



230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500 | Chicago, IL 60604-1413
800.621.7440 | Fax: 312.263.7462 | info@hlcommission.org | ncahlc.org

Serving the common good by assuring and enhancing the quality of higher learning

October 8, 2010

Roderick J. McDavis
President
Ohio University
108 Cutler Hall
Athens, OH 45701

Dear President McDavis:

Enclosed is a copy of Ohio University's *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report*. It begins with a concise Executive Summary, intended for those general readers that do not require a high level of detail. Your Systems Appraisal Team of quality experts provided extensive detail in the full report by identifying nine distinct groups of what they view as your institution's *strengths* and *opportunities for improvement*, one group for each of the nine AQIP Categories. We are also emailing your institution's AQIP Liaison a copy of this full *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report*.

To receive maximum benefit from your Systems Appraisal, you and your colleagues should plan to invest substantial time in discussing it, considering the team's observations and advice, and identifying which actions will best advance your institution. The enclosed *After Your Appraisal* details what lies ahead and how to use your Feedback Report most effectively, and explains when and how to register for your next Strategy Forum.

To comply with federal requirements, we need the CEO of the institution formally to acknowledge receipt of this report within the next two weeks, and to provide us with any comments you wish to make about it. Please read the enclosed *After Your Appraisal* suggestions *before* you decide how to respond. Limit your acknowledgement and comments to a maximum of two typewritten pages, and understand that your response will become part of your institution's permanent HLC file, to be shared with future peer reviewers who review your institution (including the next Systems Appraisal team, the next Quality Checkup visit team, and the next Reaffirmation of Accreditation panel). Email your response to AQIP@hlcommission.org; call me or Mary Green (at 800-621-7440 x130) if you have any questions about it.

We know you will gain real value from the Systems Appraisal Feedback and the activities it will stimulate within your institution, and we are proud to be working with you as you continue along the never-ending path to improvement.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Spangehl
Vice President

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT

in response to the *Systems Portfolio* of

OHIO UNIVERSITY

October 7, 2010



**Academic
Quality Improvement
Program**

The Higher Learning Commission **NCA**

**30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400
Chicago, Illinois 60602-2504
ncahlc.org/aqip-home/
home/AQIP@hlcommission.org
800-621-7440**

SYSTEMS APPRAISAL FEEDBACK REPORT
In response to the *Systems Portfolio* of
OHIO UNIVERSITY



Academic
Quality Improvement
Program
The Higher Learning Commission **NCA**

October 7, 2010

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Elements of the Feedback Report	5
Strategic and Accreditation Issues	7
Using the Feedback Report	9
Critical Characteristics Analysis	10
Category Feedback	13
<i>Helping Students Learn</i>	14
<i>Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives</i>	20
<i>Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs</i>	23
<i>Valuing People</i>	27
<i>Leading and Communicating</i>	32
<i>Supporting Institutional Operations</i>	35
<i>Measuring Effectiveness</i>	39
<i>Planning Continuous Improvement</i>	42
<i>Building Collaborative Relationships</i>	46

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR OHIO UNIVERSITY

The following are summary comments on each of the AQIP Categories crafted by the Appraisal Team to highlight **Ohio University's** achievements and to identify challenges yet to be met.

- Throughout Category One, the absence of students and external stakeholders as participants was evident in the description of the student learning processes. Although the curriculum review and approval process appears to be fairly standard and robust, the reviewers could not discern from the information provided, whether this omission was a Portfolio construction and writing issue, or whether Ohio University was coming up short in the learning outcomes assessment process. While some comparisons were presented, the information offered little concrete evidence of initiating quality improvement. That is, it was difficult for the review team to find and evaluate any true process-results-improvement cycles. The University would have been better served by drafting Portfolio responses that described how an improvement was accomplished as a consequence of a process applied to a defined student group for which results were collected and used. A final hindrance to the reviewers in providing in-depth and positive feedback was Ohio University's reliance on hyperlinks to surveys and studies as primary evidence. The URLs listed were not always accurate and were not always a direct link to the document cited. At times, these links connected to large documents, leaving the reviewers lost as to what exactly they were supposed to view as direct evidence. In-text summaries of key document points or direct references printed into the Portfolio would have greatly helped.
- Although there is reason to believe the institution's outreach and approach to Other Distinctive Objectives is a significant part of the institution's operations, it was difficult to assess the degree to which processes exist in support of these objectives and how well the results demonstrate success in achieving goals. It was also unclear exactly what the non-instructional priorities are, how they are determined, and by what processes they are implemented, measured, and improved. The default answer for most Category items was to refer the reader back to *Vision Ohio*, but little detail is provided as to how specific initiatives are vetted with regards to this overarching document. The improvement section notes that specific other distinctive objectives were achieved, but they are given passing mention in the results section and furthermore are not mentioned

at all in processes so that determination of the success of the process-results-improvement cycle could not be evaluated. While the responses provided for this Category emphasize the importance of *Vision Ohio* Strategic Planning, budget limitations, and the commitment to student learning, virtually no mention is made of non-instructional activities such as athletics, economic development, community outreach, the campus centers, international operations, and other University-supported partnerships other than 2R4. The Steering Committee appears to be heavily represented by faculty and staff from the academic side, which offers an opportunity the University to be more inclusive with community representation, employers, chamber etc. to discover enrichment and other non-instructional opportunities.

- The focus of Category Three is the importance of the relationships maintained with all stakeholders. Ohio University described numerous stakeholder groups in the Institutional Overview that were not included in the Category item responses. For example, what roles do the international operations, the five centers, the graduate students, online students, school partners, community partners, and others have on the University? What processes are used to build these relationships and measure the performance of the relationships? How is information collected used to initiate improvements? While Ohio University chose to focus attention primarily on undergraduate stakeholders, the lack of evidence that ties a given process to a result capable of being used to improve a relationship or achieve a higher level of performance or improvement limits the usefulness of the information reported. The pursuit of the *Vision Ohio* Strategic agenda should provide the platform needed to address this perceived weakness in this Portfolio.
- While there were numerous examples of opportunities for shared governance presented, there appeared to be a disconnect between employee engagement and employee satisfaction. This may be due to budgetary constraints, but the report lacks specificity regarding this important point. There also appears to be numerous systems in place to demonstrate Ohio University's commitment to its employees but there is little evidence provided in the results to indicate that the processes are successful. There is potential for improved formal information gathering as part of an efficient system for measuring and improving on how the University values people and in documenting progress towards meeting measures outlined in *Vision Ohio*.

- Category Five may contain Ohio University's strongest rhetoric on the importance and integration of *Vision Ohio*. The *Vision Ohio* framework emphasizes the importance of having a defined mission and strategic plan against which to set targets and performance goals with measurable results. Ohio University's shared governance – with representation from students and other key stakeholders – is an example of an inclusive, comprehensive, integrated and mature process for utilizing teams, task forces, groups and committees in decision making. At the same time, this Category presented little evidence of explicit processes linked to tangible results which directly inform improvement efforts in leading and communicating. While it is evident that there is overall acceptance of *Vision Ohio*, there is room for improvement in demonstrating how the plan has been implemented by providing examples of actual process-results-improvement cycles. For example, it is unclear that Ohio University can, at this time, point to specific results that directly measure leadership and show how those results directly influenced a specific improvement to a specific leadership process. Furthermore, other than typical committee meetings, performance reviews, and mass communications – which are accepted means of communication for faculty and staff – it is unclear how Ohio University's strategic vision is communicated to students and other key stakeholders not directly involved in the University's shared governance.
- Ohio University has an established process linked to *Vision Ohio* to review existing support units. No mention, however, is given to how new support service needs are identified by students or other key stakeholders. The results provided in Category Six are limited and not aligned with the processes described. The limited response made it difficult for the reviewers to provide effective feedback. Future Portfolios would be enhanced by clearly articulating key target students and stakeholders, their needs and expectations, processes to deliver support services and related metrics, results of the processes that are universally applicable including comparison data with trends and benchmarks, and improvements.
- The Category Seven results portion missed the intent of the category's questions. The intent is to look at the effectiveness of the system the institution has in place for collecting, disseminating, ensuring the validity, and using information. Data collection and analysis appear to be robust but fail to include comparative benchmarking data, data on non-instructional activities and the security of the data collection storage. It is

clear that Ohio University has the infrastructure to align and manage its data and data-collection needs. This is exemplified by its use of *Vision Ohio* as a philosophical and planning anchor for its decision-making processes. However, the specifics of those processes remain unclear. As Ohio University ramps up to improve its data collection and storage means (Oracle/PeopleSoft), it will have the ability to collect even more data. There does not appear to be processes in place, however, to efficiently and purposefully turn that data into useable information. Although, there are multiple monitoring indicators within the *Vision Ohio* documents and discussion of assessment in this section, there is little evidence presented of a systematic process for analyzing and using the data to measure performance or drive decisions. Ohio University runs the risk of losing the competitive advantage enabled by the ability to effectively measure performance outcomes by allowing the routine collection of data to determine what information is provided rather than collecting specific data to meet information needs.

- The intent of Category Eight was to examine an organization's planning processes and how its strategies and action plans help them achieve their mission and vision. The measures provided, however, did not align with the intent of the Category. Ohio University has the opportunity to better articulate the processes it uses to ensure the creation of a culture of improvement across the breadth of the University and the measurements of the process' effectiveness. Given that the five year *Vision Ohio* Implementation Plan was only approved for implementation in February 2008, and while early accomplishments appear noteworthy, it is too early to know if this planning model will remain on track and viable with the passage of time; or if improvements of performance are yet to will be documented.
- Collaboration is a key feature of a quality organization. Active collaboration also calls for the removal of obstacles as well as a system of rewards and celebration of model collaborative efforts. Ohio University has taken steps for creating a structural foundation for collaborative work through its *Vision Ohio* and culture of shared governance. It appears to be in a developmental stage in building collaborative relationships. From the information provided, it appears that Ohio University's partnerships are decentralized to such a degree that institutional criteria and oversight are apparently non-existent.

Accreditation issues and Strategic challenges for **Ohio University** are listed in detail within the Strategic and Accreditation Issues Analysis section of the Appraisal Feedback Report.

ELEMENTS OF Ohio University's FEEDBACK REPORT

The *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* provides AQIP's official response to your *Systems Portfolio* by a team of readers trained in evaluation. After appraisers independently reviewed your document, the team reached consensus on essential elements of your institutional profile, strengths and opportunities for improvement by Category, and significant issues for your institution. These are presented in three sections of the Feedback Report: Accreditation Issues Analysis, Critical Characteristics Analysis, and Category Feedback. These components are interrelated in defining context, evaluating performance, surfacing critical issues, and assessing institutional performance.

It is important to remember that the Systems Appraisal Team had only your *Systems Portfolio* to guide their analysis of your institution's strengths and opportunities for improvement.

Consequently, their report may omit important strengths — if you were too modest to stress them in your *Systems Portfolio*, or if your discussion and documentation of them was unconvincing. Similarly, the team may have pointed out areas of potential improvement that are already receiving the institution's attention. Again, the team used its best judgment in identifying improvement opportunities. If some of these areas of potential improvement are now strengths rather than opportunities because of your own focused efforts, that is all to your credit. If the team was unsure about an area, we urged it to err on the side of giving your institution the best possible advice about where investing your efforts might pay off. If some of their advice comes after the fact, after you've already tackled an area, no harm is done.

Executive Summary: Summative statements agreed upon by the Systems Appraisal Team reflecting the reviewers' assessment of the institution's current status in relation to critical quality characteristics: robustness of process design; utilization or deployment of processes; the existence of results, trends, and comparative data; the use of results data as feedback, and systematic processes for improvement of the activities that the Category covers. Since institutions are complex, maturity levels may vary from one Category to another.

Strategic challenges for the institution are listed in detail within the Strategic and Accreditation Issues Analysis section of the Appraisal Feedback Report.

Strategic and Accreditation Issues Analysis: Strategic issues are those most closely related to your institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and quality improvement goals. Accreditation issues are areas where you have not yet provided evidence that you meet the Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation*, or where the evidence you have presented suggests you may have difficulties, now or in the future, in meeting these expectations. If accreditation is essential for your institution then any accreditation issues identified are, by definition, also strategic. The Systems Appraisal Team identified both of these kinds of issues through analysis of your Organizational Overview and the feedback it provided for each Category, as well as by reviewing the Index to the *Criteria for Accreditation* that you provided along with your *Systems Portfolio*. This list of strategic issues offers a framework for addressing ongoing improvement of processes and systems, serving as an executive summary of the Report's key findings and recommendations.

Critical Characteristics: Your Systems Portfolio's Organizational Overview provides context for the team's knowledge of your institution's identity, mission objectives, strategic goals, and key factors related to improvement. Critical Characteristics are those features most important for understanding the institution's mission, environment, stakeholders, competitive position, goals, and processes. Characteristics having the greatest relevance to each Category are identified in the Report.

Category Feedback: The Report's feedback on each of AQIP's nine Categories specifically identifies strengths and opportunities for improvement. An **S** or **SS** identifies strengths, with the double letter signifying important achievements or capabilities upon which to build. Opportunities are designated by **O**, with **OO** indicating areas where attention may result in more significant improvement. Comments, which are keyed to your *Systems Portfolio*, offer brief analysis of each strength and opportunity. Organized by Category, and presenting the team's findings in detail, this section is the heart of the Report.

STRATEGIC AND ACCREDITATION ISSUES

In conducting the Systems Appraisal, the team attempted to identify the broader issues that present the greatest challenges and opportunities for your institution in the coming years. These are all strategic issues, ones you need to grapple with as you identify your institution's strategies for confronting the future and becoming the institution you want to be. The team also examined whether any of these strategic issues put your institution into jeopardy of not meeting the Higher Learning Commission's accreditation expectations.

Issues Affecting Compliance with the *Criteria for Accreditation*. An important goal for the Systems Appraisal was to review your institution's compliance with the Higher Learning Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation*. The peer quality experts who served on the team were all trained in evaluating colleges and universities using the Commission's *Criteria*, and the Systems Appraisal process they followed included careful steps to ensure the team used the *Criteria* as a major factor in their review. As the team reviewed your presentation of your institution's systems and processes under each AQIP Category, it searched for accreditation-related issues and concerns. In addition, the team used the *Index to the Criteria for Accreditation* that you provided with your Portfolio to perform a comprehensive review of the *Criteria* and each Core Component to ascertain whether you presented compelling evidence that your institution complies with each of these Commission expectations.

The Systems Appraisal team concluded that Ohio University has presented evidence that it complies with each of the Five *Criteria for Accreditation* and each of their Core Components. Although the Systems Appraisal does not in itself constitute a review for continued accreditation, the team's conclusion upon reviewing your Portfolio against the *Criteria* will serve as a telling piece of evidence during the Commission's next scheduled AQIP review of your institution for Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

Issues Affecting Future Institutional Strategies. The Systems Appraisal Team identified the following strategic issues to assist Ohio University in prioritizing and taking action on the important broad challenges and opportunities it faces. From these you may discover your vital immediate priorities, shaping strategies that can lead to a quantum leap in the performance of your institution. Implementing these strategies may call for specific actions, so AQIP's

expectation that your institution be engaged in three or four vital Action Projects at all times will help encourage your administrators, faculty, and staff to turn these strategic goals into real accomplishments. Knowing that Ohio University will discuss these strategic issues, give priority to those it concludes are most critical, and take action promptly, the Systems Appraisal Team identified:

- The numerous stakeholder groups described in the Institutional Overview received little, if any, attention throughout the Portfolio. Two key omissions from the text were information regarding Ohio University's international operations and its other Ohio campuses. Little to no mention is given to graduate students, online students, school partners, community partners, and others as distinct stakeholders with distinct needs and desires. Ohio University's Office of Institutional Research has the capacity and likely also provides unit, sub-unit, and student-sub-group reporting, but little evidence was provided to that effect. Moreover, it was difficult to determine how information regarding specific student sub-groups informs improvement processes tailored to meet their particular needs, how those improvement efforts are monitored, and then what, if any, actions are taken to improve those processes as they are assessed.
- It was evident from the Portfolio and from supporting documentation provided that Ohio University collects and analyses a lot of data. But a consistent theme throughout the Category reviews was a sense that Ohio University does not yet understand nor has incorporated true process-results-improvement cycles (plan-do-study-act) into their strategic planning. Very few of the results presented throughout this document could be directly linked to specific processes. Some results presented appeared to have little or no connection to the Category topic, and led to discussion as to their appropriateness as evidentiary material. While Vision Ohio will provide a solid framework for centralizing and unifying Ohio University's strategic vision, it is not, in and of itself, a process. It is a tool that should be used to inform, guide, and report on the results of processes in place and to be developed.
- Throughout this document, it was made clear that Ohio University prides itself on its degree of decentralization and "bottom-up" approaches to problem solving. Appropriately managed, this approach has definite strengths. However, it is unclear from the responses whether or not Ohio University is decentralized to the point that system-wide initiatives become impractical. It is unclear the extent to which central

decisions regarding strategic decisions can and do supersede local-level operations, and to what extent they are enforceable. It was evident that most units are free to set their own standards, but the reviewers were left to wonder how Ohio University can set system-level standards or baselines that may be different or conflicting with unit-level standards.

- Given that this Portfolio was a second submission for Ohio University (the first one submitted in 2006), the review team felt that Ohio University's understanding and integration of process-results-improvement cycles failed to improve from that first iteration. There were some clear improvements – such as the incorporation of Vision Ohio into its strategic planning – but the lack of clear linkages between results and processes was disconcerting given Ohio University's history with AQIP. This disparity between what was expected from the Portfolio and how Ohio University sees its progress is illustrated by the disconnect between the review team's assessment and Ohio University's self-assessment. It was unclear the extent to which these issues are, in fact, systemic to Ohio University, or rather are the result of writing that fell short of fully illustrating the progress the University has made and its incorporation of process-results-improvement cycles. While not rising to a level of concern to warrant an accreditation issue, the team wishes to emphasize that Ohio University has chosen to use the AQIP modality for seeking its continuing accreditation, and with it comes an expectation of understanding of continuous improvement through demonstrable process-results-improvement cycles.

USING THE FEEDBACK REPORT

The AQIP *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* is intended to initiate action for improvement. It is therefore important that the Report produced by the Systems Appraisal Team stimulate review of organizational processes and systems. Though decisions about specific actions are each institution's, AQIP expects every institution to use its feedback to stimulate cycles of continual improvement. At the next Strategy Forum an AQIP institution attends, its peers will examine in detail how it is using the feedback from its Systems Appraisal.

An organization needs to examine its Report strategically to identify those areas that will yield greatest benefit if addressed. Some key questions that may arise in careful examination of the

Report may be: How do the team's findings challenge our assumptions about ourselves? Given our mission and goals, which issues should we focus on? How will we employ results to innovate, grow, and encourage a positive culture of improvement? How will we incorporate lessons learned from this review in our planning and operational processes? How will we revise the *Systems Portfolio* to reflect what we have learned?

How an organization interprets, communicates, and uses its feedback for improvement ought to support AQIP's core values, encouraging involvement, learning, collaboration and integrity. Based solely upon an organization's *Systems Portfolio*, the Report reflects a disciplined, external review of what an organization says about itself. The report should help an organization identify ways to improve its *Systems Portfolio* so it functions better to communicate accurately to internal and external audiences. But the Report's chief purpose is to help you to identify areas for improvement, and to act so that these areas actually improve. These improvements can then be incorporated into an updated *Systems Portfolio*, guaranteeing that future Systems Appraisals will reflect the progress an institution has made.

Within a year following the Systems Appraisal, an institution participates in another AQIP Strategy Forum, where the focus will be on what the institution has learned from its Appraisal (and from its other methods of identifying and prioritizing improvement opportunities, and what it has concluded are its major strategic priorities for the next few years. AQIP's goal is to help an institution to clarify the strategic issues most vital to its success, and then to support the institution as it addresses these priorities through Action Projects that will make a difference in institutional performance.

CRITICAL CHARACTERISTICS ANALYSIS

The purpose of this section is to identify what team members understood to be the critical and distinguishing characteristics of your institution. They are the shared understanding of the most important aspects of Ohio University, its current dynamics and the forces surrounding it, and its internal momentum and aspirations, at least as team members understood them. This section also demonstrates that the Systems Appraisal Team recognized and knew what makes Ohio University distinctive. Should you find some characteristics that you think are critical and

missing from this list, you may want to clarify and highlight these items when you revise your *Systems Portfolio* and other literature explaining your institution to the public.

Item Critical Characteristic

- O1a The University offers a liberal arts education in over 300 undergraduate, graduate and professional programs through nine academic colleges and provides a common thread uniting all academic programs offered by the University.
- O1b The *Regional Higher Education Division* that includes five regional campuses, the web-based programs and courses, and several international venues serves the unique needs of non-traditional students.
- O2a The University seeks to expand local, regional, national, and international partnerships, such as the Innovation Center, and professional and K-12 primary schools in order to promote greater opportunities for service learning, community outreach, internships, externships, and study abroad.
- O2b Ohio provides a comprehensive array of student and technology services to support its academic programs including advising, tutoring, supplemental instruction and labs, writing assistance, and technology support.
- O2c Key organizational services contributing to the student experience at Ohio University include academic support and career services, physical and psychological health services, residential housing, dining services, and performance/recreational/sports activities.
- O3a Ohio University requires all undergraduate students to complete a three tier general education program with a set of expected common learning outcomes in order to graduate from the University. Graduates of Ohio University are expected to have basic quantitative and functional writing skills and a breadth of knowledge to allow them to excel and contribute in a competitive society.
- O3b The majority of students are 18-22 years old and from Ohio and its neighboring states. Ohio University's primary competitors are the area's other four-year undergraduate and graduate residential universities.

- O4a The University employs over 950 full time faculty on the Athens campus in over 300 undergraduate, graduate and professional programs to more than 32,000 full-time and part-time students.
- O4b More than 80% of the faculty at Ohio University are tenured or on the tenure track.
- O5a Ohio University prides itself on the transparency of its information on institutional effectiveness. University priorities are tied to measurable performance indicators with multiple monitoring indicators.
- O5b Ohio University's mission, values and goals – embedded in the *Vision Ohio* institutional strategic plan-- provide the framework for decision-making and communication. The *Vision Ohio* Steering Committee and university Budget Planning Council ensure alignment of initiatives with the strategic plan and monitor the educational, social and ethical responsibilities of the institution. All decisions, academic and non academic, must align with the goals and objectives of *Vision Ohio*.
- O5c Communicating the institution's strategic plan falls to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.
- O6a *Vision Ohio* and the Academic Support Unit Program Review process provide the framework to connect the leadership, decision-making and communication processes of the University with its mission values and goals. The 23 member steering committee is responsible for the implementation, monitoring of progress and updating of the plan.
- O6b The University Budget Planning Committee is responsible to align available resources with the implementation of the Strategic Plan.
- O6c Aligning administrative support goals with mission and values is achieved through an ongoing assessment process, a formalized process used to evaluate academic support units and offices. The three-part review includes self and peer assessment as well as stakeholder review.
- O7 The *Academic Support Unit Program Review Process*, an outgrowth of an AQIP Action Project, was created to systematically evaluate the academic support units and offices using information collected by them from key stakeholders to enable specific improvements to be realized.

- O8a Major constraints and challenges faced by the University include declining state revenues, increasing costs for health care and utilities and enrollment concerns, and that Ohio University is one of fifteen public, state-assisted non-profit universities in Ohio.
- O8b Ohio University's stated key commitments and opportunities from *Vision Ohio* include student, faculty, and staff recruitment; strengthening/enhancing undergraduate, graduate, and professional education and research; environmental enrichment for students, faculty, staff and the region; infrastructure alignment; and enhancing the University's prominence.
- O8c The major challenge for Ohio University is to find ways to align the various processes currently underway on campus to support continuous improvement with the decisions within budget realities.
- O9a Internal partnerships between the institution's faculty to form cross-discipline centers and institutes contribute to the University's effectiveness and student learning experience.
- O9b External relationships include a variety of partnerships such as: other educational institutions, business and medical partners, start-up companies, accrediting agencies, international partners, government and community agencies and organizations, and coordinating boards.

CATEGORY FEEDBACK

In the following sections, each of which deals with strengths and opportunities for improvement for one of the nine AQIP Categories, selected *Critical Characteristics* are again highlighted, those the Systems Appraisal Team believed were critical keys to reviewing that particular AQIP Category. The symbols used in these "strengths and opportunities" sections for each Category stand for *outstanding strength* (SS), *strength* (S), *opportunity for improvement* (O) and *pressing or outstanding opportunity for improvement* (OO). The choice of symbol for each item represents the consensus evaluation of the Systems Appraisal Team members, and deserves your thoughtful consideration. Comments marked SS or OO may need immediate attention, either to ensure the institution preserves and maximizes the value of its greatest strengths, or to devote immediate attention to its greatest opportunities for improvement.

AQIP CATEGORY 1: HELPING STUDENTS LEARN

Helping Students Learn identifies the shared purpose of all higher education organizations, and is accordingly the pivot of any institutional analysis. This Category focuses on the teaching-learning process within a formal instructional context, yet also addresses how your entire institution contributes to helping students learn and overall student development. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to learning objectives, mission-driven student learning and development, intellectual climate, academic programs and courses, student preparation, key issues such as technology and diversity, program and course delivery, faculty and staff roles, teaching and learning effectiveness, course sequencing and scheduling, learning and co-curricular support, student assessment, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Ohio University that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 1, Helping Students Learn:

Item Critical Characteristic

- O1a The University offers a liberal arts education in over 300 undergraduate, graduate and professional programs through nine academic colleges and provides a common thread uniting all academic programs offered by the University.
- O2b Ohio provides a comprehensive array of student and technology services to support its academic programs including advising, tutoring, supplemental instruction and labs, writing assistance, and technology support.
- O2c Key organizational services contributing to the student experience at Ohio University include academic support and career services, physical and psychological health services, residential housing, dining services, and performance/recreational/sports activities.
- O3a Ohio University requires all undergraduate students to complete a three tier general education program with a set of expected common learning outcomes in order to graduate from the University. Graduates of Ohio University are expected to have basic quantitative and functional writing skills and a breadth of knowledge to allow them to excel and contribute in a competitive society.

O8b Ohio University’s stated key commitments and opportunities from *Vision Ohio* include student, faculty, and staff recruitment; strengthening/enhancing undergraduate, graduate, and professional education and research; environmental enrichment for students, faculty, staff and the region; infrastructure alignment; and enhancing the University’s prominence.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Ohio University’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 1, Helping Students Learn.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1P1	S	Common learning outcomes expected of all Ohio University students were developed by a cross-functional, cross-departmental General Education Learning Outcomes committee during the 2006-07 academic year. The outcomes are intended to enable students “to achieve minimal standards in advanced intellectual skills, breadth of knowledge, and integrative competencies.” The comprehensiveness and inclusiveness of approach to addressing learning outcomes is commendable.
1P2	O	Program-specific learning objectives are determined by faculty of each academic school or department. Objectives are influenced by the institution’s general education requirements and discipline-specific external accreditation agencies. While this provides a broad perspective in development, no reference is given as to HOW programs determine their program learning objectives nor how they are evaluated or held accountable to an overarching Ohio University framework. Feedback from other than faculty in establishing learning objectives is unmentioned.
1P3	O	Ohio uses a structured process in designing new programs and courses led by the UCC along with the Faculty Senate. Other than detailing the sequence of committees that proposed curricula must pass, no detail of a systematic process of how new curricula are evaluated is provided.
1P4	O	The Faculty Senate is responsible for vetting curricular content developed by faculty in the respective departments. The process described provides no indication that students or external stakeholders,

such as employers, are involved in the design of academic programs. Students and stakeholders can provide valuable insight into career needs and employability.

- 1P5 O No process is detailed demonstrating how system-wide standards are kept nor what processes are used to measure student preparation. The University feels that faculty within the discipline are in the best position to determine the preparation required for a student to succeed in a specific academic program. This approach does not appear to take into account the student, stakeholder, employer, and community needs and requirements. Ohio University is encouraged to develop a comprehensive and mature process that includes input from students and stakeholders through advisory committees, environmental scanning or other sources.
- 1P6 S The faculty are directly involved in advising and communicating to current and prospective students the required preparation and learning and development objectives for specific programs and courses. Additional information is viewable on the Ohio University website for each college and is available in a variety of print and electronic media.
- 1P7 S A comprehensive advisory process using the Action Help Center, new student orientations, special programming, and placement testing helps students to be placed in appropriate coursework for them to succeed. Faculty advisors are involved throughout the Ohio University students' undergraduate experience. This personalized approach helps the students select or change programs to fit their interests and abilities. Support services are available throughout the process.
- 1P8 S Students complete a readiness inventory and/or preparatory exams to determine ability and eligibility at orientation. Support is available to supplement and enhance student skills through a variety of services.
- 1P9 S The readiness survey administered at student orientation helps detect differences in student learning styles. The Center for Teaching and

Learning provide faculty development to assist faculty in addressing learning style differences.

- 1P10 S Ohio University provides comprehensive services for students with special needs including handicapped, first-generation and at-risk, commuter, non-traditional, and multicultural students. This represents the components of a mature process.
- 1P11 O Expectations for effective teaching and learning are embedded in the institution's formal assessment program and articulated and communicated institutionally through the activities and support of the Faculty Senate, UCC, faculty evaluation and promotion, and the University's tenure process. There is little evidence in the portfolio that this process is a university-wide process and in current use. It is difficult to determine what the criteria are for effective teaching and learning and by what specific measures faculty and academic programs are assessed.
- 1P12 S Changes in course delivery methods driven by student needs and desires evidences the importance of having measures of performance to use when pursuing the design of improvements and competitive advantage.
- 1P13 O Ohio University uses its councils, subcommittees and various departments and services to vet all curricular changes and to ensure programs and courses are up-to-date and effective. There is no mention of employer or other student/stakeholder involvement in the process. In order for the University to remain competitive, it is recommended that, in the spirit of AQIP continuous improvement, curriculum review be an ongoing process in addition to the seven-year review.
- 1P14 S Changes or discontinuance of a program or course is facilitated by the UCC. Course deletions are delegated to the Individual Course Committee. Program deletions are presented to the UCC and Board of Trustees along with a phase-out development. This final step is a significant component for a successful transition.
- 1P15 O The University provides supplemental instruction, tutoring, math labs, technology and advising services and help across the institution and

departments. The narrative also suggests that colleges and campus operate independently and that an overarching policy or oversight group does not exist. Ohio University has the opportunity to develop and/or integrate advisory committees or other structures to enhance communication among and between colleges and to provide a more comprehensive support service. Financial constraints demand more timely actionable results (more timely than those gleaned from a seven-year review) to provide opportunity for evaluating how planning units make use of information to realign how the unit is helping students learn.

- 1P16 S Ohio University's co-curricular activities are aligned with curricular goals through an institutional philosophy of encouragement and responsible behavior. Ohio University is encouraged to explore additional opportunities such as community and other service learning components to link co-curricular development with specific course/program outcomes.
- 1P17 S Approximately 100 academic majors at Ohio University are nationally accredited. Ohio University utilizes alumni surveys at the 1 and 5-year post graduation mark to determine if its students met the institution's learning and development expectations.
- 1P18 O Individual programs are responsible for identifying appropriate measures for student assessment. While there exists a 7-year review cycle and various committees and working groups that review and assess various aspects of student learning, Ohio University does not appear to have a unified systematic process for designing and implementing a holistic student learning vision. The University is encouraged to include students in evaluating and designing the processes for assessing student learning.
- 1R1 O The University uses a variety of internal and external leading, in-progress, and lagging indicators as measures of student learning and development. With the exception of student portfolios most measures are indirect measures (job placement, graduation rates, external accreditation) of student learning. The institution is encouraged to incorporate more direct measures.

- 1R2 O Results only provided for survey results and no mention given as to how results measure performance on specific processes and how results inform decision-making regarding improvement. The 2004 survey results could provide a benchmark for further comparison. Future Portfolios can be enhanced by providing trend data on this and the internal and external indicators.
- 1R3 OO Student satisfaction with curriculum completed being helpful in the acquisition of job-related skills is but one performance result. The Category question asks the institution to demonstrate results for specific program learning objectives, e.g. results of common or shared objectives for learning development that you hold for all students. Ohio University would benefit from extending the learning outcomes assessment process across the entire University.
- 1R4 O The failure to provide results in the portfolio seems to indicate a significant need to extend assessment across the University and the need for driving that effort from the upper most levels of leadership.
- 1R5 O No results are provided. The institution is encouraged to identify key performance metrics for each of the offices, centers, committees, and programs listed in Table 1R5 and to report a summary of process results in future Portfolios.
- 1R6 O *Vision Ohio* and the University System of Ohio offer the promise of comparable data on Helping Students Learn. Future Portfolios may summarize key student learning processes, measures, and comparison statistics with educational and other institutions (where appropriate).
- 1I1 O Based on responses to other category questions, the readers are confident that progress has been made in processes for helping students learning but were not reported. The institution has identified teaching and student learning as an opportunity. Future Portfolios may be enhanced by summarizing progress made in *Vision Ohio* and other processes and support services for helping students learn.

- 112 S Ohio University's strategic planning process and committee actions help to select specific processes to improve and to set targets for improved performance. The development and selection process includes representation of students and stakeholders. This inclusive approach promises to give the institution a more comprehensive understanding of the processes and potential.

AQIP CATEGORY 2: ACCOMPLISHING OTHER DISTINCTIVE OBJECTIVES

Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives addresses the processes that contribute to the achievement of your institution's major objectives that complement student learning and fulfill other portions of your mission. Depending on your institution's character, it examines your institution's processes and systems related to identification of other distinctive objectives, alignment of other distinctive objectives, faculty and staff roles, assessment and review of objectives, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Ohio University that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 2, Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives:

Item Critical Characteristic

- O1b The Regional Higher Education Division that includes five regional campuses, the web-based programs and courses, and several international venues serve the unique needs of non-traditional students.
- O2a The University seeks to expend local, regional, national, and international partnerships, such as the Innovation Center, and professional and K-12 primary schools in order to promote greater opportunities for service learning, community outreach, internships, externships, and study abroad.
- O2c Key organizational services contributing to the student experience at Ohio University include academic support and career services, physical and psychological health services, residential housing, dining services, and performance/recreational/sports activities.

- O5b Ohio University’s mission, values, and goals – embedded in the *Vision Ohio* institutional strategic plan-- provide the framework for decision-making and communication. The *Vision Ohio* Steering Committee and university Budget Planning Council ensure alignment of initiatives within the strategic plan and monitor the education, social, and ethical responsibilities of the institution. All decisions, academic and non-academic, must align with the goals and objectives of *Vision Ohio*.

- O6a *Vision Ohio* and the Academic Support Unit Program Review process provides the framework to connect leadership, decision-making and communication processes of the University with its mission values and goals. The 23 member steering committee is responsible for the implementation, monitoring of progress and updating of the plan.

- O9b External relationships include a variety of partnerships such as: other educational institutions, business and medical partners, start-up companies, accrediting agencies, international partners, governmental and community agencies and organization, and coordinating board.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Ohio University’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 2, Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
2P1	O	Key non-instructional areas operate under the guidelines of the institution’s <i>Vision Ohio</i> strategic plan and five-year implementation plan. This creates an alignment with strategic direction consistent throughout the organization. While non-instructional units are expected to set goals that are aligned with institutional goals as well as <i>Vision Ohio</i> goals it is not clear how Ohio University designs and operates non-instructional processes such as athletics, economic development, alumni affairs, etc.
2P2	O	Ohio University determined its non-instructional objectives for its external stakeholders through the development of its <i>Vision Ohio</i> strategic plan. There is no mention in the Portfolio of external stakeholders participating in determining the objectives. Involvement of external stakeholders in the development of objectives impacting them would represent a more mature planning process.

- 2P3 S Public forums, university marketing materials, college and department meetings and an electronic newsletter have been used to communicate the intent and objectives of *Vision Ohio* to various stakeholder groups. This represents a strong commitment to transparency.
- 2P4 O The *Vision Ohio* Steering Committee has responsibility to vet proposals, develop implementation strategies and has been working to develop a systematic approach to assure that decisions are data-driven with an institutional wide approach to assessment and accountability. This activity is still in progress and no specific process is presented for determining alignment with *Vision Ohio*.
- 2P5 O Faculty and staff needs relative to non-instructional objectives are woven into the one- and five-year academic plans and the *Vision Ohio* strategic plan. Faculty and staff are represented and have input on the development committees; this approach encourages faculty and staff ownership in the process. The faculty and staff appear to have sufficient venues to address issues and concerns though evidence was not presented of a systematic process ensuring their needs are addressed.
- 2P6 O The Office of Institutional Research and other campus offices provide data regarding student engagement and other measures of student/institutional success. However, no non-instructional process is detailed demonstrating how specific data are incorporated into the formation/maintenance of existing processes regarding staff and faculty needs.
- 2R1 O The Academic Support Program Review adopted in 2009 is a comprehensive process that involves self-study, external review, and annual updates. Future Portfolios should list non-instructional objectives and activities the institution measures and analyzes regularly.
- 2R2 O Category Two addresses the key processes separate from instructional programs and internal support services. Ohio University emphasizes academic ranking and academic needs but does not address non-instructional distinctive objectives.

- 2R3 OO It is unclear how the measures noted in this category represent the success or failure of non-instructional programs. For example, what non-instructional process is linked to the result of Ohio University not comparing favorably with comparison institutions with regards to number of freshmen in the top-10% of high school class?
- 2R4 O Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs and the Rural Health Institute with their focus on improving the quality of life in the Ohio Appalachia Region are two examples of the institution's outreach programs. It is obvious that the institution recognizes and values the relationship it has with the community and its various partnerships. Without evidence to review, it is difficult for the reviewers to comment on how the performance results for Ohio's processes for Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives strengthens the overall organization and enhances its relationship with the community and region it serves.
- 2I1 O It is unclear how responsibility-centered budgeting will specifically improve accountability in non-instructional units. No specific processes were detailed with defined metrics tied to budgetary decisions.
- 2I2 O Ohio's culture of shared governance and the *Vision Ohio* planning process includes targets for improvement for "other distinctive objectives." While some of the goals have already been accomplished, others continue to be addressed.

AQIP CATEGORY 3: UNDERSTANDING STUDENTS' AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS' NEEDS

Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs examines how your institution works actively to understand student and other stakeholder needs. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to student and stakeholder identification, student and stakeholder requirements, analysis of student and stakeholder needs, relationship building with students and stakeholders, complaint collection, analysis, and resolution, determining satisfaction of students and stakeholders, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Ohio University that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 3, Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs:

Item Critical Characteristic

- O1a The University offers a liberal arts education in over 300 undergraduate, graduate and professional programs through nine academic colleges and provides a common thread uniting all academic programs offered by the University.
- O1b The *Regional Higher Education Division* that includes five regional campuses, the web-based programs and courses, and several international venues serves the unique needs of non-traditional students.
- O2a The University seeks to expand local, regional, national, and international partnerships, such as the Innovation Center, and professional and K-12 primary schools in order to promote greater opportunities for service learning, community outreach, internships, externships, and study abroad.
- O2b Ohio provides a comprehensive array of student and technology services to support its academic programs including advising, tutoring, supplemental instruction and labs, writing assistance, and technology support.
- O2c Key organizational services contributing to the student experience at Ohio University include academic support and career services, physical and psychological health services, residential housing, dining services, and performance/recreational/sports activities.
- O3b The majority of students are 18-22 years old and from Ohio and its neighboring states. Ohio University's primary competitors are the area's other four-year undergraduate and graduate residential universities.
- O7 The *Academic Support Unit Program Review Process*, an outgrowth of an AQIP Action Project, was created to systematically evaluate the academic support units and offices using information collected by them from key stakeholders to enable specific improvements to be realized.
- O8b Ohio University's stated key commitments and opportunities from *Vision Ohio* include student, faculty, and staff recruitment; strengthening/enhancing undergraduate,

graduate, and professional education and research; environmental enrichment for students, faculty, staff and the region; infrastructure alignment; and enhancing the University's prominence.

- O9b External relationships include a variety of partnerships such as: other educational institutions, business and medical partners, start-up companies, accrediting agencies, international partners, government and community agencies and organizations, and coordinating boards.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Ohio University's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 3, Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
3P1	S	Ohio University is collecting and analyzing information gathered from a variety of internal and external sources in an effort to develop a comprehensive portrait of its student and other stakeholder achievements, expectations, and expressions of satisfaction.
3P2	S	Ohio University begins building relationships with students using summer camps and orientation programs. These relationships are then fostered through academic experiences, co-curricular activities, campus programs and other activities aimed at increasing student engagement.
3P3	O	Opportunity exists to define the processes used to convert the information gathered either from stakeholders or from externally provided trend data into actions that might address any reported expectations, needs, or changes required to improve these relationships with the many stakeholder groups identified in Ohio University's Institutional Overview commentary.
3P4	S	Ohio University routinely uses one-on-one interactions, special events, focus groups, advisory committees, task forces, and other communication links to maintain and build relationships with its key stakeholders. This focused approach provides the University leadership with the input needed to make strategic decisions for improving these relationships.

- 3P5 O An opportunity exists to formalize the environmental scanning and data evaluation of information gathered. It is unclear what processes are used to determine new stakeholder groups or to turn a passive monitoring of state and national trend information into actionable and measurable improvements.
- 3P6 O Although it appears that complaint procedures include an in-place Ombuds Office and the Allen Student Help Center for resolving student issues, there does not appear to be a systematic process available to log, track, address, and follow-up on complaints delivered either received by formal or informal communications
- 3R1 S Ohio University collects satisfaction measures from a variety of sources including review processes that cover academic support units, alumni surveys, National Surveys of Student Engagement, and Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education.
- 3R2 O Although trend information appears to demonstrate improving student satisfaction rates on a variety of involvement categories, less clear is how this information is being used to improve relationships in these areas using the process described in 3P2.
- 3R3 O While satisfaction with the education received is reported by alumni to be high, this is but one measure of stakeholder satisfaction. Opportunity exists to expand the survey of stakeholder satisfaction measures to other categories as the interrelationships of stakeholder groups often have a direct bearing on the satisfaction of related groups.
- 3R4 O Although annual giving is one measure of performance, the data provided also suggests both a declining number and percent of alumni donors (hopefully not suggesting that by reducing donor participation one can increase giving). Similarly employer participation in recruitment activities is a vague measure of satisfaction. Opportunity exists to develop new actionable results of process implementation.
- 3R5 O Opportunity exists to develop processes that will enable performance results to be measured and used for achieving positive performance

- improvements. While it is true that trend information of graduation and retention provides an outcome measure, it is unclear how such information is used to initiate an action directly linked to the outcome which can also be measured as being responsible for the improvement.
- 3R6 O Retention and graduation rates provide a limited view for determining how Ohio University's processes might be modified so that stakeholder performance or satisfaction scores outperform the results provided by aspirational peer institutions. Opportunity exists to develop measures of performance that can be used to improve processes and the results that hopefully will follow.
- 3I1 O The University has initiated processes to evaluate student stakeholder needs and outcomes and is collecting information to measure improvement results; however, the description of improvements both for students and stakeholders in general remains in an early stage of implementation.
- 3I2 O Stakeholder improvements are defined as a future action underway rather than as an outcome of processes that generate measurable results for enabling improvements.

AQIP CATEGORY 4: VALUING PEOPLE

Valuing People explores your institution's commitment to the development of your employees since the efforts of all of your faculty, staff, and administrators are required for institutional success. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to work and job environment; workforce needs; training initiatives; job competencies and characteristics; recruitment, hiring, and retention practices; work processes and activities; training and development; personnel evaluation; recognition, reward, compensation, and benefits; motivation factors; satisfaction, health and safety, and well-being; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Ohio University that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 4, Valuing People:

Item Critical Characteristic

- O4a The University employs over 950 full time faculty on the Athens campus in over 300 undergraduate, graduate and professional programs to more than 32,000 full-time and part-time students.
- O4b More than 80% of the faculty at Ohio University are tenured or on the tenure track.
- O5a Ohio University prides itself on the transparency of its information on institutional effectiveness. University priorities are tied to measurable performance indicators with multiple monitoring indicators.
- O6a *Vision Ohio* and the Academic Support Unit Program Review process provide the framework to connect the leadership, decision-making and communication processes of the University with its mission values and goals. The 23 member steering committee is responsible for the implementation, monitoring of progress and updating of the plan.
- O8a Major constraints and challenges faced by the University include declining state revenues, increasing costs for health care and utilities and enrollment concerns, and that Ohio University is one of fifteen public, state-assisted non-profit universities in Ohio.
- O8b Ohio University's stated key commitments and opportunities from *Vision Ohio* include student, faculty, and staff recruitment; strengthening/enhancing undergraduate, graduate, and professional education and research; environmental enrichment for students, faculty, staff and the region; infrastructure alignment; and enhancing the University's prominence.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Ohio University's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 4, Valuing People.

Item S/O Comment

- 4P1 S Ohio University has a structured process for identifying and documenting specific position credentials, skills and requirements for faculty, staff and administrators.
- 4P2 S Although not required for all new hires, applications for permanent positions are subject to formalized screening and interview to ensure the appropriateness of the applicant's credentials and capabilities.
- 4P3 S The institution utilizes a variety of internal and external print and electronic media to advertise openings for faculty, staff and administrative positions. Retention efforts include orientation, communication, training and professional development, performance review, and compensation packages that reward performance.
- 4P4 S New employee orientation is currently being revised to provide more information and put more information online. Faculty members are encouraged to attend a multi-day orientation and workshop.
- 4P5 O Vacancies are aligned with organizational priorities and staffed accordingly. The institution is piloting a succession planning and management development program for high potential administrative employees. The institution is encouraged to expand this pilot to include other academic and operational areas and levels.
- 4P6 S Ohio emphasizes participation and communication among all personnel and provides numerous opportunities for personal and professional growth. The explanation of how work expectations are assigned or how employees may choose to participate on committees lacks specificity.
- 4P7 S Ohio University uses multiple processes for ensuring compliance with professional ethics in the workplace and in the research arena; each college has a Professional Ethics Committee as well as a central committee; the internal audit committee reports both to the President and to the Board of Trustees, and it operates the Ethics Point as a reporting mechanism with whistle blowing protection.

- 4P8 S Numerous training opportunities are available for all employees including workshops on new software products and workshops for faculty sponsored by the VP for Research and Creative Activity.
- 4P9 SS In-house faculty and staff development is assisted through provision of the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Center for Writing across the Curriculum, and the Academic Technologies division. Beyond this, Ohio University offers a wellness initiative, safety initiative, fellowships, and professional travel funds. The scope and comprehensive nature of the program represents a mature process.
- 4P10 SS Faculty members are evaluated by multiple means including peer evaluation in teaching, research, and service; student ratings; and other creative activities. A new performance management and compensation plan for administrators is being developed. All evaluations include goal setting and measurement of previous goals attained tied to university/division priorities.
- 4P11 S In addition to merit pay for faculty and administration, a variety of competitive reward and recognition programs are available. Opportunities exist for educational fee waivers for employees and their dependents as an added employment benefit.
- 4P12 O While there are multiple means by which faculty and staff can express their motivation (surveys, reviews, informal means), there does not appear to be a systematic, unified approach for identifying, measuring, sorting, prioritizing, and subsequently following-up on faculty/staff motivational issues.
- 4P13 S Ohio University has identified communication, recognition and involvement as contributors to motivation. Various venues of communication have been identified that are available to all employees. Recognition is in many forms including the performance evaluation process, and employees are encouraged to participate in various committees, task forces and work teams.

- 4R1 O Ohio University regularly collects measures of academic productivity as well as activity related to employee health and safety. Comparison data has revealed a need to develop a new compensation plan and is demonstrative of data being collected to use for improving other aspects of how the employee base is valued.
- 4R2 OO No results for valuing people are provided – rather, student retention/graduation is used as a proxy for these results. Stronger measures would be results of the institution’s hiring processes, recruitment, training, reward and recognition, employee satisfaction and other measures of processes described in 4P1-13.
- 4R3 O Ohio University participated in the Delaware Study, but no results are provided. It is unclear what processes are systematically measured and integrated into a systematic improvement cycle related to improving faculty and staff productivity and effectiveness.
- 4R4 OO Ohio University has the opportunity to identify and compare key measures of performance for valuing people. It is recommended that the University begin with the measures it already collects through surveys and other instruments and compare itself to peer and other institutions using similar or the same metrics (e.g. FSSE, employee satisfaction, etc.).
- 4I1 O Due to budget cuts, specific programs related to valuing people have been cut, but no indication regarding how Ohio University will address this and make improvements in this new budget reality are given. Succession planning is being piloted, and a new performance management system has yet to be fully tested.
- 4I2 O The readers are confident that Ohio University has a culture and infrastructure that helps it to select specific processes to improve and set targets for improved performance in valuing people but the response does not convey this. Future Portfolio responses should reflect how the University’s various committees, teams, and offices support a culture of valuing people.

AQIP CATEGORY 5: LEADING AND COMMUNICATING

Leading And Communicating addresses how your institution's leadership and communication structures, networks, and processes guide your institution in setting directions, making decisions, seeking future opportunities, and building and sustaining a learning environment. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to leading activities, communicating activities, alignment of leadership system practices, institutional values and expectations, direction setting, future opportunity seeking, decision making, use of data, leadership development and sharing, succession planning, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Ohio University that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 5, Leading and Communicating:

Item Critical Characteristic

- O5a Ohio University prides itself on the transparency of its information on institutional effectiveness. University priorities are tied to measurable performance indicators with multiple monitoring indicators.
- O5b Ohio University's mission, values and goals – embedded in the *Vision Ohio* institutional strategic plan-- provide the framework for decision-making and communication. The *Vision Ohio* Steering Committee and university Budget Planning Council ensure alignment of initiatives with the strategic plan and monitor the educational, social and ethical responsibilities of the institution. All decisions, academic and non academic, must align with the goals and objectives of *Vision Ohio*.
- O5c Communicating the institution's strategic plan falls to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.
- O6a *Vision Ohio* and the Academic Support Unit Program Review process provide the framework to connect the leadership, decision-making and communication processes of the University with its mission values and goals. The 23 member steering committee is responsible for the implementation, monitoring of progress and updating of the plan.

- O6b The University Budget Planning Committee is responsible to align available resources with the implementation of the Strategic Plan.
- O6c Aligning administrative support goals with mission and values is achieved through an ongoing assessment process, a formalized process used to evaluate academic support units and offices. The three-part review includes self and peer assessment as well as stakeholder review.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Ohio University’s most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 5, Leading and Communicating.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
5P1	SS	Ohio University clearly defines its mission, vision, core values, and guiding principles within its strategic plan – <i>Vision Ohio</i> – which is managed by a 22 member board representing faculty, students, administrators and classified staff representing all major stakeholders of the institution. The <i>Vision Ohio</i> Implementation Plan is communicated to the institution through the EVPP.
5P2	S	The Budget Planning Council provides an essential monitoring constraint on the initiatives introduced by analyzing costs and prioritizing the various projects then serves in a critical advisory role to the Executive Leadership Team in setting strategic and financial priorities that align with the Vision Ohio strategic plan.
5P3	S	Broad representation on Advisory Groups, the <i>Vision Ohio</i> Steering Committee, and the Budget Planning Council ensures input from all major stakeholders.
5P4-5P5	S	Ohio University prides itself on transparency and inclusiveness in governance of the University. The bottom-up approach provides opportunity for engagement within the community though it is unclear how leadership guides the institution toward future opportunities.
5P6	S	Ohio University strives to assure that decision-making is data-driven both based on internally collected data and data from comparison with peer

institutions. An abundance of data are collected by the Office of Institutional Research and made readily available to faculty and staff. However, care is required to assure that data used is tied to the assessment question being investigated.

- 5P7 S Open communication is achieved both through meetings between key constituents and the executive team and through open meetings of governing organizations. Information is readily available on the website as well as through numerous internal publications.
- 5P8 SS The *Vision Ohio* Strategic Plan has been a major focus of activities the process continues in regard to aligning all processes with the plan. Support by the Ohio University Board of Trustees to dedicate \$7 million in University funds to *Vision Ohio* initiatives evidences the confidence placed in the mission, goals and values proposed by the *Vision Ohio* Strategic Plan.
- 5P9 S Ohio University provides a number of personal and professional leadership development opportunities and programs for faculty and staff through a variety of methodologies including training, mentoring, tuition waver, awards and compensation programs. The institution has also identified the need to develop continuous training programs for academic department chairs and school directors.
- 5P10 S To ensure the continuity of institutional memory and values while also encouraging new ideas to be introduced, the University has initiated processes for the selection, training, and involvement of all persons entering a leadership role including new trustee appointees.
- 5R1 S Ohio University collects and analyzes data on accomplishment of annual goals, planning and management, leadership abilities and style, organizational skills, personnel management and external relations.
- 5R2 O While the measures reported in 5R1 appear to be significant, without trend data and target information the readers are not able to identify whether or not the institution is making any progress or determine how

these results represent progress specifically on leadership and communication.

- 5R3 O Without knowing what comparative key performance measures are collected and analyzed and without data to review, it is unclear how “favorable” the institution is performing against its 10 aspirational peer institutions in leadership and communication.
- 5I1 S Ohio University integrates their AQIP quality improvement efforts into the *Vision Ohio* strategic plan by incorporating the AQIP Advisory Committee into the strategic planning process.
- 5I2 S *Vision Ohio* is the comprehensive foundation for how the University’s culture and infrastructure selects specific processes to improve and to set targets for improved performance. Progress towards targets is incorporated in performance and other review processes.

AQIP CATEGORY 6: SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS

Supporting Institutional Operations addresses the variety of your institutional support processes that help to provide an environment in which learning can thrive. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to student support, administrative support, identification of needs, contribution to student learning and accomplishing other distinctive objectives, day-to-day operations, use of data, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Ohio University that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 6, Supporting Institutional Operations:

Item Critical Characteristic

- O1b The Regional Higher Education Division that includes five regional campuses, the web-based programs and courses, and several international venues serves the unique needs of non-traditional students.

- O2b Ohio provides a comprehensive array of student and technology services to support its academic programs including advising, tutoring, supplemental instruction and labs, writing assistance, and technology support.
- O2c Key organizational services contributing to the student experience at Ohio University include academic support and career services, physical and psychological health services, residential housing, dining services, and performance/recreational/sports activities.
- O5b Ohio University's mission, values and goals – embedded in the *Vision Ohio* institutional strategic plan-- provide the framework for decision-making and communication. The *Vision Ohio* Steering Committee and university Budget Planning Council ensure alignment of initiatives with the strategic plan and monitor the educational, social and ethical responsibilities of the institution. All decisions, academic and non academic, must align with the goals and objectives of *Vision Ohio*.
- O6a *Vision Ohio* and the Academic Support Unit Program Review process provide the framework to connect the leadership, decision-making and communication processes of the University with its mission values and goals. The 23 member steering committee is responsible for the implementation, monitoring of progress and updating of the plan.
- O7 The Academic Support Unit Program Review Process, an outgrowth of an AQIP Action Project, was created to systematically evaluate the academic support units and offices using information collected by them from key stakeholders to enable specific improvements to be realized.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Ohio University's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 6, Supporting Institutional Operations.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
6P1	S	Ohio University has developed an academic support unit program review process as the result of an AQIP Action Project. The assessment process includes self assessment, peer assessment and stakeholder assessment.

- 6P2 S Administrative support service needs of Ohio University faculty, staff, and administration are identified through stakeholder input from senates, councils, committees, and various governing organizations.
- 6P3 S Ohio University designs, maintains, and communicates key support processes contributing to physical safety and security through ongoing awareness training, support services, and mutual aid agreements with safety organizations. Additional health and safety opportunities have been identified and are being addressed.
- 6P4 S Work request systems such as those used by Faculty and OIT allow real-time tracking of progress and completion of stakeholder-service actions. This type of feedback allows units to address stakeholder concerns and needs without having to wait for annual or periodic reviews.
- 6P5 O Other than meetings and cross-functional team there is little evidence of true documentation of concrete processes that demonstrate how a particular need is addressed, how that process is measured, and how improvements to the process are informed by real data. The institution has a good start and is encouraged to build on its current successes.
- 6R1 O The response and examples provided are a mixture of lagging indicators of institutional and other performance measures, not all of which are directly related to measures of student, administrative, and organizational support services. Future Portfolios can be enhanced by identifying key support services, leading, in-process, and lagging indicators/measures of processes.
- 6R2 O Ohio University demonstrates the usefulness of having measurable results over a period of time as being necessary for determining if changes in a process or operation are needed or if actions initiated are contributing to improved satisfaction scores. This serves as a process template in supporting institutional operations. The response provided limited data for the readers to provide an effective evaluation of the performance results for student support services. As an example, measurement of campus safety, indicated by Ohio University as a key

- support process in 6P3, is not indicated and the response use of “generally satisfied” and “significant improvement” are unsupported by evidence.
- 6R3 O The ASUPR process is a positive initiative for better aligning the processes of individual units with the goals and objectives set forth by the University and state. Ohio University recognizes that stakeholder satisfaction measures regarding some administrative support units are not standard and data for key administrative support service processes are not provided. Furthermore, due to the level of administrative support decentralization, there exists the potential for process overlap/duplication and /or exclusion.
- 6R4 S When survey data indicate a need for improvement, cross-functional teams or taskforces investigate the issue and actions are taken. The actions implemented to address the engagement deficiencies of first and second year undergraduate students provides a model to be followed in addressing other issues revealed through systematic monitoring of results.
- 6R5 O No data are presented to demonstrate how Ohio University compares its academic support systems with benchmark institutions.
- 6I1 O Implementation of the ASUPR states that, “Successful implementation will be instrumental...” however the guidelines request for improvement made and in this case it appears that results are still pending. The criteria ask, “How systematic and comprehensive are your processes and performance results for Supporting Organizational Operations?”
- 6I2 O Improvements are initiated by ‘expectations’ articulated in the Vision Ohio Strategic Plan providing an unending attentiveness for pursuing operational efficiencies and productivity.

AQIP CATEGORY 7: MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS

Measuring Effectiveness examines how your institution collects, analyzes, and uses information to manage itself and to drive performance improvement. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to collection, storage, management, and use of information and data – at the institutional and departmental/unit levels; institutional measures of effectiveness; information and data alignment with institutional needs and directions; comparative information and data; analysis of information and data; effectiveness of information system and processes; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Ohio University that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its Systems Portfolio section covering Category 7, Measuring Effectiveness:

Item Critical Characteristic

- O5a Ohio University prides itself on the transparency of its information on institutional effectiveness. University priorities are tied to measurable performance indicators with multiple monitoring indicators.
- O5b Ohio University's mission, values, and goals – embedded in the *Vision Ohio* institutional strategic plan-- provide the framework for decision-making and communication. The *Vision Ohio* Steering Committee and University Budget Planning Council ensure alignment of initiatives with the strategic plan and monitor the educational, social, and ethical responsibilities of the institution. All decision, academic and non-academic, must align with the goals and objectives of *Vision Ohio*
- O6a *Vision Ohio* and the Academic Support Unit Program Review process provides the framework to connect leadership, decision-making and communication processes of the University with its mission, values and goals. The 23 member steering committee is responsible for the implementation, monitoring of progress and updating of the plan.
- O6b The University Budget Planning Committee is responsible to align available resources with the implementation of the strategic plan.
- O6c Aligning administrative support goals with mission and values is achieved through an ongoing assessment process, a formalized process used to evaluate academic support

units and offices. The three-part review includes self and peer assessment as well as stakeholder review.

- O7 The Academic Support Unit Program Review Process, an outgrowth of an AQIP Action Project, was created to systematically evaluate the academic support units and offices using information collected by them from key stakeholders to enable specific improvement to be realized.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Ohio University's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 7, Measuring Effectiveness.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
7P1	O	There is a wealth of information available for units to use in their decision-making processes however few clear processes for determining what data to collect. Rather, it appears that units tend to make decisions on available data rather than determining what is the most appropriate data to collect and what is the most appropriate form that information should take. That said, there are exceptions, since 2007 new data have been collected regarding learning objectives and first-year experience.
7P2	S	Data and performance indicators related to support of Ohio University's planning and improvement efforts are shared through the wide distribution and updates of the institution's <i>Vision Ohio</i> strategic plan with overall data collection and maintenance coordinated through the Office of Institutional Research. As stated in 7P1 the data and analysis are published in an accessible online format. The transparency of this document is commendable.
7P3	S	Over the three years it took to draft <i>Vision Ohio</i> , input regarding metrics and information needs was accumulated. The Office of Institutional Research acts as the nexus for information needs and production providing over 20 performance indicators. <i>Vision Ohio</i> is used to provide guidance in data collection and performance indicators and as the primary prioritization document for determining what data needs are to be pursued.

- 7P4 S Objectives with multiple performance measures were developed when designing *Vision Ohio* and at least one office is assigned to monitor the progress although the specific office tasked with responsibility is unclear in the portfolio though clearly defined in the *Vision Ohio* Implementation Plan. A number of online sources are utilized to communicate the information.
- 7P5 S External data systems such as the Ohio Board of Regents and NCES/IPEDS are primary sources of external comparative data in addition to national surveys such as NSSE.
- 7P6 O Ohio University uses *Vision Ohio's* structure to facilitate alignment of information and resources with institutional goals and objectives. When fully implemented, faculty and staff will be able to monitor progress toward this alignment.
- 7P7 O Ohio University has made several enhancements to data collection, storage, and reporting but does not address the security of the system. The identification of institutional information needs will be assisted by the planned implementation of an enterprise reporting and data warehousing system, Ohio University has given no description of what processes it will have in place to ensure the data collected and stored in the warehouse is timely, accurate, and reliable, and used accordingly.
- 7R1 O The University collects a variety of student measures (Student Entry Indicators, Process Indicators, Student Outcome Indicators, University Resources, and External Accountability). While these are important, they are not indicative of the effectiveness of the institution's system for information and knowledge management. The institution is encouraged to look at its information systems and identify key measures and establish targets in areas such as request response time, measures of SIS performance, etc. that reflect the efficiency of the data management system.
- 7R2 O Ohio University notes that its system for measuring effectiveness is dynamic – however little evidence has been provided regarding the

- processes by which the efficacy of data is evaluated and responded to. There exist unmet opportunities for defining performance measures.
- 7R3 O The response does not provide evidence of how the results for the performance of Ohio University's processes for measuring effectiveness compare with those of other institutions. The Category question is seeking evidence of the effectiveness of the system. For example, how responsive is Ohio University's system for handling data requests as compared to other institutions? How does Ohio University's system performance metrics (downtime, upgrades, response to help desk inquiries, etc.) compare to industry standards?
- 711 O Ohio University's recent implementation of a new student information system is an example of a decision to move towards a systematic and comprehensive approach to measuring effectiveness. The University remains in an early stage of being able to describe significant performance improvements based on the results information currently available to it.
- 712 O The merger of the *Vision Ohio* Steering Committee and the AQIP Advisory Committee appears to have laid a platform for undertaking an identification and examination of their processes to enable school priorities to be emphasized and alignment with the universities strategic plan enhanced. While this structure could be burdensome, it also has the advantage of tying the institution's continuous improvement efforts, accreditation, and strategic planning together.

AQIP CATEGORY 8: PLANNING CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Planning Continuous Improvement examines your institution's planning processes and how your strategies and action plans are helping you achieve your mission and vision. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to institutional vision; planning; strategies and action plans; coordination and alignment of strategies and action plans; measures and performance

projections; resource needs; faculty, staff, and administrator capabilities; measures; analysis of performance projections and results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Ohio University that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 8, Planning Continuous Improvement:

Item Critical Characteristic

- O2a The University seeks to expand local, regional, national, and international partnerships, such as the Innovation Center, and professional and K-12 primary schools in order to promote greater opportunities for service learning, community outreach, internships, externships, and study abroad.
- O5b Ohio University's mission, values and goals – embedded in the *Vision Ohio* institutional strategic plan-- provide the framework for decision-making and communication. The *Vision Ohio* Steering Committee and university Budget Planning Council ensure alignment of initiatives with the strategic plan and monitor the educational, social and ethical responsibilities of the institution. All decisions, academic and non academic, must align with the goals and objectives of *Vision Ohio*.
- O6a *Vision Ohio* and the Academic Support Unit Program Review process provide the framework to connect the leadership, decision-making and communication processes of the University with its mission values and goals. The 23 member steering committee is responsible for the implementation, monitoring of progress and updating of the plan.
- O6b The University Budget Planning Committee is responsible to align available resources with the implementation of the Strategic Plan.
- O8b Ohio University's stated key commitments and opportunities from *Vision Ohio* include student, faculty, and staff recruitment; strengthening/enhancing undergraduate, graduate, and professional education and research; environmental enrichment for students, faculty, staff and the region; infrastructure alignment; and enhancing the University's prominence.
- O8c The major challenge for Ohio University is to find ways to align the various processes currently underway on campus to support continuous improvement with the decisions within budget realities.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Ohio University's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 8, Planning Continuous Improvement.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
8P1	S	Within the <i>Vision Ohio</i> Implementation Plan responsibilities for seven areas of planning oversight have been assigned to university committees each of which includes representation from key stakeholder groups.
8P2	S	Using <i>Vision Ohio</i> as a guide, the steering committee and other key councils analyze progress on key strategies, contemplate adding new strategies, and coordinate Ohio University's efforts with those of USO and the University's budget.
8P3	S	Key action plans are the responsibility of university-wide committees under the oversight of the <i>Vision Ohio</i> Steering Committee, whose recommendations are then made to the Deans-Executive Staff Council.
8P4	S	All planning processes are linked to <i>Vision Ohio</i> goals. Each objective and subsequent strategy is framed by one of six institutional goals it strives to address.
8P5	S	Planning unit heads have primary responsibility for setting objectives, selecting measures and performance targets all with oversight by the <i>Vision Ohio</i> Steering Committee.
8P6	S	The University links strategy selection and action plans through an annual review of progress towards achieving <i>Vision Ohio</i> goals while taking into account levels of current resources and future needs.
8P7	O	Ohio University focuses on financial and legal risk within its Objective #17, which is both necessary and commendable. The opportunity exists to assess and address the everyday risks of taking on new ventures, exploring new ideas, and generally rewarding innovation.
8P8	S	The Center for Teaching and Learning and the Human Resources Office have the responsibility of providing training as needed to enable employees to remain informed and operative within the context of

changes made in policy or adoption of new policies. Ohio University is endeavoring to grow the capacity of its employees through professional development activities and the implementation of a comprehensive performance management system.

- 8R1 O The results provided appear to report progress in fulfillment of Outcome Tasks but lack sufficient detail to enable the reviewers to effectively evaluate and provide meaningful feedback. Future responses should clearly describe how Ohio University's planning processes, strategies and actions help the institution achieve the *Vision Ohio* plan.
- 8R2 O The response provides little evidence of performance measures and results for accomplishing organizational strategies and action plans. Future Portfolios should align the measures reported in this question to strategies and plans described in 8P1 and 8P2.
- 8R3 S The initiative to create a closer alignment between the AQIP activities, the efforts of the *Vision Ohio* Steering Committee using an implementation plan with specific strategy targets, and the Budget Planning Council appear to be a positive step for sustaining the viability of all three entities in the continuing planning effort.
- 8R4 O While each institution is unique, there should be results of process performance that can be compared to other AQIP and/or peer institutions. For example, how does Ohio University's budgeting process compare to other institutions? How does *Vision Ohio* compare to other strategic plans and planning processes?
- 8R5 O An illustration or summary of the initiatives that have been reviewed for effectiveness by the *Vision Ohio* Steering Committee and the executive leadership would have provided the reviewers with the necessary evidence that the institution's system for planning continuous improvement is effective. For example, it would have been helpful for the readers to have seen what initiatives were reviewed, the measure(s) of effectiveness, targets, and action plans related to each. The readers are

confident the institution has the measures – they need to be included in the response.

- 811 S The current planning has helped focus the University on its mission and establish a viable strategy for dealing with external, environmental influences such as the economy, competing institutions of higher learning, and internal measures of performance. Integration of *Vision Ohio* and AQIP will help keep the two from running parallel or overlapping.
- 812 S The infrastructure of committees and other representative groups demonstrates the culture of shared governance that has perpetuated a campus-wide acceptance of continuous improvement.

AQIP CATEGORY 9: BUILDING COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Building Collaborative Relationships examines your institution's relationships – current and potential – to analyze how they contribute to the institution's accomplishing its mission. It examines your institution's processes and systems related to identification of key internal and external collaborative relationships; alignment of key collaborative relationships; relationship creation, prioritization, building; needs identification; internal relationships; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas.

Here are the Key Critical Characteristics of Ohio University that were identified by the Systems Appraisal Team as most relevant for its interpretation of its *Systems Portfolio* section covering Category 9, Building Collaborative Relationships:

Item Critical Characteristic

- O1b The *Regional Higher Education Division* that includes five regional campuses, the web-based programs and courses, and several international venues serves the unique needs of non-traditional students.
- O2a The University seeks to expand local, regional, national, and international partnerships, such as the Innovation Center, and professional and K-12 primary schools in order to promote greater opportunities for service learning, community outreach, internships, externships, and study abroad.

- O9a Internal partnerships between the institution's faculty to form cross-discipline centers and institutes contribute to the University's effectiveness and student learning experience.
- O9b External relationships include a variety of partnerships such as: other educational institutions, business and medical partners, start-up companies, accrediting agencies, international partners, government and community agencies and organizations, and coordinating boards.

Here are what the Systems Appraisal Team identified as Ohio University's most important strengths and opportunities for improvement relating to processes encompassed by Category 9, Building Collaborative Relationships.

<i>Item</i>	<i>S/O</i>	<i>Comment</i>
9P1	S	Ohio University undergraduates admissions prioritized and builds relationships with educational institutions through site visits and co-sponsoring events. Viewing days introduce prospective students to the Ohio University culture. Future Portfolios can be enhanced by describing how relationships are initiated, tracked, prioritized, measured, analyzed, and overseen and any collaborative efforts the institutions has with employers and/or non-traditional students.
9P2	S	Program advisory boards play a significant role in developing relationships with employers and educational organizations for example Ohio University's Technology Transfer Office along with the business incubator, the Innovation Center, and Edison Biotechnology Institute.
9P3	S	A process of collaborative relationships has been defined where service providers are engaged only when such work can be more efficiently and costly effectively provided than by using employees of the University.
9P4	S	The Procurement Services Division and the Purchasing Office work to negotiate vendor agreements and contracts and ensure policies are followed. An AQIP Action Project has been initiated to develop a process for reviewing academic support units that will further enhance a comprehensive process.

- 9P5 O It appears that Ohio University relies entirely on interpersonal relationships for building and maintaining partnerships. While there is nothing inherently wrong with this, it does make it more difficult to examine and make improvements in systematic processes related to building partnerships. It is not clear how Ohio University creates, prioritizes and builds these relationships.
- 9P6 S Academic, research, business, and community stakeholders are periodically surveyed for usefulness and satisfaction of the collaborations with the University. Aside from surveys Ohio University utilizes structured assessments, and evaluation procedures to ensure its partnership relationships are meeting the varying needs of those involved.
- 9P7 S Ohio University's commitment to shared governance and open communication fosters an environment supportive for creating and building inter and intradepartmental relationships committees and cross-functional taskforces, *Vision Ohio* Strategic Plan, Faculty Senate, formal and informal social engagements, and an electronic newsletter. Communication is encouraged and carried out through a variety of print and electronic media.
- 9R1 O Ohio University regularly collects and analyzes internal and external measures of collaborative relationships including metrics from site visits and sponsored events, employer satisfaction surveys, patents, consortia agreements, transfer agreements, and start-up company statistics. The institution is encouraged to investigate other more direct measures of collaborative relationships.
- 9R2 O Evidence of performance results in building key collaborative relationships was not provided.
- 9R3 O Although Ohio University provides historic data results, comparative data is not indicated.
- 9I1 S Ohio University has made a number of improvements that have supported the University outreach into five regional campus locations and a number of international locations that help meet the Vision Ohio

Strategic Goal focusing on enrollment management, improving ease of transfer from community college partners, creation of a centralized procedure for articulation agreements and identifying new revenue opportunities.

- 912 O The *Vision Ohio* Strategic Plan is credited with creating partnerships to achieve institutional goals though the specific elements of the plan that are central to this improvement are not made explicit and not tied to achieving performance targets.