UCC Program Review Committee summary of review

Program – Technical and Applied Studies

This program includes the following degrees, minors, and certificates:

• Bachelor of Technical and Applied Studies (B.T.A.S.)

Recommendation
This program is found to be <u>viable</u>, with concerns expressed inside the review.

The program review committee requests an update on the concerns raised in the review during the 2022-23 academic year.

Date of last review – First review of this program
Date of this review – AY 2020

This review has been sent to school director and the dean. The director has included a response "from the faculty" which is attached. The dean's response is also attached.

The program does not have a graduate component.

Review of Bachelors in Technical and Applied Studies
November 26, 2019

Introduction

A review team visited the Ohio University-Chillicothe campus on October 24, 2019, to review the Bachelors in Technical and Applied Sciences. Jamie Cano (Utah State University) served as external reviewer. Ruth Palmer (Classics and World Religions) and Kathleen Sullivan (Political Science) served as internal reviewers.

The Bachelors in Technical and Applied Studies is a general education degree offered through online coursework offered on the five OHIO regional campuses. BTAS started out in 2008 as part of a community-college partnership for students in technical areas. It was designed as a degree-completion program for students who had earned an Associates degree in a technical field, such as agriculture, economics, education, environmental technology, business management technology, office technology, social work, nursing, etc. The program teaches interpersonal skills in leadership and ethics, and research strategies that allow these students to advance in their current positions or seek a higher level of employment. It became evident that this degree could serve students across the state. It has grown as a model to connect Associates-degree earning students with the option of a Bachelor's degree.

The program as a whole is viable and a necessary program for the student population for which it serves, i.e students who might not earn a Bachelor's degree. BTAS predominantly serves the needs of students in southern and southeast Ohio. In addition, BTAS fulfills the needs of students from across Ohio, from out of state, students who are working full time, and students who may have changed career track and may need a way to finish their degree. The Bachelors degree provides graduates the soft skills needed to advance in the workplace of their technical field. The faculty are quite knowledgeable about their area of expertise and the program. This online general education degree is poised to be the sort of program that OHIO programs will be looking for in the future as they respond to President Nellis' commitment to the themes of access and inclusion, and student success and transformation. For these reasons this committee thinks it should be supported and strengthened.

The Findings and Review Team Concerns drawn by the Review Team are identified below in five broad areas (Staffing, Recruitment and Advising, Program Coordinator, Online Delivery and Course Size, and Resources) for ease of reporting.

Findings

This degree has been structured as a system-wide program offered on-line, which means it is not housed on any single campus. The Chillicothe, Lancaster, Southern, Zanesville, and Eastern campuses share this program.

Staffing: The ten core courses of the major are shared between the campuses. Each campus "owns" two of those courses and the revenue generated by each respective campus (Chillicothe,

Lancaster, Southern, Zanesville, and Eastern) for their two courses goes to that respective campus, regardless of which campus the faculty are assigned to or where students enroll. The ten courses are offered every fall and spring, so there is no lack of availability of required courses for students. Regional campus deans are responsible for staffing of the courses. If a regional campus faculty member is not able to make their teaching load, the dean has the liberty to assign a faculty member with related experience to teach a TAS course. The TAS program coordinator reviews the cv's of the prospective teaching faculty, shares a document that has the course objectives and learning goals for the given course, and the faculty member checks off how they will meet those objectives and goals.

Recruitment and Advising: Some campuses have community partnerships with area community colleges to recruit students who have completed associates' degrees. Advisors are responsible for the students recruited on their respective campuses. Advisors might be associate deans or staff advisors, depending on the campus. Those advisors can recruit for the program by letting Associates-degree students know that it is an option, or catching students who have pursued a technical degree, such as nursing or social work, but have decided not to complete it through to the Bachelors. Advisors assist TAS majors through their course selection and keep the majors on track for graduation. Graduation reviews are conducted by the RHE dean.

Program Coordinator: The TAS program has one full-time faculty member, Dr. Donna Burgraff, who serves as program coordinator at OU-Chillicothe. She teaches a 4-4 load with a stipend for program coordinator duties. Other faculty from various disciplines related to TAS courses (i.e. communications, diversity, research, leadership) are engaged in the delivery of the courses, but not assigned as a faculty member of TAS. There are no academic advisers dedicated only to TAS students.

Online Delivery and Course Size: The TAS courses are offered exclusively online. The affiliated faculty we spoke with are clearly committed to student learning and student success. Course enrollment size is capped at 35, regardless of the level of courses. That cap enrollment size was determined at the RHE level, with faculty participation in decision making. An exception has been made for the research class, which is capped at 25 students. RHE policy is to follow the 35-cap policy, unless a regional campus offering is affiliated with an Athens campus based program, in which case course enrollment follows the practices of the Athens campus based program.

Regarding the teaching effectiveness or success in student learning, the Review Team did not review teaching evaluations or measures of student success or placement. The Review Team did review the program outcome goals, but not the syllabi for selected courses. Furthermore, the Review Team was not provided data on placement of graduates or advancement in the current workplace for program completers. The Review Team did not see student evaluations nor meet with any students, and therefore, cannot report on students' satisfaction with the program.

Resources: Selected faculty members indicated that the resources to execute the entirety of the program were not sufficient. Specifically, it was noted that some faculty do not have computers that are adequate for online courses. One faculty member indicated that the OHIO issued computer for the performance of the duties did not have a camera, a fundamental tool necessary for the delivery of an online curriculum.

Review Team Concerns

Staffing: Given the structure of the Department (spread over five campuses), it appears as if all courses are being taught regularly. The difficulty the Review Team has with this model is that with five Deans and/or Associate Deans making faculty teaching decisions, it becomes difficult for the Program Director to set up with faculty any future plans for program direction and/or course offerings. Yes, all 10 courses in the program are taught each semester, whether they make high enrollment or not, but is that the best model for delivering an academic program? It was clear to the Review Team that the TAS program does not have a "home base" or a viable funding base to draw from to provide faculty a reduced teaching load or other incentive in an effort to allow the TAS teaching faculty time for any Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, and Service (RSCA).

Advising and Recruitment: Overall, advising of students in the TAS program appears to be problematic to the Review Team. There is clearly no systematic, uniform, or coherent advising plan for the TAS program, nor is the Program Coordinator involved in advising decsions at the individual campus level. Since each campus selects who will advise the TAS students, there appears to be no consistency on what students are being told. Likewise, there is no organized plan for recruitment of students into the TAS program. Because some campuses recruit students directly from the instituions offering associate degrees, they tend to treat all their recruits as campus advisees regardless of the programs the students subsequently choose. No mention of any marketing efforts conducted on behalf of the program were mentioned throughout the review.

Program Coordinator: Of great concern is that the TAS Program is unable to fulfill its research, scholarship, or outreach mission. The Review Team believes that the TAS program as a whole needs to be more centralized and headquartered at a "home base" which would then allow the Program Director to more easily facilitate the research, scholarship, and outreach mission of the program and university. In addition, it was not made clear as to why the program coordinator is not included on the recruitment or advising efforts or decision making process for TAS majors on each respective campus. It is unusual to have an academic program at Ohio University that is run by administrators rather than by faculty members. The review team highly recommends that the Program Coordinator be provided the administrative duties to manage the TAS program, including funding for the program coordinator to travel to campuses to participate in administrative, recruitment, and advising efforts.

Online Delivery and Course Size: The faculty teaching in the program indicated that it was difficult to engage in research, scholarship, and creative activities, especially when teaching the heavy writing courses offered as part of the program. The Review Team agrees with the faculty perspective. Thus, it is clear that the faculty engaged in the program are not as engaged in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, and Service (RSCA) as one would expect in a comprehensive university. The review team recommends that the cap size of these courses be reduced, as they are intensive, requiring quite a bit of feedback from the instructor.

Resources: The Review Team proposes that the computer hardware and software of all faculty engaged in TAS courses be evaluated as to their respective capacity to be used in the execution of teaching the TAS courses online. Where there are deficiencies found, it is recommended that the proper steps be taken to ensure that the faculty are given the tools necessary for the execution of the TAS program, including, but not limited to, computers, both hardware and software.

Other: There appears to be no assessment plan relative to the program's success. Student evaluations of classes are reviewed by RHE for outstanding complaints by students, but they are not seen by the program coordinator to check for delivery of content. It is unusual for an academic program to not have someone in the field check to be sure that course and program objectives are being met. Other than the student evaluations (which were not made available to the Review Team) there appears to be no evidence of pedagogical goals actually being met, nor success of the students or the program. There is plenty of anecdotal data, but we are unable to report on the success of the program because of a lack of data. It is recommended by the Review Team that a follow-up departmental review follow in three to four years specifically targeting the teaching and learning outcomes from the perspective of the students.

Provisions for service, outside of teaching, is not appropriate for the program. There was evidence of some faculty members engaged in service activities within the broader community, but it clearly was not an organized effort. While the Southern campus has an advisory committee, comprised of faculty, program graduates, and community members, not all of the campuses have followed suit. There is a lot of research relative to Advisory Committees, and their value to the program cannot be understated. It is suggested that all campuses have a TAS Advisory Committee, or at the very least, there should be one for all campuses combined which would report the Program Coordinator.

Conclusion

The Bachelor of Technical and Applied Studies is viable. It has expanded rapidly since its inception and has served as a model for two other similar programs. Although it is an on-line program and the program coordinator and faculty developed the ten TAS courses that form the core of the program, each RHE campus 'owns' two courses, derives the revenue from them, and chooses who will teach them. The students who major in the BTAS program are enrolled and advised by the campus administrators who first recruited them, not by the program coordinator. The Review Team recommends that the Program Advisor be given more administrative duties, be included in the recruitment and advising at all five campuses and establish a home base.

Faculty Response to Bachelor of Technical and Applied Studies Program Review

Introduction

The faculty of the Bachelor and Technical and Applied Studies Program (BTAS) appreciate the work and support of the reviewers: Jamie Cano, Ruth Palmer, and Kathleen Sullivan. All faculty who teach TAS courses were invited to solicit feedback. This response is the faculty consensus.

Response to Findings

There were a few minor errors in the findings, largely borne out of unfamiliarity with the program. Again, these are minor and have no real impact on the findings themselves:

- Under *recruitment and advising* on page 2, final graduation reviews are conducted by the RHE Executive Dean or her representative, but an initial review is conducted by RHE BTAS Program Coordinator, Dr. Burgraff.
- Under *program coordinator* on page 2, while Dr. Burgraff is the BTAS Campus Coordinator for the Chillicothe Campus, she is also the Program Coordinator for BTAS across Regional Higher Education (RHE). Additionally, Dr. Burgraff is a dedicated academic advisor to BTAS students, but she only advises those from the Chillicothe Campus, which is about 10% of the total BTAS advisees.
- Under *online delivery and course size* on page 2, faculty did recommend appropriate course size to the administration, thus participating, but that recommendation was refused, and course size was set by the administration. Also, while the reviewers did not review course syllabi, the syllabi were provided in an appendix of the self-study.

Response to Concerns

The faculty wholeheartedly agree with all the concerns expressed by the reviewers. Our comments for each specific area follow. At the end of the narrative we provide a graph of the specific concerns outlined and our plan to address them. Overall, we support returning to shared governance where the faculty and administration work together to reach consensus. These concerns cannot be addressed by the faculty alone and must be done so by the faculty and administration working together. The faculty welcome the opportunity to do so.

Staffing: The faculty agree with the staffing concerns. The current structure of being spread over five campuses is not working. It does mean that making decisions in the best interest of the program is difficult. It also is confusing to students and creates unnecessary work making the program less efficient. The transition of the program to University College under One OHIO reorganization should address the five-campus structure issue. The faculty agree that offering the 10 courses every semester has resulted in low enrolled courses and is not the best model for delivering an academic program. The current schedule was insisted upon by the campus associate deans. The faculty recommend returning to the faculty recommended schedule. It was

more efficient. However, this needs to be done in the 2021-2022 academic year as doing so for 2020-2021 could create graduation issues for BTAS students at this late date. Advisors can then plan through the next academic year in anticipation of fall only and spring only courses. The faculty agree that the TAS program does not have a "home base" or a viable funding base to draw from to provide faculty a reduced teaching load or other incentives in an effort to allow the TAS teaching faculty time for any Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, and Service (RSCA). The transition of the program to University College will result in a home base, viable funding base, and an administrator dedicated to the success of the program, none of which it has now.

Advising and Recruitment: The faculty agree that the advising of students in the TAS program is problematic.   A previous solution offered by Dr. Burgraff would be that she would advise all campus based BTAS advisees. This would leave the eCampus students advised by eCampus advisors who already work closely with Dr. Burgraff. Doing this would create a systematic, uniform, coherent advising plan for the BTAS program. The faculty agree that there is no organized plan for marketing the BTAS program or for recruitment of students into BTAS. Once the program has a centralized structure in University College, the faculty and administration of University College along with representatives of each regional campus should develop a marketing and recruitment plan.

Program Coordinator: The faculty agree that the program coordinator is not being utilized and should be provided both the authority and resources in order to facilitate the research, scholarship, and outreach mission of the BTAS major. The BTAS program is, indeed, currently being run by administrators rather than, as it should be, the faculty. While the campus administration absolutely has a role to play in assisting the program coordinator with the management of the BTAS major, the campus associate deans have so taken over the program to the point that they no longer want even recommendations on scheduling from the faculty. With the One OHIO reorganization and the move to University College, the BTAS major will have a home base and can restore shared governance to the BTAS program.

Online Delivery and Course Size: The faculty agree that the cap size of the online courses is too high and all that course caps should be restored to the cap that went through the UCC process at 25. The courses are writing intensive and the faculty cannot be engaged in research, scholarship, creative activity, and service (RSCA) as is expected at a comprehensive university. The reduction in class size will allow for better student feedback, more thorough assessment, and improve both course completion and degree completion rates.

Resources: The faculty agree that the BTAS program is not adequately resourced. The program needs a budget to both assist in program coordination and the implementation of the assessment plan. Additionally, especially since the program is totally online, faculty need adequate hardware, software, and instructional design assistance in order to effectively develop and deliver TAS courses. These resources have been requested but not provided. Again, with the transition in One OHIO to University College, it is hoped that the financial model developed would allow University College the necessary resources to operate the program.

Other: The faculty agree that there needs to be centralized coordination that would allow for the assessment plan to be implemented to insure that learning goals are being met and that the faculty program coordinator be responsible to review student evaluations and complaints to insure student success is maximized. The faculty will review its assessment plan at the end of every year in order to make decisions in the best interests of the students in the program. The centralized coordination would also allow for organized service activities and development of an advisory committee for BTAS. Both the implementation of the assessment plan and the recruiting of an overall and possibly campus based advisory committees, must be provided financial resources. It is imperative that University College oversee and coordinate the BTAS major. While the individual campuses will still be coordinating with BTAS, decisions must be centralized with the program coordinator reporting to the University College Dean.

Concern	Plan to Address	Responsibility/Resources	Date to Accomplish
Five Campus Structure	One College Structure	Through One OHIO Fall Under University College	August 2020
Schedule	Return to Faculty Recommended Schedule	Dr. Elizabeth Sayrs, Dean Dr. Donna L. Burgraff, BTAS Coordinator	2021-2022
No "Home Base" to Allow for Viable Funding Base, Faculty Incentives and Administrative Oversight	One College Structure	Through One OHIO Fall Under University College	August 2020
Inadequate Advising	Adopt Dr. Burgraff's Plan for Faculty Advising on Regional Campuses	Dr. Burgraff, BTAS Coordinator Dr. Jeremy Webster, Dean of Zanesville Dr. Jim Smith, Dean of Lancaster Dr. Dywayne Nicely, Dean of Chilllicothe Dr. Nicole Pennington, Dean of Southern	Spring 2020
Lack of Recruitment and Marketing Plan	Develop and Implement a Recruitment and Marketing Plan	Dr. Sayrs, Dean Dr. Burgraff, Program Coordinator Staff and Administration in University College Faculty who Teach in TAS Staff and Administration from Each of the 5 Regional Campuses	Fall 2020

Lack of Shared Governance and Lack of Faculty Participation and Oversight of Program	Provide Program Coordinator with Authority and Resources to Manage the Major	Dr. Burgraff, BTAS Coordinator Dr. Webster, Dean of Zanesville Dr. Smith, Dean of Lancaster Dr. Nicely, Dean of Chilllicothe Dr. Pennington, Dean of Southern Dr. Sayrs, Dean of University College	Authority-Spring 2020 Financial Resources-Fall 2020
Course Size	Restore Agreed Upon Class Size Approved Through UCC	Dr. Webster, Dean of Zanesville Dr. Smith, Dean of Lancaster Dr. Nicely, Dean of Chilllicothe Dr. Pennington, Dean of Southern	Summer 2020
Lack of Adequate Resources	Provide for a BTAS Budget	Dr. Sayrs, Dean Dr. Burgraff, BTAS Coordinator One OHIO Financial Structure	August 2020
Lack of Assessment Data	Implementation of BTAS Assessment Plan	Dr. Burgraff TAS Faculty Dean Sayrs by Providing Funding for Plan and Overseeing its Implementation	2020-2021
Lack of Advisory Committee	Recruit a BTAS Advisory Committee and Possibly a BTAS Advisory Committee from Each Campus	Dr. Burgraff Dean Sayrs Regional Campus Administration	Fall 2020

Conclusion

The faculty agree that the Bachelor of Technical and Applied Studies is viable. It is a model that other programs and majors can follow. The revenue for the program needs to go to its new home base in University College. This will eliminate the need for campuses to own courses. Decisions about who teaches the courses need to be based on faculty recommendations about

who is best to teach the courses and not based on campus decisions about who does not have enough campus teaching load. The students need to be advised by faculty dedicated to BTAS and eCampus advisors who work closely with BTAS faculty. The BTAS Program Coordinator and the University College Dean, working closely together, will be able to address all the concerns in a timely manner. The One OHIO reorganization could not be coming at a better time for the Bachelor of Technical and Applied Studies.

RHE Response: Review of Bachelor of Technical & Applied Studies

Interim Executive Dean, Nicole Pennington
December 11, 2019

The program review team identified six areas of concern and recommendation for the Bachelor of Technical & Applied Studies (TAS) program: staffing, advising and recruitment, program coordinator, online delivery and course size, resources, and program assessment. RHE leadership offer the following response to their concerns and recommendations.

Staffing

The program reviewers note that each campus "owns" two TAS courses, which is inaccurate. No regional campuses own courses in the program; instead, each campus is assigned online offerings of courses to ensure an equitable enrollment distribution. The course distribution was originally created with input from the TAS faculty. Additionally, the concerns noted by the review team and the faculty response regarding course offerings suggest the information is not regularly reviewed. The regional associate deans collaborate on the online schedule, reviewing both enrollment trends and faculty input each year. When the TAS course offerings expanded to offering 10 during fall and spring, it was done with the explicit expectation that enrollments would be reviewed to determine long-term rotation plans.

Included in the program reviewer recommendations are recommendations regarding course scheduling and faculty load.

- Faculty are involved in course scheduling through a recommendation process; however, the ultimate scheduling authority, for all regional courses, rests with the campus deans, delegated to the associate deans. Cross-campus schedule collaboration helps ensure equity in course distribution and faculty load. With the One OHIO transition, we expect even greater levels of course scheduling coordination will occur between the regional campuses and Athens academic units.
- Tenured and tenure-track faculty across all campuses are regularly engaged in research and service, while consistently teaching a 4-4 load. This workload is standardized across the regional system and is taken into consideration when faculty are reviewed for promotion and tenure.

Advising and Recruitment

The program reviewers suggest that some regional campuses have recruitment advantage because of their community college partnerships, but this is an inaccurate representation. The university partners with community colleges across the state and region. Two of the regional campuses are co-located with partner community colleges, where other regional campuses are in the same or similar service district as other partnerships. Overall, the TAS program benefits from community college

partnerships, which serve as a recruiting opportunity for regional campus and eCampus program enrollments.

The TAS program is included in university marketing efforts for online degree completion programs. Additionally, each campus is encouraged to market available program offerings and to recruit students accordingly. Faculty play an important role in program recruiting, and assisting with program recruiting is included in the program coordinator duties.

Like other OHIO degree programs that are offered through multiple campuses and delivery modes, the advising for TAS is distributed based on student campus. Campus-based advising occurs by both faculty and staff; staff advisors advise eCampus TAS students. The program coordinator should be in regular communication with all advisors to ensure consistency and equity in the advising experience.

As the faculty response indicates, the TAS coordinator has an opportunity to perform an initial review of graduation candidates. As is consistent across the institution, the final decision regarding degree conferral occurs under the direction of the Executive Dean of Regional Higher Education.

Program Coordinator
As the program reviewers note, there is one full-time, tenured faculty member in the TAS program. Faculty from other disciplines teach in the program, but they are not dedicated to it. Utilizing faculty from multiple backgrounds and areas of expertise helps to support the TAS goal of providing students with the necessary leadership and professional skills required to advance within their chosen technical field. The RHE leadership views the diversity of faculty disciplines as an overall strength of the program.

The faculty response to the program review includes support for the reviewer recommendations related to the role of the program coordinator. Specifically, the program reviewers indicate a need to include the program coordinator in advising, recruitment, and administrative functions. These functions are indeed included in the stipend duties and overall expectations for the RHE program coordinator.

The RHE leadership disagrees with the assertion that the program is run by administrators. The program coordinator is responsible for curricular content and revisions, program assessment and reporting, recruitment and advising, and recommending course scheduling needs to the associate deans. These activities are supported by an annual stipend to the program coordinator. RHE leadership supports the idea that the program coordinator regularly travel to each regional campus to meet with students, faculty, and advisors to discuss program needs and expectations; existing travel reimbursement processes exist to support inter-campus travel.

Online Delivery and Course Size
The program reviewers note a concern with the standardized RHE online
course capacity of 35. Though they note that faculty participated in
the decision-making process that led to this standard, the program
reviewers may not have realized that the course capacity started as a
recommendation from the faculty via the RHE Curriculum Committee.
Additionally, there is an existing process within RHE to request a
review of course capacities, which includes the chair of RHECC and the
Executive Dean. Prior to the standard RHE course cap, most TAS courses
were routinely capped at 25 students, which was the curricular default
in OCEAN during the Quarter-to-Semester conversion. The RHE
leadership encourages the TAS faculty to develop and submit proposals
for each course they believe should have a lower, standard capacity.

The program reviewers note that TAS faculty are "not as engaged in
Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity, and Service (RSCA) as one
would expect in a comprehensive university." The RHE leadership
reiterate that the standard teaching load for tenured and tenure-track
faculty on regional campuses is 4-4, which is taken into consideration
when faculty are reviewed for promotion and tenure. Additionally,
there are existing processes within RHE for faculty to request
assistance for research or scholarly efforts. The RHE leadership
encourage tenured and tenure-track faculty to look into these
opportunities.

Resources
The program reviewers and the faculty each indicate inequity in
resources for faculty teaching in the TAS program, specifically noting
a need for faculty to have the hardware and software required for
videoconferencing. RHE leadership are unaware of any outstanding
technology requests made by faculty teaching in the TAS program. RHE
leadership agree that faculty should have the instructional resources
they need for their courses. External cameras and microphones are
available for faculty and staff use on each regional campus, and RHE
leadership encourage faculty to reach out to RHE IT with any specific
instructional technology needs.

Program Assessment
The program reviewer's statement that there is not an assessment plan
for TAS is inaccurate; the TAS program assessment plan is on file with
the OHIO Assessment Clearinghouse. However, as the faculty response
notes, the program assessment plan needs annual review and update.
Part of the duties of the program coordinator is the development and
execution of the program assessment plan, including the required
annual updates and reporting to the university clearinghouse.

Student course evaluations should have been provided to the review
team. This was an oversight and missed by everyone who developed and
reviewed the self-study prior to submission. The program reviewers
note concern that the program coordinator does not have access to all
student evaluations. While evaluation results are initially
distributed to individual faculty and to campus associate deans based

on course offerings, RHE program coordinators can request evaluations for all major courses.

As noted by the program reviewers and affirmed by the faculty, the TAS program should have an active program advisory committee. RHE leadership agrees that there should be a system-wide advisory committee, representing the needs and expectations of the TAS program across all campuses and delivery modes. Coordinating annual meetings of the program advisory committee will continue to be a program coordinator duty.

Overall Judgment by Reviewers
The committee finds the Technical & Applied Studies program viable.

Response by RHE
TAS program enrollments expanded rapidly after initial launch; however, program enrollments have steadily declined over the past several years as other completion degrees launched. With strong collaboration between administration and the program coordinator, and active engagement by the program coordinator in recruitment, advising, and program assessment, the RHE leadership agree that the program is viable.

Conclusion
As we prepare for program realignment under One OHIO and the transition of the TAS program from RHE to University College, we agree that it will be important to keep the results of this program review in mind. Both the program review report and the faculty response include thoughts about resource allocation and budgetary implications; however, the university budget model, and its interplay with the One OHIO alignment, is unknown. Additionally, we expect course scheduling will continue under a collaborative approach, including regional campus administration, program faculty, and Athens academic units. We believe the TAS program continues to serve a critical non-traditional student population, and we look forward to working with University College and the program faculty to ensure the program's sustainability and growth.