)
- Studying for other classes with my classmates (51%)

The Academic Advancement Center uses numerous performance indicators. Following is a selected list:

- Supplemental Instruction (SI) weekly reports on attendance
- Courses: pre/post tests and student evaluations are reviewed each term.
- Student evaluation surveys for all services
- College Advancement Program (CAP) external evaluator conducts student focus groups every other year and meets with the CAP director to review term and annual reports.
- Institutional Research prepares reports on student retention, college GPA of students using services. For example, students utilizing SI have a fall to fall retention rate of 86% compared to non-participants at 78%. Their adjusted GPA after their first year is 2.78 compared to 2.79
- CAP develops a comparison groups for each year’s CAP first year cohort. Retention and graduation is tracked for this comparison group.
- The CAP director prepares an annual report for the U.S. Dept of Education. This 2012 report tracks retention, graduation, and performance of the active and prior year still enrolled students.

Student Affairs programs track their relationships with students in a variety of ways. Since the formation of the Campus Involvement Center there has been a total increase of student organizations of 24% to 426. The Greek Life program provides inclusive opportunities for co-curricular involvement. The Greek community is comprised of 1756 students, which is approximately 10% of the undergraduate student body. Off-Campus Housing's Community Assistants (16 undergraduate and graduate students) conduct bi-weekly door-to-door visits to interact with off campus students and full time Athens residents. Approximately 900 – 1500 houses are reached during each bi-weekly outreach. Involvement Study data from 2012 reveals 65% of first year students are engaged in campus recreation and intramural athletics and 71% of
senior students participate regularly in Campus Recreation activities. Club sports is made up of 35 active student-run organizations which involve as many as 1,100 student-athletes and numerous spectators participating in as many as 350 intercollegiate athletic contests or demonstrations annually.

Residential Housing uses a number of assessments to track its performance. In particular, every two years it uses the EBI Housing Assessment instrument. In spring 2013, Residential Housing sent the survey to all students living on campus, and 50 percent responded. The instrument assesses 19 different housing factors on a 7-point scale (7=very satisfied). The following summary table shows Ohio University's factor mean scores, compared to the mean scores for six participating university peers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OU Mean</th>
<th>Peer Mean</th>
<th>OU Mean</th>
<th>Peer Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Staff</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room/Floor Environment</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Diverse Interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Overall Resident Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3R4: RESULTS FOR STAKEHOLDER SATISFACTION
Results for student satisfaction are described in 3R2 and 3R3. OIR regularly conducts two follow-up studies of Ohio University graduates. The Survey of Alumni is designed to collect information on Ohio University bachelor's degree graduates about five years after graduation. Summary tables containing results from the current and preceding six years of results are made available for the university as a whole, for each academic college, and for each department within its college. The Career and Further Education Study is designed to collect information on Ohio University graduates about one year after graduation. Summary tables are presented containing results from the current and preceding six years of results for the university as a whole, for each academic college, and for each academic department within its college. Most tables present results from undergraduate respondents, though graduate level results are presented for colleges and departments where appropriate.

In the 2011 Survey of Alumni, graduates were asked to rate their undergraduate major program (extremely satisfied, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not at all satisfied). Following is the most recent response to these satisfaction questions. The table shows the percent respondents reporting they were extremely or very satisfied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL SATISFACTION</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANCE TO CAREER GOALS</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF RIGOR &amp; SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTION WITH FACULTY</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEXIBILITY/ADAPTABILITY TO STUDENT NEEDS</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADVISING AND GUIDANCE</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER PLANNING/PLACEMENT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2012 Career and Further Education Study, graduates are asked to rate their satisfaction with four different areas, using the same scale as in the Survey of Alumni. In the following table, the most recent results are presented, showing the percent respondents reporting they were extremely or very satisfied:
3R5: RESULTS FOR BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAKEHOLDERS

Results for relationship building with other key stakeholders are reflected in their satisfaction as described in 3R3 and 3R4. In addition, Ohio University has long desired to improve its relationship with its new freshmen. Part of this process is to design intervention strategies around potential leavers. For nearly three decades, the University has carried out the Student Involvement Study. The First-Year Student Involvement Study, first done spring quarter 1979, is conducted annually by the offices of Institutional Research, Residential Housing, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Dean of Students and the Allen Student Help Center. Starting in 1983, these offices devised and carried out a plan to identify and intervene with students who had over a 2.00 GPA who were identified in the Involvement Study as potential leavers. Every year since 1983, all first-year students living in residence halls were given the First-Year Involvement Questionnaire to complete. From the students who responded, individuals who were predicted to be potential leavers were identified. They were identified from their responses to questions related to their commitment to continue their education at Ohio University and their reported levels of academic and social involvement. In 2012, Residential Housing staff and Allen Student Help Center staff carried out the interventions. During the intervention, the students' intentions to stay or leave were recorded. More students returned than statistically expected, and fewer students left than statistically expected.

In addition, OIR conducts a survey of students who actually left the University during or after their freshman year. Freshmen who did not return were surveyed on their reasons for not returning to Ohio University. Among the most frequent reasons given were personal reasons, personal adjustment to college problems, and cost or financial aid issues. As a result of these (and other) findings, the Allen Student Help Center helps students resolve the first two problems. Financial Aid is attempting to direct institutional scholarship programs to better assist financially needy students.

3R6: COMPARATIVE RESULTS FOR UNDERSTANDING STUDENTS' AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS' NEEDS

Ohio University has been a participant in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) since 2008. VSA was designed to enable parents and prospective students to easily compare public universities they may be interested in attending. Ohio University competes most frequently with Bowling Green State University, Kent State University, Miami University, and Ohio State University for freshman applications. VSA includes measures on satisfaction with the student experience and student progress, among others. Following is a summary table showing the most recent senior student responses to three NSSE satisfaction questions, and retention and graduation rates for these competing universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSSE Satisfaction Questions:</th>
<th>Ohio University</th>
<th>Bowling Green State University</th>
<th>Kent State University</th>
<th>Ohio State University</th>
<th>Miami University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would attend this institution if they started over again</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire educational experience is good or excellent</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other students were friendly or supportive</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention and Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
<th>6-Year Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio University's NSSE satisfaction ratings are higher than most of its competitors' ratings. Ohio University's retention and graduation rates are in the middle of the highest two and lowest two universities' rates.

**Improvement (I)**

**3I1: RECENT IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CATEGORY**

Improvements result from ongoing assessment of students' needs as described in 3R1 through 3R6. They also result from ongoing communication among stakeholder groups—senates, committees, task forces, academic leadership, and executive leadership. Large issues are identified and discussed daily by University stakeholder groups, and areas for improvement are implemented as a result. An example of this would be the First Year Council. Recognizing that the University needed to focus more on student success, and in particular improve retention and graduation, the Council recently was created to help first-year students succeed academically and socially, and make a smooth transition to university life.

The regional campuses respond to the changing needs of their students. Improvements in advising were identified as needed, because adult and commuting students need more proactive, intrusive advising. Faculty and staff are working to help students identify campus resources such as tutoring and supplemental instruction before the students become academically overwhelmed. Currently, two campuses participate in the mid-term grade report, early alert system. By spring 2014, it is expected that all five campuses will be utilizing this program. The Chillicothe campus now supports a faculty-led learning community which provides instructional support to faculty for the design of quality blended and online courses to meet the changing needs of these students.

Specific improvements have been made in Bobcat Student Orientation (BSO) based on monitoring assessment results. Beginning in 2013, BSO partnered with the Career and Leadership Development Center (CLDC) to provide involvement information and opportunities at orientation. The CLDC was able to showcase their leadership series and career coaching at check-in and also discuss the importance of campus involvement during the Expectations and Opportunities session. During transfer student orientation, transfer students were able to “tweet” in their questions and a panel of 4 current transfer students were able to share their experiences and tips for success. BSO instituted a “Pre-BSO” check list and a “Pre-BSO” survey. These two items helped BSO office monitor how well students had prepared for their orientation visit. The BSO calendar change to June in 2014 will allow incoming students to build a greater affinity with Ohio University and provide a more natural transition between high school and college. Transfer Student Orientation will increase to a day and a half long program to allow for more academic support, social programming and individual advising appointments.

**3I2: CULTURE AND INFRASTRUCTURE SELECTING TARGETS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The issues identified are discussed across campus through the constituent organizations in open meetings and through campus wide meetings or forums. In many cases, committees or task forces may be formed to study the issues in greater detail to make recommendations to address the issue/problem, and to report back to the constituent organizations and the executive leadership of the institution.

Ohio University's units whose responsibility is primarily to foster relationships with students that promote their academic and personal development have continuous improvement ingrained in their culture and infrastructure. The Libraries, Academic Advancement Center, Learning Community Programs, Bobcat Student Orientation/Allen Student Help Center, Student Affairs departments, University College, Regional Higher Education all focus on student needs by collecting and analyzing assessment and evaluation data. They recognize that their mission is to improve student success, and while these units serve the entire University, they provide examples to the other academic and academic support units at Ohio University.
AQIP CATEGORY 4: VALUING PEOPLE
Ohio University is the largest employer in southeast Ohio with nearly 5,000 faculty, administrative staff, and classified staff. Well-established rules, policies, and procedures are in place to help employees function efficiently and effectively. Hiring, evaluation, disciplinary, and grievance procedures are well documented and readily accessible to all faculty and staff. The University's benefits are comparatively generous and include employee and dependent tuition waivers. Within the University's Strategic Plan is a commitment to recruit and retain excellent employees through total compensation. All academic support positions are being reclassified to assess their comparability and competitiveness within the job marketplace. A Faculty Compensation Task Force is developing plans to address full-time faculty compensation, to keep it competitive with the University's peers. Employee appreciation days and the addition of extra holiday days off recently have been added to increase employee morale. Employee satisfaction surveys have not been done recently but are planned for the near future. We judge the maturity level of the University's approach to this category as aligned.

Processes (P)

4P1: IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC CREDENTIALS, SKILLS, AND VALUES REQUIRED FOR FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATORS
Ohio University is committed to hiring the most-qualified faculty and staff available. Rigorous standards for faculty qualifications and experience are established by incumbent faculty in each academic unit and are consistent with prevailing academic standards. Rigorous standards for staff qualifications are set by each academic support unit and are consistent with prevailing professional standards from student personnel and student services organizations, where appropriate. Guidelines for awarding of faculty status are set forth in Ohio University's Faculty Handbook. Rules governing the tenure process, academic rank, and type of contract are well-defined and followed by all University academic units. Specific credentials and skills desired for faculty positions are determined by their respective academic departments. Credentials and skills desired for faculty and administrative support positions are identified by the hiring department and documented through Position Description Questionnaires that define specific positions. Skills and credentials for classified positions are identified by the hiring department and documented through Job Information Questionnaires that define job functions required for specific positions.

The EVPP uses the following management processes and tools to monitor the quality of faculty and staff:

- Faculty Senate Executive Committee meetings
- Tenure and Promotion policy and process
- College staffing plans and workload policies
- Deans’ evaluations and hiring/searches
- Employment Policies (Leaves, Early Retirement, etc)
- Faculty Development / Faculty Commons
- Faculty Teaching and Research Awards
- Training on Title IX, discrimination, harassment and disabilities
- Workplace support for persons with disabilities
- Diversity and Inclusion – Summer Institute & Opportunity Hires

In addition, key co-curricular units—University Libraries, WOUB, WellWorks, and the Kennedy Museum—are members of national organizations or accrediting bodies that recommend specific skill sets as well as educational accomplishments for those administrators and staff.

4P2: HIRING PROCESSES ENSURE THAT EMPLOYEES POSSESS THE CREDENTIALS, SKILLS, AND VALUES REQUIRED
Addresses Core Component 3C.

Hiring departments define the job descriptions as well as minimum and preferred skills and credentials. The University’s PeopleAdmin system automatically screens applicants who do not meet those minimum requirements. Thereafter, the selection of candidates for further consideration is obtained through interviews or skills demonstration, following guidance provided by University Human Resources and review by the Office of Institutional Equity for Affirmative
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Action and Equal Opportunity. Search committees of representative faculty and staff are used for faculty and for administrative searches. In some cases, search firms are employed to solicit interest and applications from qualified applicants. Criminal background checks of candidates for many positions occur prior to a final offer to insure accuracy of credentials.

In April 2012, Ohio University began the first phase of a two-year compensation project covering classified non-bargaining employees and administrative/professional employees on all campuses. This project, called COMPENSATION 2014, entails a review of current job classifications, the development of new pay plans, and the creation of effective performance management strategies. Participation in this project will help the University develop exceptional compensation and performance management programs that will attract, motivate, and retain talented employees.

The following two tables present snapshots of Ohio University's employee headcounts. The first table shows a breakdown of faculty, administrators, and classified staff. The second table shows a breakdown of faculty by faculty type.

### Ohio University Employee Headcount 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>FT Faculty</th>
<th>PT Faculty</th>
<th>FT Admin</th>
<th>PT Admin</th>
<th>FT Classified</th>
<th>PT Classified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chillicothe</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanesville</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,056</strong></td>
<td><strong>900</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,238</strong></td>
<td><strong>476</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,038</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,786</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ohio University Total Faculty Headcount by Type 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Athens</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time: Tenure Track</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time: Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time: Visiting Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time: Tenure Track</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time: Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time: Adjunct</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time: Visiting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time: Early Retired</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1,956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4P3: RECRUIT, HIRE, AND RETAIN EMPLOYEES

All position openings—faculty, administrative, and classified—are posted on the Human Resources’ Web site. Faculty positions are advertised nationally in relevant professional journals and Web sites, and advertisements in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Announcement letters for faculty openings are sent to the membership of relevant organizations and to academic departments across the country. The Office of Institutional Equity’s hiring guidelines provide guidance.
Regarding the search process. Administrative positions are advertised nationally, with advertisements and announcements in appropriate newsletters, Web sites and professional journals. Most classified positions are advertised locally or regionally in newspapers and Web sites, depending on the qualifications sought.

Retention efforts of employees occur through orientation, continuing communication and involvement opportunities, training and professional development activities, performance management and review processes, mentoring, and compensation plans that strive for recognition of meritorious performance. In 2012-13, the University instituted two programs to improve employee morale by increasing workplace flexibility. First, summer hours, previously practiced about a decade ago, were reinstituted. On a typical 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. schedule, employees could adjust their schedule up to an hour earlier or later in the day with additional lunch time adjustments. Second, winter holiday days were added to employees' paid time off. Beginning in December 2012, the University closed operations on the days between Christmas and New Years Day, and employees were given three additional paid holidays. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) tracks retention of tenure-track faculty (see 4R2).

The University offers generous educational benefits for staff including free tuition for dependent children. An Employee Appreciation Committee, formed in 2012-13, made recommendations to the executive leadership to organize existing and new events that demonstrate the University's appreciation of employees' efforts. Other recent efforts toward retention include increased dollar limits for employee recognition awards; proactive employee assistance program; and free membership to the University’s health club (WellWorks) after 100 visits.

4P4: ORIENTATION OF ALL EMPLOYEES TO OHIO’S HISTORY, MISSION, AND VALUES
We strive to provide information that will help the employee become an engaged member of our university community. Most new faculty attend the New Faculty Orientation and Workshop sponsored by the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). That full-day session covers many Athens campus issues including history, an overview of the incoming freshman class, and student life. The New Faculty Mini-Guide helps orient new colleagues on important topics such as the Faculty Senate, course policy, Ohio University Libraries, academic technologies, and advising. The CTL also offers a full-day orientation program for new graduate teaching assistants. In addition, University Human Resources conducts a New Employee Orientation Program to provide information regarding individual benefit opportunities; policies, compliance, and expectations; and the structure, history and mission of the University. Some information is available to the new employee on the Internet once the acceptance of employment occurs with remaining orientation occurring in Human Resources and in the hiring department. Depending on the size of the academic or administrative unit, department-specific orientation programs may occur, along with formal or informal mentoring.

4P5: PLAN FOR CHANGES IN PERSONNEL
Vacant positions are reviewed for need and consistency with the organizational priorities by the individual academic or academic support department, the academic college/planning unit, and the Executive Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Finance and Administration. If approved for filling, the process is described in 4P2. Reorganization of units and departments occurs when the operational or academic needs require an adjustment of structure and personnel. In 2011, a major reorganization of academic departments among the colleges of Business, Fine Arts, Education, and Health Sciences and Professions occurred with the goals of better academic alignment, efficiency, and synergy. OIR tracks numbers of faculty, administrators, and classified staff eligible to retire, according to Ohio's retirement system guidelines. This information is available to University leaders to help plan for impending retirements and to provide information to the retention of faculty in each academic college.
4P6: DESIGN WORK PROCESSES AND ACTIVITIES WHICH CONTRIBUTE BOTH TO ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY AND EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

Employees have the opportunity to participate in University standing and ad hoc committees, taskforces and constituency-based shared governance senates. Sharing and solicitation of information is expected at all levels of the organization. Staff meetings, open forums, web-based newsletters of University activities, such as Compass, provide recognition of employee achievements, and opportunities for organizational productivity and inclusion. Processes and products are evaluated periodically to measure effectiveness and consistency with best practices through professional affiliations, internal peer review such as the Academic Support Unit Program Review Process (6P1), and comparisons with peer institutions.

Ohio University began implementing Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) and Budgeting as of July 1, 2013 with the first RCM budget approved by the Board of Trustees for fiscal year 2014. An important lesson learned from other RCM-implemented institutions was the failure to address services provided by the academic support units. An unintended consequence of RCM was the growth of administrative costs within the colleges to address support services in the areas of Information Technology, Facilities, Finance and Human Resources. Many RCM institutions found that the lack of effective central services required academic units to build their own in order to succeed. As a result, Ohio University leadership authorized the development of the Ohio Service Alignment Initiative (OSAI), which will work over the next several years, to complete an updated and modernized information systems for HR, Finance, Facilities and Information Technology, which will include extensive business policy and process redesign in each area.

A new HR Liaison program was created in Human Resources to provide an individual contact to the academic college. The goal is to move an HR professional into the college area on an almost daily basis to assist the college in posting, recruiting and interviewing; handling labor and employee relations issues within the college; and providing HR services directly to the college. This program allows the central HR function to better know their customers and to design services that are value added—and something the colleges want and will use. It will position HR to be a strategic partner with the colleges and help them achieve their personnel objectives more efficiently. The program was developed based on direct feedback from the college deans.

The Faculty, Administrative, and Classified senates also provide important venues through which employees may engage in formal conversations with University leadership pertaining to organizational productivity and employee satisfaction. Recent examples include the quarters-to-semesters conversion, domestic partner policies, compensation issues, and mentoring.

4P7: ENSURE ETHICAL PRACTICES OF ALL EMPLOYEES

Address Core Components 2A and 2E.

Ohio Revised Code and University Policies and Procedures provide clear expectations to employees regarding professional conduct and ethics. The Faculty Handbook and the Student Handbook have statements on academic conduct, and the University has documented procedures that must be followed when these policies are suspected of violation—depending upon the type, location, and level of infraction. Each University college employs a Professional Ethics Committee responsible for monitoring and investigating the ethical practices of the employees within that unit, and the University's Board of Trustees adopted a statement of expectations for board members.

Monitoring, oversight, and services to assist faculty, staff, and student researchers in appropriate, ethical, and safe research, creative, and scholarly activity is the responsibility of the Vice President for Research and Creative Activity and the staff of the Office of Research Compliance. Instruction in research methods and appropriate use of research resources is done by faculty in various disciplines as well as by academic support units such as the University Libraries.
The Office of Research Compliance ensures that all research adheres to federal, state, and university policy. Compliance efforts include monitoring conflicts of interests, training and oversight of research involving animal and human subjects, and maintaining accreditation by the Association for the Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care. Ohio University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) administers the approval process for research involving human subjects. Research misconduct is monitored by a central committee which answers to the Office of Research Compliance and the Vice President for Research and Creative Activity. The Internal Audit Department has a dual reporting line to the president and to the Board of Trustees. It also receives reports of suspected misconduct through Ethics Point, a system that provides opportunity to refer issues with whistle blower status protection to the person reporting.

Ohio University provides specific information related to Ohio Ethics Laws and Statutes to all new employees in employee orientations. The offices of Institutional Equity, Internal Audit, Human Resources, Legal Affairs, and University Ombudsman all have specialized roles in helping employees comply with respective University policies.

**4P8: DETERMINE TRAINING NEEDS**

The University’s training resources have focused on providing the day-to-day tools needed by all employees to accomplish their jobs efficiently and effectively. As new technology systems are deployed, training is provided to help employees utilize these systems. As new software products are introduced and widely adopted on campus, trained staff members from respective offices provide workshops in the use of these products. Products include the Oracle financial system, the Concur travel and expense management system, the new PeopleSoft student information system, and developing calendaring and e-mail processes, as well as others. As faculty members seek to increase their grant and research activities, the Vice President for Research and Creative Activity has provided informational workshops to assist in these activities. As the University continues to implement its refined strategic plan, training resources for faculty and staff have been identified and supported to attain the desired goals. Mandates and changes in federal or state laws are provided to employees in classes or by web based training. Student employees are provided with an abbreviated employee orientation as well as on-the job training, formal evaluation and feedback, and internship programs to complement classroom learning and provide additional work and organizational skills.

Responding to faculty requests, Academic Technologies conducts workshops and for using innovative instructional technology, such as "flipped classroom," and the CTL conducts workshops and responds to faculty requests for improving their pedagogical skills.

The University recently completed a reorganization of training functions within the Finance and Administration division. Resources from the Office of Information Technology and the Human Resources Organizational Development Office have combined to create an office dedicated to system, process and policy training priorities that were identified by academic units. This new function will focus on delivering integrated training for administrative systems, as well as functional processes and policies in the areas of HR, Finance, Facilities and IT. This new office is actively working on training modules related to the RCM budgeting process, system training related to HR, Finance and reporting tools, online training related to various administrative processes as well as topics related equity, and a management development class that is attended by both academic and administrative personnel.

**4P9: TRAINING AND REINFORCEMENT**

Ohio University provides a wide range of training opportunities for faculty and staff. Faculty training and professional development opportunities are provided by the CTL and Academic Technologies. The Academic Technologies' staff provides hands-on instructor-led seminars in the use of Blackboard as a teaching and learning tool. Faculty are given allowances for professional travel to conferences and are eligible for sabbatical leave every seven years.
The Office of the Vice President for Research and Creative Activity provides workshops regarding grant writing, research compliance (including the use of animals and humans in research, responsible conduct in research, and conflict of interest), technology transfer and other research related activities.

The Human Resources Leadership and Staff Development group offers a variety of training opportunities for all employment groups. Seminars and courses have been developed to address leadership basics, giving and receiving constructive feedback, difficult conversations, delegation, communication, project management, diversity, policies, procedures and compliance topics and performance management. Self-directed learning is also available through the Web using the University’s Learning Express Library with links from the UHR website. Classified employees can participate in the Classified Development Program, a commitment of two and a half years, for employees to take university classes for credit, to enable them to gain skills and establish a higher performance level for current and future positions. Skilled crafts staff members have an apprentice program and an organized continuing education program.

WellWorks offers employees workshops on health-related topics, health screenings, and individualized health coaching for improved employee health. The Workplace Safety Initiative, implemented by Safety and Risk Management, promotes safety in the workplace and offers a broad range of training to ensure that safety is an integral part of daily activities on campus.

The institution also supports fellowship leaves for faculty and administrators to encourage and support professional development. Travel opportunities to professional meetings and workshops are also provided to faculty and many other employees to promote professional development and career advancement. The University Libraries, for example, has recently instituted a professional engagement expectation for librarians linking implementation of professional best practice to merit increases.

4P10: PERSONNEL EVALUATION SYSTEMS
Addresses Core Component 3C.
Faculty are evaluated annually in a merit evaluation process conducted by their departmental peers. They are evaluated on their performance in teaching, research and service, and receive a written evaluation of their performance in these areas from their department chair/school director and the chair of their departmental merit review committee. A major aspect of the annual merit review process deals with teaching performance, which can be demonstrated in a variety of ways including student evaluations, peer evaluations, teaching portfolios, and other means. Faculty are also evaluated on their research/scholarship/creative productivity. This productivity is demonstrated and measured through publications, grant activities, juried exhibitions or performances, and other means. Service activities by faculty members are a third component in the evaluation process.

The Office of Institutional Research tracks faculty instructional productivity in terms of credit hours taught, weighted student credit hours taught, completed credit hours, and completed weighted student credit hours. Individual faculty load data are available as well as aggregations at the campus, college, and department/school levels. Some of the academic colleges have contracted with Digital Measures to capture data on the full range of faculty activity, including scholarship and service.

According to University policy, evaluations of administrative staff are conducted by their direct supervisors. The administrative evaluations vary according to the objectives and preferred style of the units, but they are encouraged to follow a model of setting goals and reviewing goal attainment regularly. All evaluations are related to two components – task and relationship. A new performance management and compensation plan is being developed over the next 12
months that will create standard competencies for all administrators in the evaluation process. The evaluation will then be tied to the compensation plan and the development or succession goals.

Deans are evaluated annually by their respective faculty in a process carried out jointly by Faculty Senate and the Executive Vice President and Provost. In recent years, the Faculty Senate has conducted evaluations of the president and EVPP. The Board of Trustees evaluates the president annually.

Classified staff are evaluated through a performance management system that involves year-end reviews in which staff and supervisors set objectives and review the employee’s progress. Classified employees are evaluated on their accomplishments and on the attainment of specific competencies. The goals, tied to the department or unit goals, are also tied to division and University priorities. In this manner, individual performance is connected to the university’s larger mission and priorities, while contributing to the more specific academic or academic support goals of the units.

4P11: EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION, REWARD, COMPENSATION, AND BENEFIT SYSTEM
The evaluation process for faculty is described in 4P10 above. The compensation plan for administrative and classified employees is under review and changes are expected to be implemented in 2013-14. The plan is designed to align tasks and skills with demonstrated elements of performance. Merit is a component in annual pay raises for faculty and staff.

There are programs designed to recognize and reward employee contributions. Each year, faculty committees select the recipients for the Presidential Teachers, a competitive process involving the submission of a portfolio and external letters of support. Presidential Teachers receive $15,000 over a three year period. In addition to these awards, outstanding teachers are recognized through the University Professor program, in which committees of students select outstanding teachers who receive a monetary award and the chance to develop a course on the topic of their choice. Faculty are also recognized for scholarly achievement through the Distinguished Professor program, a life-time designation, to receive a semester’s leave and the ability to award a scholarship each year to the student of their choice. A new Distinguished Professor is selected each year by the sitting distinguished professors. Many colleges also recognize their faculty with an outstanding teacher, research and service awards.

Each year, three administrators are selected as outstanding administrators. They receive a certificate and a $1,000 cash award. Additionally, administrators are recognized for their years of service through service awards, on every fifth year anniversary of their employment, with a certificate and a small gift. Classified employees receive a one-time longevity bonus on every fifth year anniversary of employment along with a small gift and certificate at a recognition ceremony. Departments, schools or units may offer their own recognition programs with rewards that vary according to the resources and philosophy of the unit.

Among the benefits offered by Ohio University to its employees is a generous health benefits program for employees and eligible dependents. Options for employees include: preventive care; a health care network; vision, dental, life, and short term insurance availability; domestic partner coverage; adoption assistance; a wellness and fitness facility; educational fee waivers for employees and dependents; access to the Libraries; and technological resources.

4P12: DETERMINE KEY ISSUES OF MOTIVATION
In 2012-13, the University instituted two programs to improve employee morale following years of budget cuts, workforce reductions, and the downturn of the national economy. First, summer hours were reinstituted and, second, winter holiday days off were added to employees’ paid time off. Additional information is described in 4P3.
The process of shared governance and discussions, which revolve around current issues, provides feedback to University leadership about the issues that affect motivation. Administrative and Classified senates regularly engage with senior leadership pertaining to motivation, and actively seek out key issues from their constituencies through a variety of venues: meetings, online surveys, and emails. Each senator is asked to develop informal and formal methods of communication with their constituents. University leadership respond to these actions depending upon budget constraints, flexibility of state and federal processes or laws, and/or the impact on other units or employees.

Employee workplace surveys were conducted by Institutional Research at the request of different units on campus and were sanctioned by the offices of the president and EVPP. Some of these include: EVPP conducted the COACHE survey in an attempt to identify issues important to pre-tenured assistant professors; the Diversity office is planning a survey of students and employees to identify inclusion and equity issues; and the Faculty Senate is attempting to coordinate a survey to faculty that would replace the evaluation of the president and EVPP, which would create a broader-based survey to identify workplace issues important to faculty rather than a personnel evaluation of University leaders.

**4P13: EVALUATE EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION, HEALTH AND SAFETY, AND WELL-BEING**

A variety of standing committees that focus on different issues relevant to employee satisfaction and interests provide recommendations to the administration on employee perspectives and concerns. An example is the Health Benefits Committee that addresses issues related to benefits and services. Here, the costs and options related to health benefits and options for wellness opportunities are discussed and recommendations are made to the university. Employees are able to contact their employee group representative in those standing committees to ask for assistance in dealing with a specific concern. In addition, the University has convened task forces to examine specific issues related to employee compensation, diversity, gender equity and other issues.

A number of data gathering opportunities are being implemented and tracked to provide additional indicators of motivation. These include the number of grievances filed by each employee group, the appeals of grievances, complaints to oversight departments such as the Ombudsman's office and Institutional Equity, systematic process of collecting exit interviews, and performance and disciplinary problems monitored for trends in locations or types of issues.

The offices of Legal Affairs, Human Resources, Institutional Equity and the Ombudsman assist employees in complaints about employment or other issues. Other offices include: Environmental Health and Safety, which addresses issues of workplace safety, and a campus police force, which protects students and employees.

University Human Resources has consolidated several human resource representatives and issues from around the University and has implemented programs to measure and enhance the benefits, health, safety and satisfaction of its employees. Units on campus that exist to ensure employee wellness, effectiveness, and safety are: Risk Management, Wellworks, Employee Assistance Program, and Environmental Health and Safety.

**Results (R)**

**4R1: MEASURES COLLECTED AND ANALYZED REGULARLY**

Data on academic productivity are captured and reported in OIR's Compendium of Historic Planning Information. Data include seven years of tables on student enrollments, degrees granted, credits taught, staffing and productivity, student/faculty ratios, and faculty salary that was broken down by the academic unit on the Athens campus. OIR conducts faculty salary and compensation comparative studies, faculty retention study, and a comparative administrative and mid-level staff salary study. OIR also publishes a faculty dashboard and collects "Staff Stats" annually, and publishes it on its
Web site. Individual departments keep data on the full range of academic productivity on teaching (including course evaluations), scholarship, and service. Three of the colleges have contracted with Digital Measures to collect and update these faculty productivity data, and other colleges are exploring working with Digital Measures.

Academic Support Unit Program Review (ASUPR/ASIC) expects academic support units to collect, analyze, and act upon data from stakeholders and peer-comparisons. ASUPR has successfully reviewed over a dozen academic support units and has made recommendations for each pertaining to data collection and actions through appropriate planning documents. An important component of the review is an organizational climate survey assessing the workplace environment pertaining to communication, training, and support for staff.

Comprehensive surveys of employees are not regularly administered. The COACH survey of probationary faculty was conducted in 2005. An equity/inclusiveness survey of all employees was conducted in 2004. Individual units survey employees as part of their needs assessment or continuous improvement activities. For example, the Libraries participates in LibQual+, which includes a survey of faculty and staff satisfaction with library services. In addition, the Libraries collects and submits salary data to the Association of Research Libraries annually to benchmark market and salary compression and regularly attempts to make internal salary adjustments based upon this comparison. Human Resources has conducted an employee survey about professional development needs. As mentioned in 4P12, Faculty, Administrative, and Classified senates are attempting to coordinate units on campus in an administration of a survey that would replace the evaluation of the president and EVPP. A Faculty Senate resolution, passed in spring 2013, calls for such a survey to be designed and implemented by fall 2014.

4R2: PERFORMANCE RESULTS FOR VALUING PEOPLE
Some samples of data from OIR's Staff Stats appear in 4P2. A sample from the faculty dashboard appears below, followed by a sample page from the Compendium of Historical Planning Information:
OIR tracks Group I faculty retention as part of its annual compensation study. The most frequent reasons for leaving are retirement, resignation/tenure denial, and status change at the University to academic administration (e.g., dean or associate provost). The faculty retention rate is about 93 percent over the last seven years with a high of 96 percent and a low of 91 percent during this period. The following is a summary of the retention rates of the most recent data available:

### Faculty Headcount Tracking from 2010-11 to 2011-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010-11 Full-Time Group I Faculty</strong></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continued to 2011-12</strong></td>
<td>447</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% <strong>Continued to 2011-12</strong></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Group I Faculty in 2011-12</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Longer Group I Faculty in 2011-12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Leaving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Retired</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/Deceased</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resigned</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to Administrator/Department Change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Denied, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% <strong>No Longer Group I in 2011-12</strong></td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011-12 Total Full-Time Group I Faculty</strong></td>
<td>455</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4R3: EVIDENCE OF PRODUCTIVITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF EMPLOYEES TOWARD GOAL ATTAINMENT

Individual faculty and staff evaluations provide evidence that individuals are achieving the performance goals set by and with their supervisors. Academic and academic support program reviews provide evidence that programs are meeting their goals. Action plans for intervention are developed for individuals and programs that are not meeting their goals. While individual performance evaluations are handled confidentially between the employee and the supervisor, program reviews are much more transparent and are available to the University community.

Many academic support units produce annual reports that document the effectiveness of their activities. All academic deans submit annual reports to their faculty, describing the extent to which they (and their colleges) had met their goals. Some colleges are beginning to ask their departments to undertake annual reporting. In 2012-13, the College of Arts and Sciences began asking its departments to write annual reports, outlining their accomplishments of the previous year. The following is an example from the Biological Sciences report. Faculty achievements include teaching awards, research and scholarly activity and grants (46 peer-reviewed publications, 27 invited seminars, 27 conferences presentations), curricular/course innovations, and student and alumni achievements.

4R4: COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE RESULTS IN VALUING PEOPLE

The greatest use of comparative data has been on salary and compensation. Ohio University compares itself to a set of national peers and also to all public universities in Ohio. Compared to public universities in Ohio, Ohio University’s average salaries ranked 8th for professors ($1,362 below next highest rank), 8th for associate professors ($789 below next highest rank), and 6th for assistant professors ($1,020 below next highest rank). Comparative faculty salary data is also available and is used (CUPA and Oklahoma State faculty salary studies).
4I1: IMPROVEMENTS IN VALUING PEOPLE

In 2012-13, the University instituted programs to improve employee morale by increasing workplace flexibility--reinstituting summer hours and expanding winter holidays. The formation of the Employee Appreciation Committee in 2012-13 represents an improvement in this area; recognition and appreciation of employees' efforts are being proposed.

Compensation for all employee types is being studied, with the goal of ensuring that the University's faculty, administrative, and classified staff salary and benefits are appropriate and competitive. The Compensation 2014 effort will lead to more consistent and fair job classifications. The Faculty Compensation Task Force is investigating the costs involved in moving faculty salary and compensation up among statewide peers. In the last several years, an additional $5 million already was allocated to Group I faculty compensation. Recommendations on both efforts are expected at the end of the 2013-14 academic year.

In 2013-14, a commitment was made to all employees that if University enrollment targets were met, then they would receive an additional one percent salary increase. In fall 2013, the president announced that employees will receive this additional salary because of their contribution to the University's strong enrollment numbers.

Ongoing efforts to improve this area occur in employee orientations, communication and involvement opportunities, training and professional development activities, performance management and review processes, mentoring, opportunities to participate in shared governance, and leadership development opportunities.

The Child Care Task Force found that there was an unmet need for quality child care especially in the areas of infant and early child care areas and after-school programming. The EVPP is interested in increasing the capacity of quality child care for employees. Commitment to investment in this area will require careful planning and consideration of the many factors including quality assurance, cost, community needs, and potential models such as growing existing capacities and identifying public-private partnerships.

4I2: CULTURE AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT IN VALUING PEOPLE

Through the Ohio Service Alignment Initiative (OSAI), the University recently reorganized system training personnel and personnel from the Human Resources Office into a single training group focused on delivering training around administrative systems, policies and processes; leadership and management development; as well as classes around diversity, conflict resolution, civility and other technical skills necessary to provide good service to faculty and staff. This realignment provides almost a one-stop-shop for employees over their employment with the University for personnel and pay-related issues and allows the University to more quickly respond to employee needs. Priorities for the development of the curriculum came directly from customer input gathered from the assessment of Finance, Human Resources, Facilities and Information Technology.

The University continues to expand ways to accommodate the different needs of its employees. In the Office of Institutional Equity, a new position was created to bring more attention and service to employee accommodation and campus accessibility for employees. The University's wellness program, Wellworks, continuously assesses and expands its programs to meet the changing needs of employees. Bringing efficient, best-practices to the institution is a priority. Recently, for example, the University Libraries restructured its annual merit to reward librarians who contribute to national best-practices as well as implement best-practice at Ohio University. Twenty percent of annual merit is devoted to those librarians who demonstrate such contributions.
AQIP CATEGORY 5: LEADING AND COMMUNICATING

Ohio University's governance is based soundly on principles of shared responsibility. Faculty maintain primary responsibility for curricular decisions, which are approved through a well-established review process. Five separate senates (faculty, administrative, classified, undergraduate, graduate student) exist to represent these different stakeholder groups in decision making. Faculty Senate recommends to the President the membership of 21 University Standing Committees, which advise the University leadership on activities ranging from library acquisitions to athletics. The University's 4 x 4 strategic plan, which grew out of Vision Ohio and had hundreds of faculty and staff directly participating in its development, continues to evolve through discussion and consultation. The recent adoption of the University's core values of excellence, integrity, and stewardship was done after a year-long process of discussion before they were formally approved by the Board of Trustees. The Trustees are actively and appropriately involved in the University's governance. They receive regular updates on the University's progress with its strategic plan through University-wide and college Dashboard updates. Academic and academic support missions and objectives are being brought in line with the University's mission. The strategic plan is being operationalized through sub-plans, such as capital, enrollment management, budget, compensation, and staffing. Recent major decisions and actions that exemplify Ohio University's shared governance approach are academic restructuring among four academic colleges, the transition from quarters to semesters, and RCM implementation. We judge the maturity level of the University's approach to this category as integrated.

Processes (P)

5P1: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND VALUES DEFINED AND REVIEWED

Addresses Core Component 1A

The current mission, vision, core values, and guiding principles of Ohio University have evolved from the Vision Ohio Strategic Plan. Vision Ohio was prepared by a 46 member Task Force representing multiple stakeholder groups. The previous Systems Portfolio described in detail how the Vision Ohio strategic plan was developed and carried out through 2010. Since that time, the hiring of a new EVPP as well as continued interaction with the Board of Trustees about strategic priorities led to a realization that the length of Vision Ohio and numerous details contained in the plan made it difficult to communicate and implement. As a result, Vision Ohio was distilled into four fundamentals and four strategic priorities that now form the basis for strategic vision and decision-making at the University (see 8P1). The Principles in this 4 x 4 strategic plan form the context for discussions with the Board of Trustees as well as decision-making by academic deans, vice presidents, and department heads.

As part of this strategic planning context, the university has also updated its mission and vision, performed an environmental scan, and created a statement of core values (see 5P4 for more details). The environmental scan was conducted by a nine-member team with representation from academic department chairs, faculty senate, the Athens community, deans, and vice presidents. Drafts were shared with the university community through presentations in open forums, planning units, and the Board of Trustees. This process resulted in the following vision statement: “Ohio University will be the nation’s best transformative learning community where students realize their promise, faculty advance knowledge, staff achieve excellence, and alumni become global leaders.” Each planning unit also conducted environmental scans and aligned individual missions and strategic plans with the university vision. Following are examples of current mission statements that demonstrate the wider university mission for academic and academic support units:

College of Arts and Sciences: The mission of the College of Arts and Sciences reflects and supports the larger mission of Ohio University. The tripartite mission of the college is defined by its commitment to advance the interrelated areas of teaching, research, and outreach in a learning-centered community. In teaching, the college provides education in the core
foundational disciplines for the entire university, high-quality undergraduate majors to nearly one-third of OU’s undergraduates, and nationally visible graduate programs to approximately one-third of OU’s graduate students. In research, the college facilitates fundamental and applied scholarship among faculty members in all areas, trains graduate students, and creates research opportunities for undergraduates. In outreach, the college takes an active role in making knowledge accessible and applying it to issues that affect the wider community.

Division of Student Affairs: We prepare students to be responsible and contributing members of a diverse, global society by providing learning-centered environments, professional support services and meaningful out-of-class opportunities

Strategic priorities:
- Support: services, activities and environments designed to maximize student growth and personal development
- Engagement: opportunities designed to foster connection and immersion with the campus and community
- Co-curricular learning: formal and informal out-of-class activities designed to promote student learning.

University Registrar: The mission of the Office of the University Registrar is:
- to support the academic mission and purpose of the University;
- to provide information and academic services to the University community in an efficient, user-friendly manner while ensuring accuracy, integrity, and confidentiality of academic records;
- to provide exemplary service by continually improving our business processes for registration, scheduling, academic records, degree audit, and related functions;
- to effectively communicate procedures and responsibilities for the successful use of our services;
- to adhere to policies and model the highest standards of the registrar profession.

5P2: DIRECTIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY IN ALIGNMENT WITH MISSION, VISION, VALUES AND COMMITMENT TO HIGH PERFORMANCE
Addresses Core Components 1A, 2C, and 5C.

University initiatives and priorities relating to the 4 x 4 strategic plan are kept up-to-date on the president's and EVPP’s websites. Compass, an email and web-based daily newsletter, is the University’s official communication vehicle for University initiatives, programs, and events; topics related to the strategic plan are regularly included in this publication.

In addition, regular emails from the EVPP and/or the VPFA are sent to the University community about important developments. Feedback to the University leadership is sought through attendance at Faculty Senate and the other constituent senates. Open forums are held to solicit community input on University issues and initiatives (e.g., RCM implementation; quarters to semesters transition).

The president of the University, the Vice President for Finance and Administration (VPFA) and the EVPP give regular updates to the Board of Trustees on progress in reaching goals associated with the 4 x 4 strategic plan. These discussions occur within the Academics Committee, Resources Committee, and in joint presentations to the entire board by the VPFA and EVPP. The President’s presentation at every board meeting also begins with a discussion of the 4 x 4 matrix to emphasize the context within which all resource allocations and strategic decisions are made. At the board’s request, the provost and all colleges have developed dashboards of key academic performance indicators that focus on academic quality; elements of those dashboards are discussed at every board meeting.

The Board of Trustees has adopted a set of bylaws and a statement of expectations for members. Board of Trustees agendas and meeting minutes are posted openly on the University's website. Broad attendance at these meetings is encouraged. The Board is comprised of governor-appointed members, national members, public members, alumni, student (nonvoting), and faculty (nonvoting) members. New Board members receive an official orientation program. Each year
the University provides professional development opportunities for all Board members through consultation services from organizations such as the Association of Governing Boards. The Board of Trustees meets four times per year, including a full-day retreat.

Budget Planning Council (BPC) plays an important role in the cost analysis of new initiatives and prioritizes these projects based on their compatibility with the university budget and 4 x 4 strategic plan. BPC enacts a critical advisory role to the Executive Leadership team in setting strategic and financial priorities that align with the mission, vision and values of the institution as outlined in the university strategic plan. BPC also utilizes two subcommittees for seeking input on the allocation of the general fee and the monitoring of course fees. The Student General Committee is made up of students and one staff representative and makes recommendations about the student perspective of the value of services offered by general fee units (e.g. Student Affairs, Health Services, Campus Recreation and Athletics), the funding of new priorities in these units and the allocation of one-time surplus funds to activities or initiatives of importance to students. The Student Fee Committee receives proposals from academic units about course fees. This committee includes representatives from enrollment management, faculty and student government and insures that course fees are justified for pass-through expenditures that are linked to consumable supplies and services provided to students in the course.

The university maintains both a six-year and a twenty-year capital plan to provide discussions within the Resources Committee of the Board of Trustees, Constituent groups on campus and the community. For capital expenditures, the university uses the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee (FPAC) to review the six-year capital plan and space management issues. This committee includes faculty, students and staff members. The capital plans are reviewed and discussed with the deans and other planning unit heads every year to keep the six year plan rolling forward in time. Final capital decisions go through the Capital Funding and Priorities Committee (CFPC), which includes the senior leader of the university and associated support staff. The six year plan and projects to be started in the next year are approved each year by the Board of Trustees.

Staff in Enrollment Management work closely with academic leaders to mold the University's enrollment profile to meet its mission. The overall objectives for this effort are described in the University's Enrollment Plan. The Office of Institutional Research provides Enrollment Management, academic leaders, and others with regular updates about enrollment trends, such as freshman and transfer profiles, retention and graduation studies, and academic unit enrollments over time. The Enrollment Management Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the EVPP on enrollment-related issues. For example, scholarship strategies are discussed and recommended by this body.

The university is currently transitioning from a budgeting system based on historical precedent to responsibility centered management (RCM). Under this approach individual academic and academic support budgets are established in the spring of each fiscal year according to a pre-established schedule. These budgets contain plans for unrestricted and restricted expenditures, revenue estimates (if appropriate), and staffing plans. Units' budgets are submitted to the planning unit budget managers and then to the Budget Office for approval. The RCM approach will assign greater control over resource decisions to academic colleges. Under this budget approach, revenue-generating areas are referred to as "responsibility centers" with all or most of the institution's revenues and support costs assigned to them. The underlying premise of RCM is that the decentralized nature of the model entrusts academic leaders with more control of financial resources, leading to more informed decision-making and better results or outcomes for the University as a whole. By allowing responsibility centers to control the revenues they generate, decision makers are better able to understand both the academic and financial impacts of their decisions, especially as resource distribution will impact progress toward unit-specific and university-wide objectives.
Planning efforts to address employee performance are embodied in the following compensation policies, practices, and projects:

- Faculty Total Compensation Task Force
- Compensation 2014 Project
- Policies on Non-Tenure Track Faculty
  - Multi-year Contract Opportunities
  - Professional Development opportunities
  - Annual Evaluations
  - Promotions
- College Staffing Plans
- Professional Development Initiative
- Employee Appreciation Initiative
- Pilot Parental Leave Project

**5P3: CONSIDERATION OF NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS OF CURRENT AND POTENTIAL STUDENTS AND KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUPS**

Addresses Core Component 1B.

Ohio University's mission and vision are articulated publicly in official University documents, such as in the President's website and in the University's undergraduate and graduate catalogs.

Ohio University strongly believes in the importance of shared governance. Advisory groups to the executive leadership team of Ohio University are created with broad-based representation from all campus constituency organizations. Representatives from key stakeholder groups are encouraged to participate in advisory group discussions to ensure that institutional planning includes addressing and meeting the needs of all stakeholder groups. For instance, the Budget Planning Council is broadly representative and includes all of the institution’s key stakeholder groups. It is important that these groups have a voice in the decision making process to ensure that the initiatives and directions followed by the institution are effectively meeting the needs and expectations of multiple stakeholder groups. In addition, the EVPP, VPFA and president regularly speak before the student, administrative, classified, and faculty senates on issues of interest to those groups such as the Quarters-to-Semesters transition, tuition and fees, budget cuts and investments, and the RCM implementation.

Because the intellectual and personal development of students is the overarching goal of the institution, it is critically important that students and alumni groups also have a strong voice in the decision making process to ensure that the academic needs of Ohio University students are met. The Student Trustee representatives have a strong voice in the University's Board of Trustees, students serve on BPC, FPAC, the Student General Fee Committee and Course Fee Committee. Student exit surveys and follow-up surveys of graduates are conducted on a regular basis by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). The results of these surveys are published on the OIR website and are communicated to University leaders and academic units. These results are analyzed and discussed and play a significant role in the university and college decision making processes.

Enrollment Management staff identify needs of incoming students and recommend adjustments accordingly. The Office of Institutional Research works with Enrollment Management staff to track characteristics of incoming students. Changes in patterns of ACT/SAT scores and high school GPA, numbers of multicultural students, first generation students, and Appalachian students are tracked and communicated to the Enrollment Management Advisory Committee, the Strategic Enrollment Management Steering Committee, and the Enrollment and Retention Monitoring Committee. Financial needs
of incoming students are tracked, and changes in scholarship funding are recommended as a result. In 2012-13, as a result of changing financial needs of students, the EVPP commissioned a financial aid leveraging study, the results of which are to be implemented in 2013-14 for the 2014-15 class. In addition, environmental scans revealed a growing concern about college affordability. As a means of addressing college affordability, the University leadership began exploring a guaranteed tuition plan to be implemented in 2014-15.

Refer to 3P1, 3P3, and 3P5 for additional answers to this question.

**5P4: LEADERSHIP FOR FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES AND BUILDING AND SUSTAINING LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

At its August 2013 meeting, the Board of Trustees formally endorsed the University's core values as recommended by the president:

- Excellence is our hallmark: outstanding people, ideas, and programs drive our educational mission.
- Integrity, civility, and diversity define our community: these values guide our leadership in a global society.
- Stewardship enhances our legacy: as Ohio’s first institution of public higher education, we are mindful of our accountability to the public trust.

The core values were developed through a year-long process that included academic and administrative support leadership as well as input from the various stakeholder Senates.

At Ohio University, the executive leadership team is expected to keep an open mind and work with constituent organizations to realize unique opportunities that fit within the strategic plan. The institution takes advantage of unique opportunities that increase the learning opportunities of Ohio University students is a bottom-up approach that requires the vision of Ohio University stakeholders and an open line of communication and support from the leadership. The university and many of the individual colleges utilize external advisory groups, with alumni well represented, in decision making processes that set the direction of the unit and take advantage of discipline specific opportunities that arise.

In May 2010, the president and the EVPP announced the advent of a multi-year planning approach for Ohio University. The announcement highlighted previous strategic planning work, which yielded six strategic priorities and a Vision Statement which grew out of Vision Ohio. The priorities called on the University to improve the quality of undergraduate and graduate education; to promote student and faculty research and creative activity; to create short-term and long-term enrollment goals; to improve financial strength; to establish effective total compensation; and to complete the capital campaign.

The Vision Statement declared that, “Ohio University will be the nation’s best transformative learning community where students realize their promise, faculty advance knowledge, staff achieve excellence, and alumni become global leaders.” The priorities related to undergraduate/graduate education and research and creative activity were grounded in four fundamentals: inspired teaching and research, innovative academic programs, exemplary student support services, and integrative co-curricular activities. The goal of our engagement in multi-year planning was to provide a flexible framework for aligning strategic planning and budgetary decisions with the four fundamentals.

A university-wide environmental scan was also conducted in 2010, followed by environmental scans for each planning unit. The goal of these environmental scans was to identify the trends that we believe are most likely to influence our continued progress over the next six years on the fundamentals outlined above. We determined which trends should be selected to inform our actions. The University scan and planning unit scans must be aligned with the realities of this time.
of strained resources, and resources cannot be invested in any activity without attention to how its effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity will be measured.

5P5: MAKING DECISIONS AND CARRYING THEM OUT
Addresses Core Component 5B.
Decision-making and execution are carried out through an active shared-governance structure codified in the Faculty Handbook and in the Oho University Policy and Procedures Manual. The president meets weekly with his leadership team and reports regularly (about four times per year) to the University’s Board of Trustees, which is the final authority on critical University matters. In addition, the president welcomes input from the University’s Administrative Senate, Classified Senate, Faculty Senate, and Student Senate, as well as a number of other University Standing Committees. Each year, based on nominations from the Committee on Committees, the University President appoints members of University Standing Committees. The Chairperson of each committee manages all aspects of committee operations, including communication with members, establishment of meeting schedule and location, development of recommendations, and delivery of recommendations to the appropriate University officials. Students serve one-year terms, and faculty, administrative staff, classified staff, and community residents serve three-year terms on all University Standing Committees (except those appointed to fill vacancies in unexpired terms). University Standing Committees are the following:

- Baker Fund Committee
- Committee on Committees
- Council for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity
- Ecology and Energy Conservation Committee
- Enrollment Management Advisory Committee
- First Year Council
- Graduate Council
- Greek Life Committee
- Honorary Degree Committee
- Intercollegiate Athletics Committee
- Interdisciplinary Council
- Kennedy / Frontiers in Science Lecture Committee
- Library Committee
- Ohio University Research Council
- Post Publishing Board
- Radiation Safety Committee
- Science Fair Committee
- Student Code of Conduct: Review and Standards Committee
- Transportation & Parking Committee
- University Curriculum Council
- University International Council
- University International Council

The standing committees meet on a regular basis making policy and other decisions related to University issues critical to day-to-day operations. As with all of the university committees and task forces, these groups have broad-based representation from all campus constituencies. However, they are also staffed with faculty, students and staff who have expertise and interests in the individual areas of each committee’s responsibility.

In addition to standing committees, there are committees mentioned previously that are involved in resource allocation recommendations such as BPC, FPAC, and the Student General Fee Committee. In addition there are task forces currently analyzing faculty and administrative compensation as well as a Benefits Advisory Committee. The are several planning task forces analyzing space allocation and capital projects such as the Ridges Advisory Committee which has broad representation from faculty, students and the communities analyzing the use of the buildings and grounds from the old State Mental Hospital that were given to the university.

The colleges and departments/schools maintain a similar committee structure to that of the university standing committees for making decisions related to the day-to-day operation, curriculum, or academic policies of the individual college/department/school. Task forces and working groups are usually created by the President or the EVPP, for a short term (no more than one year), to investigate a specific issue facing the institution. For example, a task force may be
assembled to investigate compensation issues related to an employee group, university benefit offerings, or an academic calendar change. These groups investigate the issue specific to their charge, file a report and are then disbanded. Therefore, all of the above groups act in an advisory capacity to the executive leadership. Departments/schools and colleges use similar advisory groups to inform the chairs/directors and deans in making decisions within their units.

Decisions related to academic policy and faculty issues begin with one of the subcommittees of Faculty Senate. In certain cases, issues involving academic policy may be presented to one of these subcommittees by another group such as the Student Senate(s), the Chairs and Directors Council, or the Assistant Deans Council. The subcommittees investigate these issues and, if supported, introduce new policies, changes in policies, or other matters, in the form of resolutions, to the full Senate at a meeting. The resolutions are debated during meetings and, if approved, are passed to the EVPP and the President for consideration.

Curriculum decisions are regulated by the faculty. The vice chair of the Faculty Senate serves as chair of the University Curriculum Council (UCC) - the body governing policy affecting university curriculum. The UCC oversees academic program approval, the seven year program review process, and approves and oversees all changes to course curriculum.

Advisory committees, such as the Budget Planning Council and the Benefits Advisory Committee, discuss issues and make recommendations related to the future direction and strategic plan of the university. As discussed above, these groups are broad based and guide the executive leadership team in making decisions that support the needs of key stakeholders.

Many of the other stakeholder organizations investigate issues and policies of concern to their constituents and make recommendations to the President or an appropriate Vice President. These organizations are generally advisory in nature and do not create policy.

Refer to 5P2 for additional information about the University's Board of Trustees and its role in decision-making.

**5P6: USE OF DATA IN DECISION MAKING PROCESSES**

Addresses Core Component 5C.

In a shared governance environment there is openness, transparency, and an expectation that timely and accurate information is freely shared between the university administration and stakeholder groups. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) is well respected and utilized widely by the university to provide accurate institutional data that demonstrates trends and allows comparison to other institutions. Data on comparative peer institutions is made available to the University community. When considering important decisions and reviewing institutional policy, University leaders often compare information and data from peer institutions and other universities in Ohio; then make decisions that align with the strategic plan. For example, faculty salary and compensation rankings in relation to national and state peers influence salary and compensation decisions in the budgeting process.

OIR collects and reports data on a number of issues related to the operation of the institution including, but not limited to: salary data, faculty workload, student admission and retention, student outcomes assessment and student involvement and engagement. The data are available to all faculty and staff by accessing the Institutional Research website or by contacting the OIR to request a specialized report. OIR annually produces a *Fact Book* and *The Compendium of Planning Information*, which display descriptive data on various indicators for Athens campus colleges and departments/schools. The Compendium, which is organized both by type of indicator (section) and by college and department (profile), contains seven years of the most current data available. Such data are readily used in reporting to external constituency
and accreditation organizations, in the academic and academic support unit review process, and by university committees, task forces and executive leadership in making informed decisions regarding the future of the university. The director of the OIR, which was recently changed in title to be the “Associate Provost for Instructional Research and Effectiveness,” reports to the EVPP and attends all Academic Leadership meetings.

Staff in Enrollment Management work closely with academic leaders to monitor the University's enrollment in relation to its capacity. The details of the university's enrollment and capacity analysis are described in the University's Enrollment Plan. OIR provides Enrollment Management, academic leaders, and others with regular updates about enrollment trends, such as daily admissions statistics, freshman and transfer profiles, retention and graduation studies, and academic unit enrollments over time. The Environmental Scan done for the University and for all planning units identified state, national, and international enrollment trends that might affect how the University meets its short and long term enrollment goals. Such data are used by BPC to make projections on yearly enrollment so that the university budget can be based on reasonable assumptions.

Two existing and three developing governance/review entities help the University link institutional and program evaluation to resource allocation recommendations. The UCC Program Review Committee reviews all academic programs every seven years and issues an action plan for program improvements at the end of the review. The program chair/director and the academic dean have the responsibility for carrying out the recommendations before the next review. The Academic Support Improvement Committee functions similarly for academic support units. With the implementation of Responsibility Centered Management (RCM), this committee is being re-formed to the Academic Support Improvement Committee. RCM implementation includes the development of two additional governance committees, RCM Budget Implementation Committee and the Service Alignment Projects Oversight Committee. As the University implements RCM, the need for unit performance data is being addressed through OIR, OIT, and "Chief Finance and Administrative Officer" (CFAO) positions being created in the colleges. These CFAO positions have responsibility to take data from the OIR and OIT and help their colleges (or cost centers) turn their enrollment data into operational information to increase their efficiency and effectiveness. RCM is entirely data-informed.

Recent examples of process-results-improvement decisions that have used data to guide decisions are the following: childcare options for employees are being shaped by studies and deliberation about current services available in relation to identified needs; scholarship allocation decisions based on analyses of admissions yield and leveraging studies done by Institutional Research and Enrollment Management; and efforts to identify and intervene with students who may leave the University to improve student success and retention. Return on investment is usually considered in resource allocation decisions; data on potential revenue, market potential, or expected expenditures are considered.

**5P7: COMMUNICATION BETWEEN AND AMONG INSTITUTIONAL LEVELS**

There is a great deal of interaction among constituent groups, including the governing organizations and the university administration. During the academic year, the President, the EVPP and the Vice President for Finance and Administration meet separately on a regular (typically monthly) basis with the leadership of the various constituent senates (student, faculty, administrative and classified) and the officers of the (academic) Chairs and Directors Council. During these updates, important issues both internal and external to the university are communicated by the university leadership and discussed. Meetings of the constituent governing organizations are usually open and the executive leaders of the institution are invited on a regular basis to make presentations and answer questions. The President and EVPP regularly attend these constituent senate meetings and provide communication updates to the memberships.
The mission of Communication and Marketing is to design and execute “effective communications strategies in support of University initiatives and priorities.” The department accomplishes this mission in a number of different ways including: publishing community press releases, hosting press conferences and helping organizational units to prepare and publish print materials for both internal and external use. As a major communication vehicle to faculty and staff, the department also produces a daily online newsletter called Compass, which is sent via e-mail three times per week to all faculty, staff, and students and is published on the Ohio University website. The Ohio University independent student newspaper, called The Post, is published daily during the academic year and once per week in the summer. The Post is published to appeal to a wide range of constituent groups including students, alumni, faculty, staff, and community members. The publication is available in both print and online formats.

The EVPP meets on a biweekly basis with the college deans to communicate and discuss internal and external issues critical to the institution. The college deans also meet on a regular basis with the President and Vice Presidents in order to maintain open lines of communication among the academic and academic support units. College deans typically meet on a weekly basis with their department chairs/school directors in order to maintain the communication flow between the central administration and the academic units of the institution.

The President schedules press conferences throughout the academic year to discuss critically important issues facing the university. These addresses are often broadcast via webcast on the university website. Press conferences are held after each meeting of the Board of Trustees and a meeting with the budget office and the student newspaper occurs immediately following every meeting of the Budget Planning Council. Constituent groups maintain updated websites so information can be accessed electronically by the university community. Finally, campus meetings and open forums are sometimes scheduled to focus on particular issues important to the university community. Representatives from various institutional levels are encouraged to attend and participate in discussions. Recent examples of these open forums were held on the quarters-to-semesters transition and the RCM implementation.

5P8: LEADERS' COMMUNICATION OF A SHARED MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES
Addresses Core Component 1B.
Refer to 5P3 for information on how the University's mission is articulated publicly. The mission, vision, core values and guiding principles, endorsed by the President and the Ohio University Board of Trustees, clearly communicate the values and mission of the institution. The University and college dashboards clearly communicate the measurable metrics and priorities and progress toward achieving these goals. With the help of the President's executive council and the EVPP's academic leadership groups, the University continues to focus on the plan’s goals and supports initiatives that align with the university’s mission and vision. The leadership will also continue to expect constituent groups and units within the organization to create and align the goals and expectations of their students, faculty and staff. Performance expectations and institutional directions are clearly communicated and reviewed with faculty and staff during annual performance evaluations. Faculty expectations are also stated in department/school and college promotion and tenure guidelines.

5P9: DEVELOPMENT OF LEADERSHIP ABILITIES AND SHARING OF LEADERSHIP KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS
Addresses Core Component 5B.
Organizational Leadership and Development in University Human Resources, offers programs and provides manager and leadership training to university administration and staff. These training programs are typically offered to middle management to encourage the development of managerial and leadership skills and to improve the operation and efficiency of the unit. Similar training and professional development opportunities are available to classified staff.
The Chairs and Directors Council provides advice, best practices and mentoring to new department chairs and directors. Deans and other chairs/directors encourage new chairs to participate in council activities for professional development. In addition, the Office of the EVPP offers a New Chairs and Directors Orientation in the summer and training workshops throughout the academic year to provide advice, training and continuing education for new and continuing department/school leaders. A continuous training program for academic department chairs and school directors is an area that has been identified by campus leaders as opportunity for improvement.

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and the Academic Technologies staff provide ongoing programming for faculty to develop and improve teaching skills, learn new technologies to advance teaching capabilities and provides an area (and programs) where faculty can network and share best practices for instructional and scholarship development.

Participation in shared governance is encouraged of every constituent group. Serving on one of the constituent senates (e.g., Faculty Senate, Classified Senate) as a member or as an executive officer is another avenue where university employees and students can serve the institution in a leadership role and gain valuable leadership skills. The university also supports faculty leaves and course buyouts for faculty members so they can work with the various administrative offices on campus to develop leadership skills and gain an appreciation and understanding of the function of the institution as a whole.

The University actively supports the professional development of all employees through a tuition waiver program as well as opportunities to attend outside conferences and workshops. Awards are given to encourage excellence and leadership in the workplace. Awards given annually include The Presidential Teacher Award, University Professor Award and the Outstanding Administrator and Classified Employee Awards. Also, special stipends and other means of compensation are typically given to encourage employees to assume leadership roles within the institution.

**5P10: LEADERSHIP SUCCESSION**

The University's strategic priorities do not depend on individuals, but rather, on a shared sense of purpose across the University. The University's mission is not embodied by any single individual. As new faculty, staff, and board members join the University community, they are introduced to Ohio University's basic mission to help students develop intellectually and personally. New strategies or objectives may be introduced, but the mission is reconfirmed. An example of this is the transition from the Vision Ohio strategic plan to the 4 x 4 strategic plan. The present plan is a reconfirmation of the priorities developed through Vision Ohio.

The 4 X 4 Strategic Plan provides a roadmap for the leadership to follow regardless of personnel changes that occur within the university. Executive leadership positions, such as the President, EVPP, Vice Presidents and Deans, are hired through extensive external search processes. Before finalist candidates are interviewed for these positions, they are given adequate materials and information about the institution, as well as materials that define the mission, vision and values of Ohio University. Candidates for these positions are expected to understand and support the objectives in the strategic plan. However, they are also encouraged to critique and provide their own opinions regarding the best strategies to implement the plan’s goals. These new leaders embrace the mission and values of the institution, along with the core of the strategic plan and to provide leadership, new ideas and directions for achieving goals and objectives while moving the university forward in new and positive directions.

New members of the Ohio University Board of Trustees are oriented regarding the mission, vision, values and strategic goals of the institution before they begin their nine year terms. Terms of board members are staggered so that the majority of the board are continuing members. Before their terms begin, new board members are given an extensive one day
training workshop organized and offered by senior board members and Ohio University administrative staff and faculty. In this workshop, the board members are trained regarding their responsibilities as board members and educated about the university, its mission and values. On a continuous basis, board members are given regular updates regarding the plan’s implementation and how budget priorities are aligned for its support.

Institutional memory is important in following a strategic plan and in preserving the critical values and positive characteristics of the institution. Many midlevel leadership positions (e.g., department chair, school director, program or graduate chair) along with the memberships of the various standing committees, boards and governing bodies are changed on a staggered, rotating basis to provide fresh ideas while preserving institutional memory. Given the size of the institution and its leadership team, it is unlikely that a sufficient turnover would occur to jeopardize institutional knowledge or the succession of the mission and core values of the institution.

Results (R)

5R1: PERFORMANCE MEASURES COLLECTED REGULARLY
The executive leaders (President, Executive Vice President and Provost, Vice Presidents and Deans) are evaluated annually. These evaluations are based on the following performance measures:

- Accomplishment of Annual Goals
- Planning and Management
- Leadership Abilities and Style
- Organizational Skills
- Personnel Management
- External Relations

Depending on the position, data related to these performance measures are collected from surveys of students, faculty and staff. These surveys, along with data analysis of the results, are usually performed by staff in the Office of Institutional Research. During comprehensive evaluations of the executive leaders, typically performed every 5 years, performance data may also be collected from focus group interviews with University stakeholders.

The Board of Trustees evaluates the president annually. The evaluation is based on the president's performance objectives, which are linked to the University's strategic plan; an outside consultant from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB)conducts the evaluation. In the annual evaluation of the President, the board obtains performance measure results from constituency organizations (student, faculty, administrative and classified staff senates). The President of the university is responsible for the evaluation of the executive administration, including the EVPP and the vice presidents. Evaluations are based on unit goals and objectives being met.

The deans of the various colleges are evaluated by the EVPP and the chairs and directors are evaluated by the deans. The evaluation of deans/chairs and directors is informed using input from the faculty and staff within each academic unit. Vice and associate provosts and assistant and associate deans are considered administrative staff and are evaluated by their supervisors, often with feedback collected from constituencies who work closely with the particular staff member. Feedback from the constituent groups is often collected from performance and satisfaction survey instruments administrated internally or externally.

College Dean Evaluation Committees, consisting of faculty from the deans’ respective colleges, are formed each year, in consultation with the faculty senate, to evaluate the college deans. The committees receive the performance data from surveys administered by the Office of Institutional Research and create an evaluation report which is submitted to the EVPP.
Faculty are evaluated annually using performance measures related to teaching effectiveness, scholarship/research productivity and service to the department/school, college, university and academic discipline. Departmental committees of faculty colleagues are used in the evaluation process along with an assessment by the department chair/school director. The results of the faculty evaluations are communicated by the department chair/school director to the college dean.

As mentioned in the response to 5P2, the EVPP has developed a university dashboard of measures to monitor key performance indicators and assist with the communication with the Board of Trustees. This dashboard is updated annually, and a subset of the metrics is highlighted at each board meeting. This approach was also implemented at the college level for use by the deans in monitoring the performance of the colleges and communicating the progress within the college to the EVPP and external constituents and advisory boards.

The RCM implementation represents a new effort where data is used to drive decisions about budget allocation. Under the model, revenue allocation is driven by measures of academic performance such as credit hour production, student major enrollments, grant activity, and degrees granted. Central cost allocations are made on the basis of numbers of students and employees, space assigned, and revenues. These economic measures of academic activity are balanced with academic quality indicators such as section size, use of tenure-track faculty, incoming class quality and other metrics that are often also part of the college dashboards.

As part of the RCM implementation, the cost of central support units becomes a focal point of discussions where the support units need to demonstrate the value and cost of their services. The Service Alignment Initiative (SAI) was launched as part of the RCM implementation and is focused on the services provided by Finance, Human Resources, Facilities and Information Technology. The SAI process has involved the collection of direct feedback from users of these services through surveys and focus group interviews, the establishment of strategic plans and goals for service units, and the creation of service level agreements to communicate the level of service academic units can expect from the support units. The Academic Support Program Review/Academic Support Improvement Committee process was created to assist each academic support unit in developing service measures appropriate to their particular service.

5R2: PERFORMANCE RESULTS FOR LEADING AND COMMUNICATING
Individual personnel evaluation data will not be presented in the Systems Portfolio. However, the University Dashboard, pictured in 8R2, includes trend and comparative data on 19 indicators. The president's and the EVPP's performance are evaluated on the extent to which the University is achieving its strategic objectives, which are measured by the indicators in the Dashboard.

Performance results and data from RCM are extremely detailed and too lengthy for the Systems Portfolio. However, following is an example of how data from different revenue sources serve as input to the RCM model.
Revenue attribution in the model uses three year averages of college performance in terms of credit hours generated, students enrolled and degrees granted.

In addition to the calculations for revenue attribution in the top half, indirect cost allocations in the model are made using data on the number of employees, assignable square footage and fee waivers in addition to the number of students.
5R3: COMPARATIVE RESULTS

Most of the measures from the University Dashboard include comparative data (see 8R2 and 8R4). Measures such as retention, graduation rate, headcount and degrees granted, ACT Composite scores, and student-faculty ratios are compared to the performance at the other Ohio four-year public universities schools. Financial performance indicators are reported at the state level through Senate Bill 6 ratios and are included with financial standards in the footnotes. Ohio University's performance scores are above the Ohio public university averages on all of the measures, and Ohio University's financial ratios are better than the financial standards on all but one--deferred maintenance backlog.

As described in 2R3, 2012 Ohio University updated its 10 national peer universities to benchmark against in comparing essential processes and characteristics (2R3). The president's expectation is that Ohio University would be able to improve its standing among these universities in the next few years. Following are sample data from the most recent peer study.

The first table shows a variety of performance measures, some of which also are included in the University Dashboard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT Estimated Median</th>
<th>Freshmen Retention</th>
<th>Freshmen Top Ten Percent HS Class</th>
<th>Student Faculty Ratio</th>
<th>Undergrad FTE</th>
<th>Graduate FTE</th>
<th>Land Grant Status</th>
<th>US News Public Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina - Columbia</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17,212</td>
<td>3,332</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19,485</td>
<td>5,988</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21,770</td>
<td>4,037</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20,696</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15,709</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12,217</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16,229</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16,164</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12,261</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second table shows a comparison of the universities’ revenues and expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Total Revenues</th>
<th>Institutional Instructional Expenditures</th>
<th>Institutional E &amp; G Expenditures</th>
<th>Instructional Expenditures per FTE</th>
<th>Research Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University-Main Campus</td>
<td>$520,957,089</td>
<td>$184,182,199</td>
<td>$498,346,521</td>
<td>$8,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>$797,131,180</td>
<td>$245,553,256</td>
<td>$722,957,629</td>
<td>$9,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>$961,338,862</td>
<td>$209,555,886</td>
<td>$919,059,347</td>
<td>$8,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>$1,652,679,074</td>
<td>$277,045,292</td>
<td>$1,641,980,498</td>
<td>$9,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>$2,662,587,000</td>
<td>$289,396,000</td>
<td>$2,485,491,000</td>
<td>$12,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>$827,386,103</td>
<td>$198,989,784</td>
<td>$628,396,319</td>
<td>$7,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
<td>$461,251,492</td>
<td>$142,919,927</td>
<td>$319,331,565</td>
<td>$10,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>$858,905,165</td>
<td>$234,929,961</td>
<td>$623,975,204</td>
<td>$8,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>$723,978,919</td>
<td>$167,935,600</td>
<td>$556,043,319</td>
<td>$8,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>$715,615,932</td>
<td>$169,897,532</td>
<td>$545,718,403</td>
<td>$8,839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| University of Rhode Island    | $461,874,031                             | $94,337,934                     | $367,536,107                      | $6,541               | $65,013,694
Improvement (I)

5I1: IMPROVEMENTS IN LEADING AND COMMUNICATING
Several of the initiatives and actions described previously demonstrate the continuous efforts related to creating broad-based discussions on key issues facing the University. For example, the process by which the capital plan is developed has expanded to include the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee with broad-based constituent membership as well as committees for capital planning and space management and the new Capital Funding and Priorities Committee, where final decisions are made. Through this expanded process a 20-year capital plan has been developed and vetted to create a planning tool for the Board of Trustees to use in decision-making and to promote transparency around the development of the plan.

A similar improvement has occurred with the budget planning process. The establishment of the Budget Planning Council with membership from among deans, Faculty Senate, Classified Senate, Administrative Senate, Student Senate and Graduate Student Senate, the Student General Fee Committee, and the Course Fee Committee has created a transparent process for discussions about the budget.

Other examples of improvements that include the use of a broad-based task force approach for major issues are:

- The academic restructuring of the College of Health and Human Services to the new College of Health Sciences and Professions which resulted in the movement of several departments to the College of Business, the College of Education and the College of Fine Arts.
- The transition of the university from a quarter system to a semester system which included a design task force and an implementation task force and involved major efforts from college curriculum committees, the university curriculum council, the assistant dean’s council and faculty senate. This process has been an AQIP Action Project and has received very favorable reviews.
- The implementation of the RCM budgeting system involved many years of collaboration within the Academic Leadership Council, the Faculty Senate Finance and Facilities Committee, and Budget Unit Managers, along with numerous public forums, presentations to senates and meetings within colleges.

5I2: CULTURE AND INFRASTRUCTURE ON LEADING AND COMMUNICATING
Ohio University is committed to a culture of shared governance. Ideas and opportunities are freely shared through advisory groups such as the Executive Leadership and Academic Leadership teams and constituent governing organizations (student, faculty, administrative and classified senates). Important issues and concerns are openly offered for discussion with the institution’s leadership. The executive leadership team fully engages in open and shared discussion, and works with constituent organizations to realize unique opportunities that fit within the University’s strategic plan. The institution understands that taking advantage of unique opportunities that increase the learning opportunities of Ohio University students is a bottom-up approach that requires the vision of Ohio University stakeholders and an open line of communication and support from the University's leaders.

This commitment to continuous improvement and data-driven decision making has been exemplified in the many examples previously presented. From the development of strategic plans based on environmental scans and dashboard metrics to the budget planning process to the capital planning process to the major transitions from quarters-to-semesters and RCM, the university has consistently demonstrated a commitment to broad-based, transparent processes for moving the institution forward in a positive way that fulfills its vision of providing students with a transformative learning experience.
AQIP CATEGORY 6: SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS

The University's strategic plan identifies four fundamentals to help it accomplish its mission and vision. All four of these elements are critical to students, and two of the four relate specifically to supporting institutional operations: “exemplary student support services” and “integrative co-curricular activities.” Apart from the University's existing organizational structure and commitment to shared governance, one evolving and one new program work to help the academic support units work more effectively. The Academic Support Program Review has evolved into the “Academic Support Improvement Committee” (ASIC), which has successfully reviewed 13 units. In addition to helping academic support units assess and achieve their objectives in support of the University's mission, it will begin to review financial performance and efficiency of those units. A new program, “The Service Alignment Initiative,” was devised in 2012-13 as a direct result of evidence that particular academic support units (information technology, human resources, finance, and facilities) could improve services by realigning their goals and objectives to better support the needs of the academic colleges. Specific goals for improving services provided by these units were established, and they are being led through strategic planning exercises to help them function more effectively in the RCM environment. We judge the maturity level of the University's approach to this category as systematic.

Processes (P)

6P1: IDENTIFICATION OF SUPPORT SERVICE NEEDS OF STUDENTS

Ohio University holds as its central purpose the intellectual and personal development of its students . . . Ohio University will be the nation's best transformative learning community where students realize their promise, faculty advance knowledge, staff achieve excellence . . . Among the strategic priorities collectively known as the Four Fundamentals (see 8P1) that were selected to help the University accomplish this mission/vision, "exemplary student support services” and "integrative co-curricular activities” are especially critical to students. Answers to these questions will focus on the stakeholders identified in the University's mission and in 3P1: students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

At Ohio University, administrative and student services operations are called "academic support" because they exist to serve the academic mission of the University. Originating under the Vision OHIO strategic plan, and continuing with the move to the Four Fundamentals and the new Responsibility Centered Management approach to resource allocation, all academic support units are expected to collect and use information from their key stakeholders as part of their operations. A formal review process was created to facilitate this approach. The academic support unit program review process is a formalized process to evaluate academic support units and offices that serve the institution. Academic Support Unit Program Review (ASUPR) is one of the University's three Action Projects. Following is an excerpt from the annual progress report on this Action Project:

Ohio University is undergoing a transition to a Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) financial model, and ASUPR remains important to the RCM governance and review process. To support the changing demands of the new financial model, ASUPR continues to evolve as additional topics are incorporated into the review process and as committee membership expands. Under RCM, colleges will know what each support unit charges for services. These charges directly impact a college’s bottom line, influencing future decisions. Rising costs from a support unit mean that a college must seek additional revenue – from subvention, state subsidy, tuition, or fees – or cut costs to balance its budget. Deans will put more pressure on support units to reduce costs or to slow the rate of rising costs. Further, colleges will think more deeply about the value of services they receive and ask themselves whether they are getting a fair value for each dollar spent.

ASUPR will become, under RCM, one of three university governance committees. It will continue with its traditional role of encouraging continuous improvement and promoting a culture of assessment. Under the new governance role, however, it will also more closely review financial performance and efficiency of units and
report directly to both the Provost and to the Vice President for Finance and Administration. The ASUPR process was successfully completed on 13 units, and a sample final report of one unit is included as appendix 1. A revised committee charge has been developed (Appendix 2), with an expanded membership that includes faculty, associate deans, academic department chairs, and the Associate Vice President for Finance & Administration (Appendix 3). The title of the committee has changed from Academic Support Unit Program Review (ASUPR) to that of Academic Support Improvement Committee (ASIC).

The purpose of ASIC is to make sure that Ohio University’s academic support services (administrative and co-curricular units) provide continuing value to the University community by:

- Ensuring that university-wide service level and cost allocation decisions are transparent.
- Aligning service activities with the institution’s mission and vision.
- Working to meet unit objectives for achieving ongoing service effectiveness, efficiency, and excellence.
- Stimulating proactive planning and achieving outcomes that support university strategic planning goals and RCM guidelines.
- Creating efficiencies that can lead to new resources for priority investments.
- Perpetuating a culture of continuous improvement and organizational renewal.

ASIC monitors metrics used by support services to ensure alignment with stakeholder interests and compliance with appropriate standards and adequate stewardship. As needed, ASIC directs improvement efforts of academic support service units. ASIC conducts and reviews internal assessments and provides guidance on unit improvement plans. ASIC also reviews and certifies results of external assessments as well as assessments from stakeholder/customer groups. Approximately one fourth of the academic support service units will be reviewed each year.

ASIC reports to the Executive Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Finance and Administration. A template for the review summary was established:

- Organizational Profile
- Internal Review Results
- Stakeholder Review Results
- External Metric Review Results
- Unit Planning Goals & Milestones
- Next Steps

In addition to ASIC, units and groups that are closely aligned with the life and success of Ohio University students monitor support services within the institution and identify areas that need improvement or suggest new services. These units/groups include: the Assistant Deans Council, University College, The Academic Advancement Center, The First Year Council, the Enrollment and Retention Monitoring Committee, the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Dean of Students Office, Student Success Network, the Allen Student Help Center and Bobcat Student Orientation, Undergraduate Student Senate, Graduate Student Senate, Faculty Senate, Classified Senate, Administrative Senate, the Registrar’s Office, and the Alumni Association.

6P2: IDENTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT NEEDS OF FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATORS

The University does this in three ways: through the University's formal organizational structure; through shared governance; and through an effort called the "Strategic Alignment Initiative." First, Ohio University is organized into "planning units." These units are comprised of the academic colleges and major academic support units (e.g., Student Affairs, Regional Higher Education, Advancement, Finance and Administration, Enrollment Management). The academic support planning unit heads report either to the president or to the executive vice president and provost (EVPP). Needs are identified and prioritized by department heads within these units and passed on to planning unit heads.
Second, support service needs of faculty, staff, and administrators are also identified through the constituent governing organizations, which include Undergraduate Student Senate, Graduate Student Senate, Classified Senate, Faculty Senate, Administrative Senate, Academic Chairs and Directors Council, and two labor unions (Fraternal Order of Police and American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees). These groups meet regularly with the executive leadership of the university to discuss needs of their constituents. For example, the EVPP meets with both Faculty Senate Executive Officers and the full membership of Faculty Senate monthly.

Third, in order to better understand how to align services with the needs of our academic units in an RCM environment, the University engaged the Huron Consulting Group to conduct a review of the operations of Finance, Human Resources, Information Technology, and Facilities Management. As part of its review of these operations, Huron surveyed faculty and staff across the institution. Based on the results of its survey, Huron identified a set of service-related issues to be prioritized and addressed. As a means to help Finance, Human Resources, and Information Technology make progress on the issues identified by Huron, the University authorized the development of a Service Alignment Initiative (SAI) to make improvements in relevant administrative processes.

**6P3: DESIGN, MAINTAIN, AND COMMUNICATE THE KEY SUPPORT PROCESSES CONTRIBUTING TO EVERYONE’S SAFETY AND SECURITY**

We engage in ongoing efforts to keep our campus community safe. Ohio University has a comprehensive, full-service police department (OUPD), with student Campus Safety employees who are very active in residence hall educational programs and enforcement. Student Affairs provides comprehensive educational programs in community standards, including alcohol use/abuse information. The office of Community Standards and Student Responsibility (formerly University Judiciaries) works to educate, rather than simply to penalize, student offenders of campus policies. The university maintains cooperative mutual aid agreements with many regional safety forces and emergency response organizations. Specific initiatives to inform the University community about safety issues include the following: email Crime alerts issued by OUPD; Web-based emergency notifications; an outdoor emergency alert notification system; a cell phone text alert emergency messaging system; active shooter training; a Critical Response Team that includes cross functional University membership and regularly scheduled planning and training. Occasionally, students exhibit behavior or communicate in a fashion that raises concern for the student's welfare or for the welfare of others in the community. In order to best respond to such occurrences, the Office of the Dean of Students maintains and coordinates the activities of the Student Review and Consultation Committee (SRCC).

Within the last three years, the university has created a division of Risk Management and Safety to create efficiencies and synergies with the following areas: Emergency Programs, Environmental Health & Safety, Laboratory & Radiation Safety, Occupational Health, Workers Compensation, and Risk Management & Insurance.

**6P4: MANAGE KEY STUDENT, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT PROCESSES**

Ohio University expects that employees of the academic and academic support units strive to respond and provide the best service possible to the stakeholders they represent. These expectations are emphasized in new employee orientations, professional development seminars, and unit retreats. The University's Board of Trustees recently adopted the following core values, which were developed over a year long process that included academic and academic support leadership as well as input from all senates:

- **Excellence** is our hallmark: outstanding people, ideas, and programs drive our educational mission.
- **Integrity, civility, and diversity** define our community: these values guide our leadership in a global society.
- **Stewardship** enhances our legacy: as Ohio’s first institution of public higher education, we are mindful of our accountability to the public trust.
Work request systems for Facilities and the Office of Information Technology allow stakeholders to view the progress of their requests, respond to questions, and offer feedback when the request is completed. Dining Services provides comment cards at all venues for stakeholder feedback. In Finance and Administration, departmental goals are linked to the strategic plan and regularly updated in weekly staff meetings. The President’s Office keeps a log of all stakeholder contacts to ensure that follow up is prompt and complete. The Libraries regularly monitors student comments from surveys and develops an action plan to address each issue.

The Strategic Alignment Initiative was designed to implement the strategic initiatives identified for Human Resources, Office of Information Technology (OIT), Finance, and Facilities on a day-to-day basis by revising their processes to meet stakeholder needs. The Enrollment Management planning unit was created to bring together Admissions, Financial Aid, and the Registrar’s Office to improve daily functioning of these operations.

6P5: DOCUMENT SUPPORT SERVICES TO ENCOURAGE KNOWLEDGE SHARING, INNOVATION, AND EMPOWERMENT
Ohio University's planning units and key functional areas have formal structures that include regular meetings with representatives from across campus to review processes and to work on improvements. Most notably these include:

- Budget Unit Managers from each planning unit
- Assistant Deans Council
- Chairs and Directors Council
- Human Resources Advisory Council
- Facilities Planning Advisory Council
- Information Technology Advisory Council
- Two separate enrollment management committees

The University's electronic work request system, Footprints, enables faculty and staff to work directly with service providers in OIT and Facilities. This system encourages regular updates and interaction between providers and users. Footprints allows for tracking of "ticket" progress, completion, and user satisfaction. The ongoing work of these areas is shared through the University's official communication medium, "Compass." This regularly-distributed newsletter shares with the entire University community information about innovations, news, changes in policies, environmental issues, etc.

The Academic program review process and ASIC both have established guidelines for unit self-studies. Academic and academic support units respond to these guidelines with year-long self-studies, which are then reviewed by different committees. Results of these reviews are shared with the unit, then the units' dean or vice president, then the EVPP and president, and finally the Board of Trustees. Action plans are developed to ensure that opportunities that are identified are documented. Progress is expected to be made by the next review.

Results (R)

6R1: MEASURES OF STUDENT, ADMINISTRATIVE, & INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES
OIR regularly conducts surveys, including satisfaction surveys of students and alumni to assess the quality and availability of support services. Several of these surveys focus on first-year students. In 2010 the First-Year Student Satisfaction (Treatment) Study was resurrected to assess student perceptions of treatment by University personnel, information, and services. Students rate how they feel they are treated by people, how they feel about the quality of information they receive, and how they feel about the quality of services they receive. University-wide and academic college breakdown results are available as well as results for various academic support units and functions (e.g., Admissions, Campus Care, Libraries, Registrar, Residential Housing). This study is designed to be conducted every three years on the Athens campus. OIR conducts first-year experience surveys on a three-year rotating basis: NSSE, CIRP, and ACT's Advising Survey. Institutional Research also conducts a survey of first-year student leavers, asking why they left Ohio University.
In addition, OIR conducts two follow-up studies of graduates, one and five years after they graduate. Questions ask about satisfaction with Career Services, advising, interaction with faculty, and many questions about the graduates' major program of study. Individual academic support units also conduct surveys of student satisfaction. For example, Dining Services conducts a needs assessment survey of its stakeholders every three years. Residential Housing regularly surveys its residents to assess students' perceptions about the quality of residential living. Most units conduct follow-up program evaluations, directed toward participants of support activities.

The Service Alignment Initiative was created to enhance academic support services to the university community. An external consulting firm, Huron Consulting, conducted user satisfaction surveys to create a basis to understand the level of support and to identify perceived deficiencies. The Academic Support Improvement Committee (ASIC) was created to sustain this assessment of support services as the university moves to RCM. As mentioned in 6P1, the Academic Support Unit Program Review is designed to provide regular and systematic measures of support services. The outcome of the review is to provide each unit with an action plan to help it provide better service to its stakeholders.

6R2: PERFORMANCE RESULTS FOR STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

The First-Year Student Satisfaction Study is perhaps the most comprehensive example of performance results and was developed to assess students' perceptions of treatment by university personnel, the quality of information they receive about campus offices and functions, and administrative processes they go through on campus. Students rated how they felt they were treated by people and the quality of the information they received, as well as the quality of service they received from a unit or function associated with processes in which students had participated. See 1R5 for an example. Results from this survey show that first-year students report overall high levels of satisfaction with their treatment from office staff, the information they receive, and the quality of service. The survey results also suggest several areas for further improvement, particularly the items rating how sympathetic staff are to student concerns and speed of service. For these survey items, approximately 20 percent of the student respondents gave unfavorable responses. Departments are following up with front-desk staff to make necessary improvements, which may be reflected in the next administration of the survey.

The Survey of Alumni is designed to collect information on Ohio University bachelor's degree graduates about five years after graduation. Summary tables containing results from the current and preceding six years of results are presented for the university as a whole. Following is a sample of graduates' satisfaction results, showing the most recent data available for each year's graduating class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC ADVISING AND GUIDANCE</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(percent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Satisfied</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Satisfied</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLEXIBILITY/ADAPTABILITY TO STUDENT NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely/Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, these results show a relatively stable set of responses from alumni, from 2000 through 2005, with approximately three-quarters or more of alumni reporting satisfaction (extremely/very satisfied or satisfied) with academic advising and guidance and with the university’s flexibility/adaptability to students’ needs; approximately one-quarter of alumni indicated that they were not at all satisfied in these areas. In the area of career planning and placement services, approximately seventy percent of alumni reported satisfaction (extremely/very satisfied or satisfied), and approximately thirty percent reported that they were not at all satisfied with these services.

6R3: PERFORMANCE RESULTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES
Following are two examples of performance results for administrative service processes. The first example comes from an academic support program review for University Mail Services that was conducted in 2012:

Internal Review Results
Upon a review of the seven categories on the Organizational Checklist (Excellence in Higher Education), University Mail Services’ staff consider external focus, process effectiveness, and faculty/staff workplace focus to be areas of strength. This is consistent with observations made by the ASUPR Steering Committee consultant. Three areas were highlighted by the staff as needing improvement: faculty/staff and workplace focus (regularly assessing workplace climate and faculty/staff satisfaction), leadership (encouraging and using feedback and performance reviews to improve leadership practices), and (using effective approaches for assessing and recognizing individual and group contributions. This is also consistent with the observations and analyses of the ASUPR Steering Committee consultant.

Stakeholder Review Results
While University Mail Services has previously participated in external surveys through its national association and previously gathered benchmarking data from peer institutions, internal stakeholder feedback has been gathered primarily from point-of-service contact and not through formally administered surveys or other data collection methods. While such individualized information is important, it does not allow the unit to develop a comprehensive and documented perspective of how its services are perceived and valued by internal stakeholders.

External Metric Review Results
University Mail Services has recently rejoined the National Association of College and University Mail Services (NACUMS). The association administers and publishes an annual benchmarking survey which Mail Services may use to compare its level of service and offerings to other similar institutions.

Unit Planning Goals & Milestones
Working with the ASUPR Committee consultant, the unit has articulated goals towards improving its use of data to more effectively assess its workplace climate and staff satisfaction, encourage and use performance reviews to inform leadership practices, and assess and recognize group and individual contributions.

Next Steps
1. Begin development of a survey/web-based data collection tool that supports the goal of formally encouraging customer feedback which in turn, may then be used for assessing and recognizing contributions of groups or individuals within the unit.
2. Utilize updated comparative data from peer organizations that integrate with the continuous improvement process. A key source would be data derived from the national association (NACUMS) listed above.

A second example comes from results of the Service Alignment Initiative. A survey of stakeholders was conducted about customer opinions of the Finance division. Overall, Finance received largely negative or neutral feedback from customers. Customers highlighted improving policies and procedures and improving communication as two key areas in need of significant improvement.
6R4: USE OF INFORMATION AND RESULTS TO IMPROVE SERVICES

The ASUPR/ASIC process includes an evaluation of data collection and data use and provides opportunities for support units to improve services and adapt to a culture of continuous improvement. Committees are formed with broad institutional representation to study a problem and recommend solutions. A recent example of this is the Student Scholarship Task force. This working group of faculty and staff recommended that Maguire and Associates be engaged to provide detailed statistical analyses of the University's institutional scholarship awards to improve admissions yield for desired groups of students. Initiatives are identified, and funding for improvements will follow if the initiatives align with the goals of the strategic plan.

As discussed in 6R3, results from the Survey of Alumni showed that while approximately seventy percent of alumni have reported satisfaction with career planning and placement services, approximately thirty percent have indicated that they were not at all satisfied with these services. The Career and Leadership Development Center (CLDC), which is now partnering with many of the academic colleges on shared positions and initiatives, has recently launched new career planning and placement initiatives, including offering ten sections of a first year career development course, “Career Planning in the Liberal Arts.” The CLDC also offers career coaching appointments and has expanded its offering of career fairs and other career-related opportunities for students.

Following the Finance example from 6R3, the Finance division was led through a series of service alignment discussions by Huron Consulting. As a result, Finance updated its Strategic Plan and revised its goals and strategic objectives to become more service-oriented. (See Improvement section below for details.)

6R5: COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE RESULTS

Many of the assessments that Ohio University uses were created internally to measure the university's impact in particular areas. Internal assessments typically are preferred because they offer greater face validity or relevance to Ohio University's particular setting. The disadvantage with preferring internally-developed instruments is that comparative data are not available. However, some assessments are conducted that provide comparative data, such as Residential Housing's use of EBI and OIR's use of CIRP and NSSE (1R6).

Improvement (I)

6I1: RECENT IMPROVEMENTS IN STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

The 2011 NSSE results in 6R5 document substantial improvement in key areas that have resulted from our continuous improvement efforts, specifically with respect to the FYE. NSSE helped the University identify a “freshman homelessness” problem for a number of academic programs, in which admitted students were not allowed to take courses in their major until the sophomore year. As a result, colleges such as Education instituted a freshman seminar class for all entering students. Additional improvements in offerings and services have been made, including tutoring, supplemental instruction for courses with high DFW rates, academic coaching, early alert identification, and disability/accessibility services.

See 6R4. Following the Finance example, specific goals for improving service were created. Detailed objectives, measures of effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction, and service level expectations were created with the aim of creating service agreements. Comparable strategic plans were created for the Office of Information Technology, Facilities Management, and Human Resources.
F-1.0.0 – Customer Service-Oriented Culture

GOAL OVERVIEW

Goal 1.0.0
Build and cultivate a customer service-oriented culture to provide exemplary service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objectives</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Develop service level expectations and develop service level agreements</td>
<td>1. Efficiency and Effectiveness Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Consider long-term reporting relationship of Customer Care Center</td>
<td>2. Partnership Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3. Engage customers and provide timely solutions to their needs</td>
<td>3. Level of Overall Customer Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Strategic Objective Supported</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Strategic Objective 1.1.0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>FY 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Strategic Objective 1.1.0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>FY 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**612: CULTURE AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT OF SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS**

Two different but related University initiatives help us select processes to improve. The first is the University's 4 x 4 strategic plan. Among the four supporting priorities is a commitment to exemplary student support services focused on helping students fulfill their academic promise. This commitment is operationalized through the ASUPR/ASIC process, from the academic support units' assessment and evaluation initiatives, their receptivity to OIR's Treatment (satisfaction) study, and the university's recent adoption of core values.

The second initiative is the implementation of RCM. RCM has identified two distinct service providers: the cost centers, or academic colleges and regional campuses, that provide academic services; and the academic support units, whose missions are expected to reflect their service to the academic units. In developing the RCM models, direct costs of these academic support services are being identified, and a "tax" (i.e., overhead) rate has been identified. The academic cost centers will soon be charged indirectly for this tax and directly for additional services. It will be incumbent on the academic support units to demonstrate their worth by showing improvements in their services. The Service Alignment Initiative was created to identify and improve deficiencies in OIT, Human Resources, Finance, and Facilities even before RCM is fully implemented.
AQIP CATEGORY 7: MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS

As large, complex, and decentralized as Ohio University is, it relies on a strong commitment to transparency and a strong commitment to shared governance. Ohio University does not have a formal continuous improvement program as might exist at a smaller institution, but it has a long tradition of measuring effectiveness and using data to inform decision making. University leaders routinely use a process-results-improvement cycle to identify issues and solve problems. Once an emerging issue is identified, people are selected who are in the best position to work on it, the issue is refined and defined, relevant information is collected and analyzed, resource needs are identified, and recommendations for action are made. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) often is the unit selected to assist in data collection and analysis. OIR transforms data into information that supports decision making. Other units are emerging to assist in this capacity. The recent implementation of the PeopleSoft student data system provided an opportunity for the University to implement Oracle Business Intelligence Executive Edition (OBIEE). Production reports ("dashboards") are being developed to give functional users greater access to operational data. Program reviews--academic and academic support--are being revised to culminate in action plans. Action plans (i.e., improvement plans) are now incorporated in the review process to place greater emphasis on using the reviews to improve programs and services. We judge the maturity level of the University's approach to this category as aligned.

Processes (P)

7P1: SELECT, MANAGE, AND DISTRIBUTE DATA TO SUPPORT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Openness of information on institutional effectiveness is a unique aspect of Ohio University’s culture. Few restrictions are placed on access to University information, as long as FERPA laws and University policy on appropriate use are satisfied.

The central University unit charged with selecting, managing, and distributing data to support programs and services at Ohio University is the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). OIR reports directly to the office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (EVPP), so it occupies a central place organizationally, yet it serves the stakeholders across the University. OIR responds to directives from the EVPP, who works with OIR to set performance and project goals. OIR staff sit on most major University committees and are therefore aware of strategic and day-to-day needs. As a result, a variety of studies and information resources are made available, communicated to stakeholders, and are kept current on the Institutional Research Web site and in response to direct requests. OIR publishes annual updates to the Compendium of Planning Information (see 7P2).

Decentralized data for day-to-day operational use are available. Data for analyses and reports created by individual departments are also available through the Oracle Business Intelligence Executive Edition (OBIEE) project, an outgrowth of the PeopleSoft Campus Solutions (student information system) project. OIT partners with functional units of Admissions, Financial Aid, and the Registrar's office to make "dashboards" (i.e., customizable data reports) available to users in academic and academic support units as needed. To date the primary objective of these reporting solutions have been to allow each office to manage internal operations, to provide basic operational reports to external users, and to provide ad-hoc reports on a per request basis. The Registrar’s Office provides access to unit-record enrollment, graduation, and course-related data to academic and academic support units for their operational needs. Access is given either by sharing the results of an ad hoc query run against modeled data within OBIEE or through end-user access to run the query on-demand. The Office of Student Financial Aid and Scholarships uses the OBIEE reporting system for multiple purposes.

OIR and other units regularly conduct studies, primarily through student, alumni, and employee surveys, as ongoing assessments or to answer research questions. For example, the Student Involvement Study, CIRP, ACT's Survey of Academic Advising, and NSSE are done regularly to help understand student behavior in and out of the classroom. These studies are carried out to support the institution's mission. Indeed, the mission of OIR is to provide central information and
analytical support for university planning, management, and assessment activities to help Ohio University fulfill its mission. OIR uses data and information to support decision making and strategic initiatives.

Ohio University has a long and well-documented history with institutional effectiveness and student assessment and planning information (see 1P18). The Offices of the EVPP and Institutional Research have provided central university-wide support for department-based assessment. For example, in 2013 OIR provided financial and knowledge support to the Department of English's Writing and Rhetoric Course Portfolio Assessment project.

In recent years, assessment at Ohio University has been done within two different frameworks. First, regular academic program reviews, called Academic Assessment, are conducted by every academic program every seven years (see 1P13). In addition, in 2008, the University began Academic Support Unit Program Review (ASUPR). All academic support units must go through a self-study process every seven years as well. ASUPR will become, under Responsibility Centered Management (RCM), one of three university governance committees. It will continue with its traditional role of encouraging continuous improvement and promoting a culture of assessment. But under the new governance role, it will also more closely review financial performance and efficiency of units and report directly to both the Provost and to the Vice President for Finance and Administration. As ASUPR, the review process was successfully completed on 13 departments. A revised committee charge has been developed with an expanded membership that includes faculty, associate deans, academic department chairs, OIR, and the Associate Vice President for Finance & Administration. The title of the committee has changed from Academic Support Unit Program Review (ASUPR) to that of Academic Support Improvement Committee (ASIC). See 6P1 for more information.

7P2: SELECT, MANAGE, AND DISTRIBUTE DATA TO SUPPORT PLANNING AND IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS
Addresses Core Component 5D.
As with 7P1, the central unit charged with selecting, managing, and distributing data to support programs and services at Ohio University is OIR. OIR staff sit on most major University committees and are therefore aware of strategic and day-to-day needs. As a result, a wide variety of studies and information resources are made available and are kept current on the Institutional Research Web site and in response to direct requests. OIR's primary responsibility, in addition to conducting state and federal reporting, is to be responsive to the University's needs to enable it to achieve its mission. OIR publishes annual updates to the Compendium of Planning Information. The Compendium contains 25 performance indicators for academic units on performance and productivity (enrollment, credit hour production, retention and graduation rates, instructional resources, admissions statistics, degree production, etc.). The content of the Compendium changes in response to requests from the EVPP and/or the academic colleges and departments. For academic and academic-support units, customizable reports are available with edited data sets. In addition, requests for ad hoc studies and analyses can be fulfilled by consulting with OIR staff.

The University Fact Book presents detailed information on enrollment, degrees, fees, faculty salaries, including comparisons with other state universities. Changes to its content, as well as to the Compendium, are updated with suggestions made by the EVPP, other planning unit heads, and based on availability of data, especially comparative data.

The president, EVPP, academic and regional campus deans, et al. use OIR's Compendium data, retention and graduation rate studies, comparative data on peer universities, faculty and staff salary studies, etc. as they carry out their duties. The president and EVPP give performance updates at each Board of Trustees meeting. Examples from the August 2013 meeting included updates on becoming a tobacco-free campus, guaranteed tuition plan, licensing revenue, enrollment, the capital campaign, Bobcat Student Orientation, and a detailed report on the economic impact of the University on the state of Ohio. Academic deans take turns reporting on their college dashboards at Board of Trustees meetings. Budget hearings
are held by the EVPP and the Vice President for Finance and Administration, in which University and college dashboard data and Compendium data are used for discussions about performance and efficiency as resource allocation decisions are made.

Transparency is a common goal of groups charged with planning and managing at Ohio University. The EVPP Office, Budget Planning Council, Quarters to Semesters Transition Team, and other groups post their notes and reports on University Web sites. These reports often include detailed data on University performance indicators. The President’s report to the Board of Trustees and the EVPP’s University Dashboard are made available on University Web sites. The University's Environmental Scans and the EVPP’s and Vice President for Finance and Administration's strategic initiatives are available to the University community on the EVPP Web site.

**7P3: DETERMINATION OF THE NEEDS OF DEPARTMENTS RELATED TO THE COLLECTION, STORAGE, AND ACCESSIBILITY OF DATA AND PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

Academic units rely on OIR for performance data. The Compendium of Planning Information, produced by this office, contains over 25 performance indicators for colleges and departments/schools. Institutional Research primarily functions to ensure that the university community is well-informed with reliable data to carry out its mission effectively and efficiently. Ad hoc information needs are determined and met on an as-needed basis. Standing committees and groups of faculty and staff determine the University’s systematic information needs. External forces, such as the Ohio Board of Regents, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the federal government (e.g., IPEDS), and private agencies such as *US News and World Report*, often determine information requirements as well. OIR regularly seeks input from University stakeholders regarding their need for academic and planning information through their participation on various University governing committees.

Office of Information Technology's Information Technology Advisory Group and Faculty Technology Advisory Group help OIT understand and determine the collection, storage, and accessibility of information needs of academic and academic support units. OBIEE is being developed as an efficient tool to help OIT and the PeopleSoft functional units (Admissions, Financial Aid, and Registrar) better respond to requests for day-to-day data. The Office of Information Technology relies on subject matter experts in Enrollment Management and Finance for guidance in determining data requirements.

With the implementation of the RCM budget model, incentives and accountability have been placed at the college level. Colleges have responded to this change by creating additional analytic capabilities to develop models to quantify the financial impact of academic activity as well as to monitor the quality of academic activity to ensure financial incentives are balanced with academic quality goals. Dashboards and queries have been built to provide access to financial data, student record data and human resources data to support this effort. Governance groups and data steward groups exist to monitor and control data needs and distribution. The Budget and Planning Office and budget and finance officers from the academic colleges also provide input into this process.

The RCM process now requires academic support units to collect and analyze data pertaining to performance and costs. While each support unit is responsible for such collection, OIR has presence on the University review body—the Academic Support Improvement Committee—to understand data support units might need and advise on available data that might be pertinent.
7P4: INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS OF DATA AND INFORMATION ON OVERALL PERFORMANCE AND COMMUNICATION THROUGHOUT THE INSTITUTION

Addresses Core Component 5D.

The University included measurable and attainable goals and objectives when developing Vision Ohio and the 4 by 4 strategic plan, which grew out of Vision Ohio. The University Dashboard was designed to address the Four Fundamentals and the Four Supporting Priorities. Each academic college has developed its own College Dashboard to complement the University Dashboard. Most of the information for the University Dashboard comes from OIR. These dashboards provide an overview or summary view of the organizational performance and regularly are communicated to the Board of Trustees. OIR collects and posts institutional performance reports and detailed unit performance reports (e.g., Compendium Department Profiles) online where they are available to the University leadership, department heads, and the University community. These reports include daily admissions and enrollment updates, retention and graduation studies, and results of student assessments. OIR annually updates its peer university study, which compares institution-wide indicators with the University’s 10 institutional peers. Ohio University also actively participates in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA); OIR coordinates VSA updates.

For the transition to RCM, Ohio University engaged Huron Education Consulting Group to advise on a wide range of critical topics. Huron was asked, to propose a revised academic support unit review process that incorporates comparative financial and cost data for each program being reviewed. In May, 2013 Huron provided a provided an “Operating Manual” for the revised committee. Huron Education relied almost exclusively on the ASUPR process and objectives in making their recommendation for “a collaborative, evidence-based process to stimulate planning and outcomes that align closely with the university’s vision and mission, and to create and perpetuate a culture of continuous improvement.” The proposed process acknowledges that few support units operate from a strategic plan with clearly defined success metrics. Of those, even fewer possess sophisticated tools and processes to measure performance over time. Because of this, the committee will focus on working with units to incorporate such analytical and planning elements into their practices.

Support units will present a broad overview of what structures, policies, and programs are used to deliver service, and then create a multi-year strategic plan that outlines those items that will direct future efforts to improve performance. In some cases, support units may spend the several months on items – benchmark studies, customer surveys, and employee focus groups – that feed the development of the strategic plan. In addition, external benchmarking data will be required of each unit to compare their costs and service effectiveness to peers. This will enable the unit to gain clarity on those unit-level activities that best support the university mission. Over time, it is anticipated that the committee’s role will be to shift its focus to how the unit is performing against its strategic plan and external cost metrics, how well that performance translates to meaningful impact for the university mission, and what the unit is doing to address any performance gaps. This committee reports directly to the EVPP and the VPFA and will regularly report to the Deans and Vice Presidents through academic leadership and executive committee meetings.

The Office of Information Technology provides data models on a BI platform and access to developers to its constituents in Enrollment Management and Finance for analysis, report authoring and delivery. The University uses the OBIEE reporting functions to determine the performance of delivered and custom PeopleSoft processes. OIR's online data query builder tools are being upgraded, expanded, and integrated into OBIEE.

7P5: DETERMINE THE NEEDS FOR COMPARATIVE DATA AND SELECTION CRITERIA FOR SOURCES OF COMPARATIVE DATA WITHIN AND OUTSIDE HIGHER EDUCATION

Internally, the 4 x 4 Strategic Plan influences the information needed. The University Dashboard was designed to include reliable and comparative data. Also, the University participates in assessments such as the NSSE, which provide comparative information. Externally, the University System of Ohio/Ohio Board of Regents and the National Center for
Education Statistics/IPEDS influence information availability. In addition, the University relies on the expertise of Institutional Research for advice regarding the availability of reliable comparative information and trend data.

Several academic support units regularly benchmark service satisfaction and cost ratios against external comparative data. The University Libraries assesses service and cost both within the state and against its national Association of Research Libraries peers. Dining Services compares cost against meal plans of peer Ohio institutions. Residential Housing has extensive assessment of student use and needs towards satisfaction of campus dorms. Such assessment has resulted in improved dining halls, construction of new campus housing, and is informing plans for library renovation.

7P6: DEPARTMENT AND UNIT ANALYSIS THAT ALIGN WITH INSTITUTIONAL GOALS / SHARING THE ANALYSIS

The University Dashboard provides a template for academic colleges to monitor progress toward institutional goals. The colleges' dashboards resemble the University's dashboard in content, given the availability of college-level data. In addition, regular academic program reviews and assessment of teaching, learning, and student services help ensure this alignment. Ad hoc reviews, such as the comprehensive review of all graduate programs in 2008-09, also help ensure this alignment. Furthermore, the Academic Leadership (primarily academic deans) established a set of academic quality indicators for all academic units to follow as the University adopts RCM:

- Appropriate mix of full-time faculty
- Tenure-Track faculty workload
- Research and creative activity production
- Course duplication and hoarding
- Section size
- Time to graduation

- Grade inflation
- Incoming student profile
- Program accreditation
- Support for honors programs
- Interdisciplinary programs

Different institutional entities are called upon to provide monitoring: the University Curriculum Council Review Committee; departments completing self-studies for the academic program review; RCM review panel; academic colleges; the EVPP. Finally, Academic Support Unit Program Review (ASUPR) was designed to tie academic support programs and services to the University's academic mission and goals.

OIT relies on subject matter experts in Enrollment Management and Finance for guidance in determining data requirements. In its Registrar dashboard training materials, end-users are told that unit-record data available through the dashboards is for operational use only and that any aggregate data that must be reported out of the institution or used for analysis be obtained from OIR. The Office of Student Financial Aid and Scholarships utilizes the automation of OBIEE reports that provides listings on a weekly basis directly to staff members for review. They utilize the OBIEE dashboard features to share data across university departments. They have comprehensive dashboards that have been developed specifically to be used internally and by college scholarship chairs to assist in making scholarship recommendations for both new, incoming freshmen and continuing undergraduate students.

7P7: TIMELINESS, ACCURACY, RELIABILITY, AND SECURITY OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND RELATED PROCESSES

Implementation of the new PeopleSoft student information system in 2011-12 was to include a major focus on enterprise reporting and data warehousing. Implementing the data warehouse has been delayed in favor of implementing the OBIEE solution. OBIEE has been deployed and is being piloted in a limited number of units as resources allow to support its use. Using OBIEE and other tools, OIR's sole mission is to provide reliable and timely management and planning information to the University community. Training in the use of PeopleSoft and OBIEE is ongoing.
Access to data is strictly controlled under the supervision of data stewards. Accounts are provisioned and roles are granted on a case by case basis, with documented approvals. User role assignments are exposed in the BI platform to allow data stewards to periodically review this information. The Office of Information Technology provides near-real time reporting. Accuracy is considered of paramount importance: subject matter experts in Enrollment Management, Finance, and Institutional Research validate any changes to data models before production use. OIT uses a number of database and systems technologies to verify accuracy as well. Reliability is achieved by implementing tools such as Oracle Database, Oracle Active Data Guard, Oracle Business Intelligence, and careful systems monitoring. OBIEE’s Registrar-related data models are either hour-old or real-time against the student information system. In terms of accuracy and reliability, much time and effort was spent collaborating on the design and function of the data models within OBIEE. As data anomalies are discovered, the models are adjusted accordingly or query-writers learn what may be found in the data. As for end-user security, Registrar-related dashboard users and ad hoc report recipients agree up front to abide by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and agree to use the data only for their intended purpose. End-users are told the data received must be maintained securely and only used for their intended purpose. The Office of Student Financial Aid and Scholarships: using OBIEE, the office is able to proactively investigate issues found on a particular student’s file to determine if issues are more widespread or isolated. This assists in ensuring accuracy and reliability.

**Results (R)**

**7R1: MEASUREMENTS COLLECTED REGULARLY**

The University regularly evaluates measurements for relevance, timeliness, cost, and effectiveness. Institutional Research regularly updates its studies and reports to meet changing needs. The University seeks a balance between keeping measures constant to facilitate trend analyses and changing measures to meet new needs. Units regularly ask for changes to ongoing data collection projects. These changes result in improvements in OIR’s information systems.

The UCC’s Academic Assessment (program review) criteria continually undergo renewal and updates to improve the process. Major process redesigns occurred in the last few years. The most recent changes were done to include measures of evidence of quality teaching and learning and a formal action plan to address areas needing improvement before the next review.

The academic support program review process recently was improved to include organizational climate assessment, operating performance evidence, stakeholder feedback, and elements of strategic planning, linking the unit's mission to the University's.

Academic units now have dashboards tracking key metrics such as enrollment, retention, completion, as well as metrics unique to each college. These are reviewed by the President, EVPP, and Board of Trustees.

**7R2: EVIDENCE THAT THE INFORMATION FOR MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS MEETS INSTITUTIONAL NEEDS IN ACCOMPLISHING MISSION AND GOALS**

The University Dashboard was designed to address the Four Fundamentals and the Four Supporting Priorities. This dashboard was created at the request of the Board of Trustees. The EVPP created the 19-cell University dashboard with consultation from academic deans, OIR, University leaders. The EVPP presentation to the Trustees was well received, and they asked for comparable dashboard presentations from each academic college. Most of these dashboards have been created and presented.
Ohio University has been a leader nationally in measuring effectiveness. The assessment timeline presented in 1P18 shows that there have been some significant milestones in the University's assessment history. Since the University has been in AQIP, the HLC expectation that all academic programs assess student learning objectives has been subsumed under the Action Projects (some of which focused on general education assessment or assessment of the first year experience) and the nine AQIP categories. Presently, the University leadership recognizes that among its academic units, a range of effectiveness of assessment activities exist. Some units carry out assessments as required by their specialized accreditors. Some units carry out assessments with little outside impetus and are able to document continuous improvements. Some units have fledgling assessment efforts with little documented evidence of improvement, even though indirect measures, such as student demand, suggest they are offering worthwhile programs. Ohio University is working to improve its assessment efforts to improve teaching and learning in all of its academic programs, on- and off-campus.

**7R3: COMPARATIVE RESULTS**

Much of the answer to this question is anecdotal and reputational. Among public universities in Ohio and among similar universities nationally, OIR, the University's unit charged with measuring effectiveness, has been known to be a leader and innovator for decades. Routinely, the Ohio Board of Regents staff have called upon Ohio University's OIR staff to lead discussions for statewide consultations. OIR was recognized as a leader in using IPEDS data; for two years a member of OIR's staff was an IPEDS trainer. OIR staff have led state and national panels on using institutional data in measuring effectiveness. OIR's Web site has become known around the state of Ohio as comprehensive and innovative.

Academic Support Unit Program Review—recently expanded and renamed to be the Academic Support Improvement Committee—is an innovative program unique to Ohio University. In Huron Consulting Group’s work in guiding the campus transition to RCM, they concluded that the work of ASUPR to be national best practice. A key expectation of the Academic Support Improvement Committee assessment is benchmarking service satisfaction and unit costs against external peers. While many support units are beginning to compile such data several support units have compiled and now regularly use peer-benchmarking as part of their planning efforts. Residential Housing, for example, maintains extensive metrics on the costs and services in relation to peers. Such data formed the basis for the bonding of new residence halls and university apartments. The University Libraries regularly collects metrics pertaining to student and faculty satisfaction with library services and collections through a national survey, LibQUAL+. This survey of library users (and non-users) is comparable across national peers and has formed the basis of the Library’s 2012 Strategic Plan.

**Improvements (I)**

**7I1: RECENT IMPROVEMENTS IN MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS**

Major process redesigns occurred in the last few years. Academic Support Unit Program Review has been improved to better fit an RCM environment with a more focused charge, expanded membership, improved reporting, and more clear expectations for data analysis on behalf of support units. Now titled “Academic Support Improvement Committee,” it will continue with its role of encouraging continuous improvement and promoting a culture of assessment. But under the new governance role of RCM, it will also more closely review financial performance and efficiency of units.

Institutional Research strives to be of service to the University community by operating with a commitment to continuous improvement and by providing rapid and reliable service. OIR's mission is to provide central information and analytical support for university planning, management, and assessment activities to help Ohio University fulfill its mission. OIR encourages open and candid suggestions for improvements in the information and reports it produces. Annual changes are made to the Compendium of Historical Planning Information based on suggestions and requests from the academic colleges and the EVPP. The director of OIR recently retired from that position, and the title of the position was changed to
Association Provost for Institutional Research and Effectiveness to emphasize the University's interest in reliable and useful information to help it meet its goals and objectives. OIR is updating its dynamic query builders to meet the changing data and information needs identified in the RCM implementation. OBIEE continues to be developed as an efficient tool to help OIR, OIT and the PeopleSoft functional units better respond to requests for day-to-day data.

712: CULTURE AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT OF MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS

Two HLC-related events have helped Ohio University improve in this area. First, the impending reaffirmation of accreditation in 2015-16, and the Systems Portfolio and Quality Checkup Visit just prior, have enabled the University to increase visibility of assessment and evaluation. Academic program review was reworked over the last two years to include assurance of learning requirements and verifiable action plans.

Second, HLC’s revision of the Criteria for Accreditation, including making Criterion Four a separate criterion on demonstrating effectiveness, has made this expectation much more clear. As an AQIP institution, it was difficult to focus on improving teaching and learning as a primary assessment activity because all activities were based on process-results-improvement, and assessing student learning objectives became lost in the "noise" of all of the other expected improvement cycles. In preparation for the reaffirmation of accreditation review and beyond, Ohio University is working to develop a sustainable culture and infrastructure of assessing teaching and learning that will help it document that it is achieving its vision, to be a transformative learning community.

In addition, RCM has initiated the Service Alignment Initiative and a revision of the academic support review process. These two improvements will extend across the entire institution and help it improve performance in academic and academic support units. An example of this improvement from SAI comes from OIT. Before upgrading to new versions of Blackboard, OIT now pilots the proposed newer version and solicits faculty feedback. Faculty who agree to have their course in the Blackboard pilot receive training and regular communication from OIT. Feedback from both faculty and students is gathered to help determine how OIT can best implement the new version campus wide. Additionally, new tools can be installed in Blackboard (referred to as building blocks) by faculty request.
AQIP CATEGORY 8: PLANNING CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Much of the 2010 Systems Portfolio was based on Ohio University's major strategic planning effort of the previous four years, Vision Ohio. After one year of implementation, the University leadership realized that Vision Ohio, with its 130+ objectives, was too detailed to sustain. At the request of the Board of Trustees, Vision Ohio was condensed into four fundamentals and four supporting priorities. This 4 x 4 model now forms the context for all planning efforts. Decisions about requests for new resources and evaluation of academic support unit performance are based on the extent to which they support this 4 x 4 plan. As part of this evolution of the strategic plan, the university has engaged in several major efforts including the updating of the university mission and vision, performing environmental scans (university-wide and one for each college), and creating a statement of core values. In addition, the University's AQIP Steering Committee is being reconstituted as the AQIP Task Force. Among the Task Force's charges is an effort to communicate the principles of AQIP and the HLC Criteria for Accreditation to the University community, especially with regard to AQIP Category One, Helping Students Learn and Criteria Three and Four, Teaching/Learning and Evaluation/Improvement. An Action Project is planned to help the University develop a student success assessment plan that it can sustain and improve over time. The implementation of RCM will provide additional support for academic units to continuously improve as they develop innovative and desirable programs that will help them generate new resources. RCM will provide additional support for academic support units to continuously improve as they will be asked to provide increasing levels of quality service. We judge the maturity level of the University's approach to this category as integrated.

Processes (P)

8P1: KEY PLANNING PROCESSES

Ohio University's planning is guided by the 4 x 4 strategic plan which grew out of Vision Ohio. With the hiring of the new EVPP and the realization that Vision Ohio was too detailed to practically sustain and difficult to concisely communicate, it was distilled into four fundamentals and four supporting priorities at the request of the Board of Trustees. This contemporary 4 x 4 strategic plan forms the context for all discussions with the Board of Trustees and guiding principles in decision-making by academic deans, vice presidents, and department heads. Requests for new resources are evaluated by these leaders in terms of whether or not they support the values and principles of this 4 x 4 plan. The following graphic summarizes the plan; it is familiar to the University community.
The University has several planning processes involved in major resource allocation efforts with a number of individuals or committees responsible for carrying them out. Strategic Planning for the university is the responsibility of the President and EVPP using groups such as Deans-Executive Staff Council, Academic Leadership (Athens, RHE deans, vice/associate provosts) and the Board of Trustees. The budget construction process involves groups such as the Budget Planning Council, Student General Fee Committee, Course Fee Committee, RCM Governance Committee, Strategic Alignment Initiatives Group and Academic Support Unit Review Committee. Committees dealing with the enrollment management plan include the Enrollment Management Advisory Committee and the Strategic Enrollment Steering Committee. Planning for facilities and space occurs in multiple groups including Facilities Planning Advisory Committee, Capital Planning Team, Space Management Committee and Capital Funding and Priorities Committee. Planning for information technology needs uses groups such as the Information Technology Governance Committee, Student Administrative Systems Governance Group, Small IT Systems Committee, Student Technology Advisory Group, Faculty Technology Advisory Council, Data Stewards Group and Web Advisory Group.

As part of this strategic planning, the university has engaged in several efforts including the updating of the university mission and vision, performing environmental scans (university-wide and one for each college), and creating a statement of core values (see 5P4). The university-wide environmental scan was conducted by a nine-member team that included representation from academic department chairs, faculty senate, the Athens community, deans and vice presidents. It was shared with the university community through open forums, presentations to planning units and the Board of Trustees.

8P2: SELECTING SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM STRATEGIES

_Vision Ohio_ consisted of over 130 distinct strategic objectives in 40 pages, which became practically unworkable to conceptualize, manage, and monitor. The deans and executive staff reviewed the original plan during the summer of 2009 and endorsed a document containing six strategic priorities that they then shared with the Board of Trustees before their August 2009 retreat. The Board used the retreat to produce a strategic priorities document on which they reached a consensus during the October Board of Trustees meeting. Executive Vice President and Provost Benoit charged the Vision Ohio Steering Committee (VOSC), a university-wide committee with representatives from each constituent group, with reviewing the two documents, seeking input from their constituents on them, and ultimately producing a single set of strategic priorities that corresponded to existing strategic planning areas. The deans and executive staff, heads of the constituent senates, and all chairs and directors of academic units then completed a prioritization exercise using the VOSC set of priorities. The results of the exercises were compiled and served as the basis for the Board of Trustees’ discussion at its January meeting. After the January meeting, the campus community had the opportunity to review the proposed priorities and provide comments. The comments were reviewed by VOSC and adjustments were made. The priorities were presented again at the April Board of Trustees meeting in the following form:

- Enhance the quality of the undergraduate curriculum and the graduate curriculum through assessment and the Q2S transition.
- Bolster graduate education and associated efforts of faculty in research and creative activity.
- Establish effective strategic short-term and long-term enrollment planning to ensure recruitment goals (quality and mix of students) and revenue projections are met.
- Institute effective compensation policies and practices to reward and retain talented faculty and staff
- Launch a $350 million capital campaign focused on supporting core academic initiatives.
- Improve the institution’s financial strength so that fiscal and capital resources are stable and permit ongoing strategic investment.

While work proceeded on the priorities, the President led a university-wide process to create a vision statement for the university. The new University Vision Statement (endorsed by the Trustees at the June 2010 meeting) states that “Ohio University will be the nation’s best transformative learning community where students realize their promise, faculty advance knowledge, staff achieve excellence, and alumni become global leaders.”
In May 2010, President McDavis announced the advent of a multi-year planning approach for Ohio University. In making his announcement, he referenced the strategic planning work, which yielded six strategic priorities and a Vision Statement. The priorities and the new University Vision Statement were used to construct a more focused strategic planning platform, Vision 2016, better suited to the needs of a multi-year approach. The first two priorities were expanded to the Four Fundamentals and oriented around the vision statement’s goal.

These objectives were refined and condensed into four fundamentals x four supporting priorities with input from a comprehensive environmental scanning effort, which will guide strategic planning through year 2016. This 4 x 4 model guides selection of short- and long-term strategies, which result from various planning processes occurring throughout the academic year. A recent result of this type of planning was characterized as "Smart Growth" and presented to the Board of Trustees in August 2013. A representative sample of the University's planning efforts to address the competitive environment, be innovative, and respond to emerging trends to recruit and retain students includes the following:

- Enrollment Management Plan
- Expanded eLearning Initiatives
- General Education Goal Assessment/Revision
- Scholarship Task Force
- Undergraduate Scholarship Investment Program
- Academic Computing Initiatives
- Tuition Guarantee Program
- Expanded Pathways for Student Segments (e.g., Transfers, Veterans)
- Residential Housing, Phase I

8P3: DEVELOPING KEY ACTION PLANS TO SUPPORT ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGIES

University-wide committees are charged with the task of developing key actions plans, such as those for budget prioritization, enrollment management, and information technology (see 8P1 above) and aligning them to the 4 x 4 model. These individual plans are vetted through the executive leadership of the University, including the president, EVPP, vice presidents, deans, and ultimately the Board of Trustees.

The University's AQIP Steering Committee is being reconstituted as the AQIP Task Force. Its purpose is to:

- review the AQIP Systems Portfolio and assist in its completion and submission by November 1, 2013;
- review HLC’s response to the Systems Portfolio, the Systems Appraisal, and help draft a response;
- help disseminate Systems Appraisal findings to the University community;
- help develop an action plan to address opportunities for improvement in the Systems Appraisal;
- assist with preparation for the AQIP Quality Checkup (on-site) Visit to occur in 2014-15;
- assist with selection of the University's AQIP Action Projects;
- promote the university community's engagement in AQIP accreditation activities.

8P4: COORDINATE AND ALIGN PLANNING PROCESSES, ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGIES, AND ACTION PLANS ACROSS ORGANIZATIONAL LEVELS

Further refocusing and distillation of the previous Vision Ohio strategic plan has resulted in the creation the 4 x 4 model (see 8P1 and 8P2 above). All planning processes focus on these fundamentals and priorities, which serve as the means through which all organizational strategies, and action plans are aligned and coordinated. It is the responsibility of the coordinators of each of the planning processes to ensure that their efforts contribute substantively to progress in achieving the strategic fundamentals, which are supported by the four supporting priorities. The president and EVPP carry the 4 x 4 strategic plan message to different audiences at every opportunity. The president delivers an update to the Board of Trustees at each meeting (five times per year). The EVPP carries the message to the academic deans, and the deans carry the message to their faculty and programs. The deans are expected to actualize the 4 x 4 priorities in their colleges, especially as they become responsibility centers under RCM. The University dashboard was created to help coordinate, prioritize, and communicate about the 4 x 4 plan. College dashboards are being created for each academic college that replicate in format and content, as much as possible or appropriate, the University dashboard.
8P5: DEFINE OBJECTIVES, SELECT MEASURES, AND SET PERFORMANCE TARGETS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

University leaders (e.g., EVPP, academic deans) define and select objectives for support by their relevance to the 4 x 4 plan. Measures for which relevant, reliable and informative data exist were selected to be included in the University's dashboard by the EVPP. Colleges' dashboards are expected to follow the University's template, where similar data exist. Each academic dean presents his/her dashboard to the EVPP and to the Board of Trustees for feedback and accountability and use the dashboards internally with their faculty and staff and externally with their advisory boards.

8P6: LINK STRATEGY SELECTION AND ACTION PLANS, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT LEVELS OF CURRENT RESOURCES AND FUTURE NEEDS

Addresses Core Component 5A.

The Board of Trustees delegates the University's operation to the President. The Board of Regents distributes about $130 million in state operating revenues annually but does not directly influence University operations, except through general policy guidelines and program approval. The President bears ultimate responsibility for moving the University forward on the 4 x 4 strategic plan, with regular reports to the Board of Trustees. Budget Planning Council (BPC) is jointly chaired by the EVPP and the Vice President for Finance and Administration as the President's advisory body charged with:

- Ensuring overall financial policies and budgetary guidelines are consistent with and promote priorities.
- Recommending to the President the general assumptions and principles used in construction of the budget.
- Reviewing and recommending approval of tuition, fee, and internal rate requests.
- Monitoring and reviewing the University budget model.
- Conducting and utilizing scans of internal and external financial trends as part of the budget process.
- Receiving and reviewing the General Fee Committee’s recommendation(s) to the President.

In addition, BPC deliberates to annually set University planning priorities. In setting those priorities, resource availability and resource needs play an important role. The planning taking place by BPC and other planning entities places a priority on strategies that move the university forward on the four fundamentals and the four supporting priorities. Although the overall budget is approaching one billion dollars, availability of sustainable resources is central to defining new initiatives.

As Ohio University moves to an RCM environment, the academic colleges (i.e. "cost centers") will be able to establish their own processes for resource allocation to meet their academic missions, within the framework of the University's overall mission and strategic priorities. Budget hearings are conducted with every planning unit in the university. Hearings with central costs centers focus on the strategy of those units for delivering services to the colleges as efficiently as possible. Their allocations of resources are justified in the context of service level agreements and any additional resources they need can be requested. Hearings with the responsibility centers (colleges) involve a discussion of subvention levels needed to balance revenues and expenses while making investments in academic initiatives. The RCM governance committee will review the RCM model every five years to help ensure that the colleges follow the University's strategic plan and the Academic Support Unit Review committee will review the plans and performance of support units and the satisfaction with their services.

The University is well supported with infrastructure designed to provide tools for budgeting and monitoring expenses. Oracle Financials provides monthly expense reports to all departments. Concur is another tool used by all employees for reporting and tracking University expenses. Bobcat Buy and Comdoc are newer technologically-based tools, used in purchasing/procurement and printing activities, respectively, that create efficiencies for the institution as a whole and its departments. PeopleAdmin is the university's online system for receiving, tracking, and acting on employment applications. As part of the RCM implementation, the university is investing in new budgeting and reporting systems to provide responsibility centers with the information they will need to operate in the RCM environment.
Qualifications for newly hired faculty and staff are set by the hiring department. All departments are committed to hiring appropriately and highly qualified employees. Ohio University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer. Ohio University has a deep resource pool of fiscal and human resources to support its operations. The following table excerpted from the University's Fact Book shows a summary of the fiscal resources available, and the tables in 4P2 show a summary of the human resources available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>$144,999,895</td>
<td>$155,105,566</td>
<td>$151,734,370</td>
<td>$154,038,627</td>
<td>$136,636,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>$215,984,212</td>
<td>$229,594,651</td>
<td>$245,886,316</td>
<td>$267,334,343</td>
<td>$282,916,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants / Contracts</td>
<td>$78,214,400</td>
<td>$90,449,401</td>
<td>$99,374,960</td>
<td>$118,227,609</td>
<td>$112,356,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Services</td>
<td>$21,135,921</td>
<td>$24,622,431</td>
<td>$27,151,339</td>
<td>$57,890,440</td>
<td>$31,168,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Services</td>
<td>$69,154,022</td>
<td>$75,094,902</td>
<td>$82,392,704</td>
<td>$83,027,005</td>
<td>$87,059,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>$589,929</td>
<td>($15,432,315)</td>
<td>$12,244,259</td>
<td>$16,751,364</td>
<td>$3,658,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Capital</td>
<td>$17,603,472</td>
<td>$24,900,160</td>
<td>$19,547,635</td>
<td>$8,542,842</td>
<td>$6,200,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>$474</td>
<td>$5,980</td>
<td>$2,510,700</td>
<td>$2,512</td>
<td>$6,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$547,682,325</td>
<td>$584,340,776</td>
<td>$640,842,283</td>
<td>$705,814,742</td>
<td>$660,002,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8P7: ASSESS AND ADDRESS RISKS IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

Structures are in place for the University to avoid risk. The University has established a division of risk management and safety within the Vice President for Finance and Administration area. However, the University Risk Management Initiative has expanded to an all-encompassing definition of risk to include all types of risk and not just those which are insurable. Compliance, operational, reputational and economic threats, or core risks, are identified, assessed and either mitigated or negated before they disrupt the strategic objectives. University leadership is involved by advising the President regarding major risks and utilizing the line authority possessed by each in order to negate risks that may pose a threat to the institution. Data will be collected from individual interviews and surveys, which will ultimately produce a heat map. The URMI will then focus upon the most potentially severe and the most likely to occur of these risks for immediate remediation.

The possibility of risk was evident in the development of three of the four supporting priorities. Ensuring that enrollment goals are met, completing the $450 million capital campaign (of which $424.5 has been met as of May 2013), and strengthening the University's finances were intended to provide a strong foundation. Having this strong foundation enables the University to be more innovative in developing programs and services.

The university maintains a conservative financial strategy that budgets only 98% of projected tuition and subsidy revenue and does not budget investment returns. This allows the university to have a buffer for events such as enrollment downturns and when targets are met, creates a positive fund balance that can be invested in strategic priorities. This approach of ensuring that the University is strengthening its financial resources has allowed for the creation of an investment pool of $100 million, which is enabling the University to make strategic investments in the following areas:

- Creation of a gift matching program to allocate $25M towards a $75M scholarship endowment by matching (2:1) gifts to general scholarship programs
- Creation of a gift matching program to allocate $25M towards endowed professorships
- $8M in investments to seed academic and research programs
- $5.9M in investments in programs targeting student success
- $34.5M in infrastructure investments for technology and facilities
- $12.5 in investments targeting community programs and economic development
8P8: ENSURE TO DEVELOP AND NURTURE FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATOR CAPABILITIES TO ADDRESS CHANGING REQUIREMENTS DEMANDED BY ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

The university has always supported a tradition of professional development among its employees and recognizes that it is essential to the four fundamentals in the strategic plan. Indeed, the University's mission describes its "outstanding faculty of accomplished teachers whose research and creative activity advance knowledge across many disciplines."

Professional development opportunities for faculty are available through Academic Technologies and through the Center for Teaching and Learning, as well as within each academic unit (See IP9 and IP11). University Human Resources provides regular opportunities for classified and administrative staff development.

The compensation studies for faculty and administrative staff are designed to help ensure that employees' compensation is competitive, given the University's peers, job responsibilities, and our geographic region.

Results (R)

8R1: MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS COLLECTED AND ANALYZED REGULARLY

In September 2011, the senior leadership of Ohio University developed a university dashboard that aligned with the 4x4 strategic plan that evolved from Vision Ohio. The dashboard was intended to provide an ‘at a glance view’ of the current institution, monitor performance toward strategic priorities, academic quality, and those indicators needed to fulfill the fiduciary responsibilities for trustees. The dashboard included indicators that provide trend data and comparative data when available. Each of the priorities and fundamentals has at least one measure to determine effectiveness and ensure accountability. Nineteen measures were selected. The format was chosen after reviewing the best practices for other institutions' dashboards. The measures in the dashboard present five years of trend data and comparative data when available, highlighting the current year's measure. Representative measures from the four fundamentals and the four supporting priorities were selected. The measures are as follows:

Four Fundamentals:
- First-year retention
- Six-year graduation rates
- ACT Composite average score
- Student-Faculty Interaction rating from NSSE
- Student-faculty ratio
- Group I faculty
- Research and Creative Activity Expo
- Grants and Contracts

Total Compensation:
- Average faculty compensation
- Group I faculty retention

Capital Campaign:
- Gifts (pledges)

Financial Strength:
- Senate Bill 6 Composite
- Primary Reserve Ratio
- Debt Burden Ratio
- Investment Performance
- Deferred maintenance backlog

Enrollment:
- Tuition discount
- Undergraduate headcount

The measures are color-coded in the dashboard to reflect association with each fundamental or priority. Each academic college is developing a dashboard to complement the University dashboard, to show each college's progress in helping the University meet strategic priorities. Each of these measures is intended to show a summary representation of the strategic fundamental or supporting priority that it represents. Many different additional measures underlay each dashboard measure. For example, OIR produces an annual report, "Factors Associated with First-Year Retention" that includes dozens of retention-related variables.
The RCM Steering committee established a list of academic quality indicators to monitor once RCM is fully implemented, to ensure that the new budgeting process does not lead to colleges' maximizing financial performance at the expense of academic quality. The list is as follows:

- Appropriate mix of full-time faculty
- Tenure-track faculty workload
- Course Duplication and hoarding
- Section Size
- Time to Graduation
- Grade inflation
- Incoming student Profile
- Honors and interdisciplinary programs
- Program accreditation

8R2: PERFORMANCE RESULTS FOR ACCOMPLISHING ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

Following are the University's most recent strategic dashboard. An example of one of the college's dashboards, College of Health Sciences and Professions, is included next.

Ohio University Strategic Dashboard
College of Health Sciences and Professions Strategic Dashboard

8R3: PROJECTIONS OR TARGETS FOR PERFORMANCE OF STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS FOR NEXT 1-3 YEARS

At the August 2013 Board of Trustees Retreat, the EVPP and the Vice President for Finance and Administration gave a presentation on "Smart Growth." Given the University's Environmental Scan, the financial challenges that public universities are likely to face, and the fact the University’s performance in its strategic objectives have been improving, the case was made to the Board to embark on selected, disciplined planning effort. Given these efforts, Ohio University expects to continue to make steady progress in each of its strategic priorities. The decisions made about where to invest the University's annual budget and the $100 million strategic investment pool will advance the strategic priorities and enable the university to accomplish its mission and vision.

8R4: COMPARATIVE RESULTS

The University Dashboard includes comparative data on 11 of the 19 indicators. Ohio University's scores are above the Ohio public university averages on all of the measures, and Ohio University's financial ratios are better than the financial standards on all but one—deferred maintenance backlog.

Comparison studies on RCM have been a significant part of the RCM implementation at Ohio University. Teams of Ohio University faculty and staff travelled to Indiana University, Ohio State University and the University of New Hampshire,
and have hosted representatives from the University of Delaware and Kent State. Ohio University's RCM implementation compares favorably with other institutions in its transparency, relative simplicity, and its potential as a planning tool.

**8R5: EVIDENCE THAT SYSTEMS FOR PLANNING CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ARE EFFECTIVE/MEASURE AND EVALUATE PLANNING PROCESSES AND ACTIVITIES**

As measured by the indicators included in the University's and colleges’ dashboards, Ohio University is achieving its strategic objectives. Disciplined fiscal management has resulted in strong financial ratios and a $100M strategic investment pool. Enrollment and degree completions continue to increase. Base funding is available to continue to improve faculty compensation, compared to peer universities. Scholarship investments are increasing.

The university successfully completed several major initiatives including an academic restructuring of the College of Health and Human Services, the transition from Quarters to Semesters and the implementation of RCM. All of these initiatives represent projects with a large scope affecting numerous units that were conducted using an inclusive approach involving all constituents and extensive planning.

**Improvement (I)**

**8I1: RECENT IMPROVEMENTS IN PLANNING CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

The strongest improvements in this area are related to the implementation of RCM. RCM is being implemented at Ohio University to align resources with strategic priorities to help the University achieve its mission and vision. The University budget now will be prepared using a model that connects incentives and priorities. It empowers the academic colleges to combine efficiency, accountability, and attention to academic quality. It provides a planning structure that is more responsive, predictable, and stable. It relies on strong shared governance that necessitates collaboration among academic units. The RCM governance committees--Budget Planning Council, RCM Budget Implementation Committee, Academic Support Improvement Committee, and the Facilities Planning and Advisory Committee--already have been formed. The Strategic Alignment Initiative--focusing on the planning and improvement efforts of Human Resources, Information Technology, Facilities Management, and Finance--has begun to result in changes within those units including:

- Human Resources and Payroll have been reorganized under a single academic support unit. This reorganization was done to better align services to ensure a more comprehensive and service based approach to delivering critical HR and business services. It is apparent that this realignment creates more effective services and processes in the area of human resources and payroll to the academic units.
- Information Technology is developing a catalog of services so that it can better communicate how its resources are aligned with the processes and initiatives it controls. The IT governance structure is being changed to provide stronger oversight of major initiatives such as the update to the Oracle Financial system while streamlining the implementation of smaller systems and responding to the needs of academic units.
- Facilities staff are working to establish service level agreements and standard rates for services.

**8I2: CULTURE AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORTING PLANNING**

The culture of the University depends upon effective shared governance. Partnerships with the senates, along with clear communication, are critical in improvement efforts and in setting targets for improved performance. Representative groups, such as the Budget Planning Council, the RCM governance committees, and other University Standing Committees, play a critical role in identifying areas that will help it achieve its mission and vision.
AQIP CATEGORY 9: BUILDING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS
Ohio University is one of 13 public universities in Ohio, a research University with its own Board of Trustees, but also a member of the University System of Ohio. The University devotes considerable energy to coordinate and manage its relationships. It has many different structures and processes to ensure that the external relationships that are formed are consistent with its mission and objectives. From an MOU with the City of Athens to relationships with over 1,000 secondary schools, to international agreements with 130 organizations, Ohio University successfully coordinates these relationships. An enrollment plan, monitored by enrollment management committees, helps oversee the University's relationship with other educational institutions, domestic and international. Academic units maintain accreditation with 35 different agencies, with support from their colleges, the Executive Vice President and Provost's (EVPP) Office, Institutional Research, and others. The Ohio University system, including the 5 regional campuses, relies on relationships with service providers, internally and externally, to provide services to its stakeholders. Ohio University also steps out in leadership roles with its partners in state and national organizations to help the University achieve its mission. The President and EVPP are active leaders in the state of Ohio's Inter-University Council, University representatives participate in professional conferences to share the University's best practices, and the University has established collaborative relationships with organizations such as the Interlink Alliance. We judge the maturity level of the University's approach to this category as integrated.

 Processes (P)

9P1: CREATE, PRIORITIZE, AND BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS FROM WHICH WE RECEIVE STUDENTS
Ohio University developed an enrollment management plan in 2010, which provides enrollment targets that help guide admissions activities for all levels of students. Although Ohio University's Athens campus is a traditional residential campus, the University increasingly is serving nontraditional and distance learning students through its regional campuses and e-Learning. Enrollment Management coordinates with academic and academic support units to build relationships with organizations from which the University receives its students. Undergraduate Admissions, Student Financial Aid and Scholarships, the Graduate College, International Student and Faculty Services (ISFS), eLearning OHIO, and Regional Higher Education work collaboratively with academic units to provide information to prospective students and to build relationships with educational organizations and other organizations that supply students to Ohio University. The Enrollment Management Advisory Committee is charged with monitoring progress toward attaining enrollment goals and coordinating and communicating information pertaining to the goals of the Enrollment Plan.

Undergraduate Admissions creates and builds relationships by visiting over 1,000 high schools and sponsoring numerous campus visit days for prospective students. Recruitment is a campus wide responsibility at Ohio University. Faculty, students and admissions staff participate in the regular visitation days and meet with prospective students and their parents, as appropriate, to describe the university and its academic programs. Undergraduate Admissions staff members visit and communicate by phone/electronic/mailings to potential students as well as community colleges and technical schools in Ohio and the surrounding states to forge relationships with school counselors and other school officials.

Regional campuses host “College Nights” where potential students within their service region can visit the host Ohio University regional campuses and meet with admissions representatives from a number of area institutions of higher education, including the Ohio University regional campus host and the main (Athens) campus.

The University's Enrollment Plan includes targeted growth in nontraditional students--transfer students, relocating students from the University's regional campuses, and distance learning students. Over the last three years, the University has established partnerships with 15 community colleges in Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia:
Partnerships with community colleges provide a means by which students can build on their associate degree by taking courses at Ohio University to complete a bachelor's degree. Regional Higher Education creates and builds relationships with community college partners by establishing articulation agreements for general education requirements and by bringing associate and baccalaureate degree programs to students online and at community college campuses where students live and work. The RN–to–BSN program is the most popular program offered and has grown from a few hundred students to over 6,500 students in the last five years.

International student enrollment growth is a stated goal in the University's Enrollment Plan. The Senior International Management Team was created to coordinate international student recruiting activities. The following diagram shows the relationships among units involved with international student recruiting.

Ohio University supports 172 international educational programs in 56 countries on 5 continents. These programs involve partnerships with over 130 different organizations, primarily universities. Most of the programs provide internships, fellowships, career training and study abroad opportunities for Ohio University students.
The Graduate College works collaboratively with academic colleges, departments, and schools to create, prioritize and build relationships with educational organizations and other organizations and serves as the centralized admissions office for graduate students on all Ohio University campuses. However, academic units—not the Graduate College—make graduate admissions decisions and determine admissions requirements and deadlines.

9P2: CREATE, PRIORITIZE AND BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND EMPLOYERS WHO DEPEND ON THE SUPPLY OF STUDENTS AND GRADUATES

Creating, prioritizing, and building relationships with educational organizations and employers that depend on the supply of Ohio University’s students and graduates is accomplished, in part, through academic college/program and regional campus advisory boards. These advisory boards are comprised of employers and professionals in the field. Programs consult advisory board members regularly, to gather input as curricula are being developed or updated and to ensure the content is relevant to employers’ needs. These processes are reviewed internally every seven years as part of Ohio University’s Academic Program Review Process (1P4).

It is the responsibility of academic program directors/coordinators, who are typically faculty, within the institution to develop relationships with potential employers and other outside organizations who may offer students employment to begin their careers. In many cases these relationships begin by setting up clinical experiences, practica, and internships for students within the discipline. These activities happen extensively in the Nursing, Social Work, Business Management and Counseling fields.

Ohio University’s Office of Career Services coordinates career fairs and on-campus recruiting for employers as well as an online resume referral service. Bobcat CareerLink, allows employers to post job opportunities, access students’ resumes, schedule on-campus interviews and information sessions, and register for career events such as Career Fairs. This one-stop resource makes it easier to connect employers with students and graduates that meet employers’ needs.

Ohio University’s Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine works closely with its medical partners in the state in efforts to continue to bring high quality health care to the citizens of Appalachian Ohio. The establishment of the Health Sciences Center, a multidisciplinary entity between the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine and the College of Health Sciences and Professions, is a positive step forward in building relationships with educational organizations and employers within medical fields. Recently, the College established a formal partnership with the Cleveland Clinic, which will begin in July 2015 and add 32 new medical students to this northeast Ohio location. The College also established a formal partnership with Ohio Dominican University, in which 10 outstanding high school seniors will be selected for a "ODU-to-OU-HCOM Med School Early Acceptance Program." The goal of these programs is to help meet the need for primary care physicians.

9P3: CREATE, PRIORITIZE, AND BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH ORGANIZATIONS THAT PROVIDE SERVICES TO STUDENTS

Ohio University student services are provided directly by Ohio University employees, both faculty and staff, in almost all cases. Instruction, academic support services, student life (including housing, dining, recreation, and health) are operated solely by Ohio University. Service providers are employed only when it is determined that contract services will be significantly more effective or efficient.

Because of their smaller student population, regional campuses routinely partner with local businesses and other organizations to provide many services for students. For example, area health care providers have come to the regional campuses to provide Flu shots and HIV testing. Area banks and financial planners have provided financial literacy
seminars on the campus. Such partnerships also foster positive relationships between the regional campus and the communities they serve.

eLearning OHIO recognizes the need to provide distance learning students the same student services given to the on-campus students. In the 2012-13 academic year, eLearning OHIO started a Student Success Center to provide call center based retention services to the largest online degree completion program, the RN to BSN program. Ohio University works with a vendor partner, Pearson Embanet, to offer eight graduate online programs. Pearson Embanet offers enrollment and retention services to the Ohio University students who are part of their partnership programs.

9P4: CREATE, PRIORITIZE, AND BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH ORGANIZATIONS THAT SUPPLY MATERIALS AND SERVICES

Procurement Services is responsible for purchasing goods and service contracting, and related negotiations and contract administration in compliance with State of Ohio and federal law. Ohio University’s Purchasing Office negotiates vendor agreements and contracts, including customer service level agreements, and maintains a list of preferred vendors internal and external to the University. Legislation (both state and federal) and policies and procedures govern the operations of the Purchasing Office. The Purchasing Office is committed to recruiting new vendors and recruits minority or disadvantaged business enterprises whenever possible. Innovative programs have been piloted to create savings and efficiencies. Procurement has taken advantage of a statewide initiative using SCIQUEST that makes use of electronic purchasing and negotiates discounts on goods and services. Also, ComDoc was contracted beginning in 2012-13 to help centralize departments' and individuals' desktop printing needs and create efficiencies and cost savings.

When possible, the regional campuses utilize businesses and service providers within the campus’ service area. These partnerships allow the services to be provided efficiently and in a more cost effective manner. The relationships also foster positive community relations with the campus.

9P5: CREATE, PRIORITIZE, AND BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS, EXTERNAL AGENCIES, CONSORTIA PARTNERS, AND THE GENERAL COMMUNITY

Ohio University faculty, administrators, and staff create, prioritize, and build relationships with educational and professional associations, external agencies, consortia partners, and the general community participation in meetings, conferences, and professional development activities offered by these associations and organizations. Members of the Ohio University community attend these events, and in many cases, provide leadership through service to these organizations as members of their boards of directors or program chairs.

Academic programs in disciplines such as business, engineering, medicine, education, health science, just to name a few, are externally accredited by over 30 different accrediting agencies. Relationships with these agencies are built, sustained, and enhanced by the large number of faculty, administrators, and staff who participate in the accreditation process by writing annual and comprehensive self-study reports and preparing for and participating in site visits.

The University maintains memberships and participates in state and national educational organizations. Nationally, the University maintains a relationship such as the Association of Public Land Grant Universities, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the American Council on Education, and the Higher Learning Commission. Ohio University actively participates in Ohio's Inter-University Council, a 14-member association whose purpose is to "facilitate the development of common interest and concern of its members and to assist in sustaining and improving the quality of public higher education" (IUC Web site). President McDavis has served as Chair of the IUC Presidents. Recently he was named to serve on the Board of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).
The Office of Government Relations serves as a liaison between the University and the Governor’s Office, the Ohio General Assembly, Ohio Board of Regents, the United States Congress, and local, state, and federal agencies. This office initiates and coordinates, with the Office of Legal Affairs and others in the development of legislative proposals for consideration; coordinates University responses to proposed legislation, communicates the University’s position on legislative proposals and assists the President and members of President’s staff in helping shape the University’s legislative agendas at the state and federal levels.

The Office of the President has worked to improve relations between the University's Athens campus and the City of Athens. The president meets regularly with the mayor and the service safety director to discuss matters of mutual interest. The Ohio University-City of Athens MOU committee exists to strengthen university-city relations. In the 1980's, the University was granted receivership of several hundred acres, on which was located the "Athens Lunatic Asylum," a state mental health facility of local and regional historical significance. The Ohio University Ridges Advisory Committee was created to review the comprehensive land use plans for the area known as "The Ridges" and the university's progress toward its implementation. Its membership includes city, county, and University representatives.

The deans of the regional campuses are typically involved in the communities which their campus serves; by serving on economic alliance boards, chamber of commerce organizations, community improvement organizations, education task forces, community fundraising groups and service clubs.

Ohio University played a leading role in founding The Interlink Alliance. The nine member institutions in this partnership have pledged to work cooperatively in the key areas of faculty development, student leadership, and fostering interest in attending college among students as early as middle school. The Alliance's central purpose is the development and preparation of African American students to learn, live, and lead in the 21st century. Its mission is to recruit, retain, and encourage talented individuals to achieve their full potential for the betterment of community and society. The other Interlink Alliance member institutions include:

- Central State University, Wilberforce, OH
- Hampton University, Hampton, VA
- Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, NC
- North Carolina Central University, Durham, NC
- South Carolina State University, Orangeburg, SC
- Spelman College, Atlanta, GA
- Virginia State University, Petersburg, VA
- Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, OH
- [Interlink Alliance member institutions]

**9P6: ENSURE THAT PARTNERSHIP RELATIONSHIPS ARE MEETING THE VARYING NEEDS OF THOSE INVOLVED**

Given the decentralized nature of many of the partnership relationships that exist at Ohio University and the combination of units that may be involved in each one, continuous review of the operation, goals and benefits of each relationship and open communication are critical to making sure the needs of the partnerships are being met. Satisfaction surveys, assessment and evaluation reports are used in ensuring that the relationships between academic and international partnerships are achieving their goals. Admissions statistics produced by OIR are used to assess the quality of the academic collaborations and whether the stakeholder needs are being met. Expectations are communicated in the forging of articulation and reciprocity agreements with other academic institutions. These agreements are reviewed on a regular basis in order to determine if they remain beneficial to the parties involved. Academic curricular partnerships are assessed and reviewed as part of the program review process. Feedback from advisory boards and regional campus coordinating councils (business, education and community leaders) provide information about how well relationships are functioning.

Research partnerships with other institutions are assessed on a regular basis. The selected individuals, usually faculty researchers, control these agreements and are in the best position to determine whether the agreements achieve their goals.
and objectives. The Office of the Vice President for Research and Creative Activity oversees a formal process that reviews research centers and institutes on a five-year cycle.

**9P7: CREATE AND BUILD RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN AND AMONG DEPARTMENTS AND UNITS WITHIN THE INSTITUTION AND ENSURE INTEGRATION AND COMMUNICATION ACROSS RELATIONSHIPS**

Stakeholders share in the responsibility for defining and supporting the overall mission of the institution and in decision-making processes, a characteristic of a shared governance system. These responsibilities and activities require that relationships be forged and maintained among different organizations within the university, including students, faculty, staff and alumni. Committees, task forces and working groups that are formed to investigate issues important to the institution, have broad representation that helps build relationships and understanding among stakeholder groups. Budget Planning Council (BPC) is an example of this type of functioning. BPC members serve as representatives of the entire University community as they conduct council business. They also communicate to and receive feedback from their respective constituent groups on institutional budget policy and financial planning issues that impact the long-term health of the institution. Standing committee assignments through the Faculty Senate are also formed in a manner to ensure constituency membership is broad based, thus encouraging institutional relationships. Communication is encouraged by open discussions at these meetings and through private meetings with the executive committees of governing organizations and the university leadership. Representative University leaders such as the president, the EVPP, and the Vice President for Student Affairs regularly attend Faculty and Student Senate meetings, respectively.

The New Faculty Welcome, Faculty Senate activities as well as teaching and research workshops offered to faculty by the university support relationship building between colleges, departments, schools as well as the main and regional campus faculties.

Ohio University *Compass* is a regular electronic newsletter produced by the University’s Communications and Marketing department. An email containing headlines with embedded hyperlinks is sent to all Ohio University students, faculty, staff and alumni. *Compass* functions as a communication vehicle for the entire campus community and others interested in university news and activities.

**Results (R)**

**9R1: MEASURES COLLECTED AND ANALYZED REGULARLY OF COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS, EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL**

Ohio University systematically collects and analyzes data on several measures of building both internal and external collaborative relationships. Ohio University tracks the amount and nature of external funding; the number of patents, consortia agreements, technology transfer agreements, and the number and nature of start-up companies. The University collects and publishes admissions statistics on undergraduate and graduate students, transfer students, and subgroups such as international students. Ohio University also systematically gathers data related to educational opportunities and student life, including the number of students participating in internships and fellowships, education abroad programs, community activities and service learning projects. The Student Involvement Study, conducted annually by the Office of Institutional Research, collects information from Athens campus freshmen and seniors about students' perceived importance of and satisfaction with many of these activities. Some of Ohio University's campuses and academic programs use employer surveys to assess performance related to building collaborative relationships with employers that depend on Ohio University students and graduates to meet their needs. Annual evaluations of academic deans, the president, the EVPP, and others provide an opportunity to assess issues related to internal collaboration and cooperation. The university-wide
Service Alignment Initiative surveys provided the University community an opportunity to evaluate their perception of the relationship between Human Resources, Finance, Facilities, and Information Technology with the rest of the institution.

The Vice Provost for eLearning and Strategic Partnerships meets annually with each Community College partner to evaluate the partnership and to determine what potential programs can be added to the partnership.

**9R2: PERFORMANCE RESULTS IN BUILDING KEY COLLABORATIVE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS**

As described in 9R1, Ohio University has many sources of data for this area. Space limitations allow presentation of only a sample, which are presented as examples. Following are sample tables from OIR's Compendium of Historical Planning Information on admissions statistics:

**Admissions Statistics for New Freshmen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>12,684</td>
<td>10,781</td>
<td>4,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13,020</td>
<td>10,679</td>
<td>4,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14,046</td>
<td>10,931</td>
<td>3,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>14,204</td>
<td>11,591</td>
<td>4,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13,366</td>
<td>11,372</td>
<td>3,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>13,392</td>
<td>11,436</td>
<td>3,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>17,466</td>
<td>13,571</td>
<td>3,888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Admissions Statistics for Graduate Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,937</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4,348</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>1,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partnerships with community colleges have seen increased enrollment in transfer students:

**Athens Campus New Transfer Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>444</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following are summary tables of Ohio University's sponsored research activity that describe the growth and variety of funding partners:

**Fiscal Year Number Number Award**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number Proposals</th>
<th>Number Awards</th>
<th>Award Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>$ 57,201,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>$ 71,693,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>$ 60,342,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>$ 67,797,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>$ 66,466,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>$ 63,856,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>$ 64,216,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2012 Grants and Contracts by Source of Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Award Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>7,792,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Labor</td>
<td>4,989,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
<td>4,072,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Transportation</td>
<td>3,760,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9R3: COMPARATIVE RESULTS ON COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS
Comparative data are included to provide context for the University's performance wherever possible. The University's dashboard, reported in 8R2, is an example. If a standardized test or survey is administered through a third-party, comparative data may be available. Examples of this found in other parts of the Systems Portfolio would be NSSE. Comparative data on indirect measures are available only for those data reported, such as aggregated enrollment, which are available from the Ohio Board of Regents or IPEDS.

9I1: IMPROVEMENTS IN BUILDING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS
Performance results on internal and external relationships are sought and used whenever possible. Qualitative and quantitative data help inform decision making to minimize risk and maximize return on investment. Recent improvements in this category are as follows:

- Increased marketing efforts and recruiting relationships developed
- Increased international student enrollment and focus on serving these students
- Increased transfer enrollment
- Rapid growth in distance learning programs and enrollment, especially in RN-to-BSN program
- Increased external funding from grants and contracts—amount and variety
- Formal community college partnerships increased from 4 to 13 during the last 4 years
- Partnerships in health and medical education through Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine
- Regional campuses have created degree completion programs which can be completed 100% online to better serve community college partners.
- Increased number of community college partners

9I2: CULTURE AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT BUILDING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS
The creation of the enrollment management plan provided internal impetus for improving relations with educational partners—high schools, community colleges, international institutions. The Ohio Board of Regents’ focus on transfer articulation provided external impetus for the University’s developing interrelationships with community colleges and other colleges and universities in Ohio. The enrollment plan's projected growth in distance education has necessitated that the University develop partnerships with reliable technology and service providers.

Many colleges, departments, regional campuses and academic programs employ external advisory boards to help identify and inform decisions related to processes targeted for improvement.