RADFORD UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Introduction

When program review is done well, everyone benefits. Faculty and administrators gain an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the university's programs; there is clear agreement on goals for the future; decisions are based on academic priorities; the university is accountable to its students, the taxpayers of Virginia, and other supporters for the quality of the university's product; and, most importantly, the university improves its programs while working in a collegial way.

The central focus of Program Review at Radford University is on program improvement. While Program Review can be used as a tool to meet certain accountability standards, the essence of the process is based on a model of continuous improvement. That is, it assists programs in defining clearly stated goals and then supporting the accomplishment of those goals. It also is used to provide required information for external agencies including the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV). The Program Review Committee was charged with revising the Program Review Guidelines (last revised April 2002) to reduce the burden placed on the programs under review. The aim was to streamline the review and reporting process, while gathering the information necessary to focus on program improvement and external reporting requirements. This document outlines the organization of the Program Review Report and the Program Review Calendar. It specifies the information to include, sets limits on the length of each section, provides templates to simplify reporting and standardize information, and changes the calendar to better fit the academic year. The report should be submitted using standard editorial design (one inch margins, no smaller than 12 point type--with the exception of the templates if desired), single spacing within paragraphs).

Part I. Program Information

Section A. Program Identification

Provide the official name of the program, CIP Code number if appropriate, and list any program options and/or concentrations.

Section B. Rationale for Program (1 page limit)

State the overall scope, philosophy, mission, vision, and overriding goals of the program, and the centrality of the program to the Mission and Vision of the institution. Responses of programs to this criterion will vary depending on the degree to which the program "fits" with the various aspects of the institutional mission and vision. To illustrate, one program may be central to the mission and vision because the program prepares graduates in a particular area, another because it provides primarily general education preparation necessary for all majors, another because it supports outreach and public service, and so forth. Thus, the program should describe the primary ways in which it

supports the mission and vision of the institution, rather than attempting to defend centrality based solely on enrollments or numbers of graduates.

Section C. Summary of Prior Review (1 page limit)

Summarize the last program review recommendations and, if applicable, the last accreditation report. Summarize the program's responses to the recommendations.

Section D. Curriculum Analyses (1 page limit)

Describe the program's curricular strengths, weaknesses, and unique aspects. Analyze and evaluate trends in the discipline that might have an impact on the program. Indicate any significant curricular changes over the past five years.

Part II. Student Learning and Student Engagement

Section A. Update of SACS Compliance Requirements III.13 (Template)

Update expected learning outcomes, assessments used for outcomes evaluation, and evidence of program improvement using SACS Compliance Requirements III.13 developed for each program. (Provided by Office of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment.) See Appendix A for sample.

Section B. Program's Quality Enhancement Plan (Template; commentary limited to 5 pages)

As part of the University's Quality Enhancement Plan, academic programs are to develop an assessment plan to measure student learning as a result of intentional efforts focused on student engagement. The following template outlines the components of such a plan. Complete the template and provide a commentary on the program's QEP Implementation Plan. For more information on the QEP, see Appendix B. Examples of "QEP Implementation Strategies" can be found in "Five Dimensions of Effective Educational Practices" from National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Information (pages 2-4) on the university's website: http://www.radford.edu/~planning/SACS/NSSEInformation040501.pdf and the sample template in Appendix B. In addition, early in the fall semester, each program undergoing program review will be contacted by representatives from the QEP Implementation Team. These individuals will serve as consultants as the programs assess their current student engagement strategies and propose and implement new student engagement strategies.

Quality Enhancement Plan Template

QEP Implementation Objectives (What activities and practices are expected to result in students becoming more engaged?)	**Implementation Strategies** (What strategies are used to improve student involvement in those activities and practices?)	**Implementation Assessments** (How are the degree to which the strategies are implemented and the level of participation among faculty and student assessed?)	**Targeted Learning Outcome Objectives** (What Student Learning Objective from the updated SACS III.13 is related to the QEP objective?)	**Outcome Assessments** (What tools are used to assess student learning outcomes)	**Evidence of Improvements** (What revisions or changes in strategies, pedagogy, curricula, etc., have been made as a result of the assessments?) *

* In some cases programs may not be able to complete this column until the follow-up report is submitted.

The commentary should include responses to the following questions:

- What evidence led the program to choose the QEP Implementation Objectives in Column 1?
- Why and how were the Implementation Strategies in Column 2 chosen; why are they appropriate for the discipline and how are they expected to contribute to greater student learning?
- What did the program learn from the assessment of the implementation of the strategies and how does the program interpret these findings?
- What did the program learn from the assessment of student learning outcomes and how does the program interpret these findings?
- What changes are proposed in the program's QEP (from Column 1 to Column 5)? How will the program measure the effects of the changes? (In some cases programs may not be able to answer these questions until the follow-up report is submitted or until the QEP is fully implemented.)

This information will be used as part of program review and for the interim progress reports on the university's QEP required by SACS.

Section C. Other Evidence of Program Quality (1 page limit)

Summarize other evidence of program quality such as job placements, internships/practica participation, employer surveys, pass rates on licensure or other professional examinations.

Section D. Relationship of Scholarly and Service Activities to Student Learning (Template; summary limited to 1 page)

Complete the template for the program as a whole over the past five academic years, not for individual faculty. Summarize the program's balance or relationship of scholarly creative output and service activities to student learning.

SCHOLARLY AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES	
Number of new courses developed	
Number of courses revised	
Number of theses completed	
Number of internships/practica supervised	
Number of directed studies supervised	
Number of books published	
Number of journal articles	
Number of international presentations	
Number of national presentations	
Number of regional presentations	
Number of grants submitted	
Number of grants funded	
Number of professional performances	
Number of professional exhibits	
Number of national professional offices held	
Number of regional professional offices held	
Number of state professional offices held	
Number of workshops led	
Number of non-credit courses taught	
Number of other relevant activities (list)	

[List other activities appropriate to the program]	

Part III. Quantitative Productivity Data

Data for each program will be provided by the Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment. Programs should provide any interpretation or information that guides the understanding of these data. See Appendix C for sample.

- Credit Hours Taught By FT & PT Faculty
- Number of Majors
- Number of Students Taught
- New Freshmen Selecting Major (undergraduate programs)
- Enrollment History
- Program Graduates
- Schedule M Analysis
- Cost Per Credit Hour and Major
- Faculty List

Part IV. Relationship with Other Programs

Complete the checklist and summarize evidence supporting each item relevant to the program. (Summaries limited to ½ page each or 2 pages total.)

____ Program courses support general education and/or professional programs.
____ Interdisciplinary program
____ Program shares a substantial number of courses and faculty with other similar programs
____ Student or employer demand is high
____ Program provides access to an underserved population or geographical area
____ Program meets a unique need in the region, Commonwealth, or nation without being unnecessarily duplicative
____ Other

Part V. Conclusion and Recommendations (1 page limit)

- Does this program meet the SCHEV productivity/viability criteria? The criteria can be found in SCHEV's *Program Productivity/Viability at Public Institutions: Policies and Procedures for Review of Academic Programs*: (http://www.schev.edu/AdminFaculty/ReviewPublicAcademicProg.pdf?from=adminfaculty).

- Is this program recommended to be maintained, developed, or discontinued?

- What changes, if any, are recommended by the program?

Calendar

Mid-September	Workshops in program review will be conducted for department/program faculty by the appropriate dean. Program Review Committee members will be available to assist deans as appropriate. Workshops on the Quality Enhancement Plan will be conducted by the QEP implementation team.
October	Relevant information, including the program's template of SACS Compliance Requirements (expected learning outcomes, assessments used for outcomes evaluations, and evidence of program improvement), the Quality Enhancement Plan template, and Quantitative Productivity Data, will be distributed no later than October 31 to the department chair or program coordinator by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment.
March 1	The department chairperson or program coordinator shall submit the completed "Program Review Report" to the dean(s).
March 22	The dean(s) shall evaluate the Program Review Report to form his or her recommendations. Those recommendations, along with the completed Program Review Report, shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Academic Program Review Committee. Recommendations from the dean(s) shall be forwarded to the department chairperson or program coordinator.
March 23 – May 14	The Committee shall complete its review. As appropriate, the Committee Members will meet with department chairpersons, deans, and faculty to seek clarification of the Program Review Report or dean's recommendations.
May 31	The Committee submits its final report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A copy of the Committee's report and recommendations shall be forwarded to the department chairperson or program coordinator and dean(s).
July 1	The Vice President for Academic Affairs will make recommendations based on Program Review to the President. A copy of the recommendations of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, including the developmental actions resulting from program review recommendations, will be sent to the department chairpersons and deans. Deans are responsible for monitoring the implementation of recommendations.

October 15	Should there be recommendations related to program continuance approved by the President, those recommendations will be forwarded to the Board of Visitors for action at the November meeting. A copy of such recommendations from the President to the Board of Visitors will be sent to the department chairpersons, deans, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
November 15	As appropriate, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall submit recommendations to the University Planning and Budget Committee that reflect decisions resulting from program review.
November 15	As required, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will report the actions resulting from Program Review to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.
April 1	The Department Chair or Program Coordinator will submit a report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and appropriate Dean(s) indicating how the program has addressed recommendations of the Program Review Committee and any recommendations from the Dean(s) or Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Appendix A

Sample

SACS Compliance Requirements III.13

Program: Chemistry Undergraduate Program
Department: Chemistry and Physics
College: Arts and Sciences

Expected Learning Outcomes

Upon graduation, Radford University chemistry majors will

1. understand and successfully apply the fundamental principles of chemistry; integrate the various areas of chemistry to solve complex problems that require knowledge from all components of the curriculum

2. identify problems, formulate logical solutions, and extend problem solving skills to situations different from any previously encountered

3. function as an effective member of a group in the assessment and solution of problems

4. plan and execute well-designed experiments utilizing the chemical literature and relevant computerized data bases

5. maintain legible and complete experimental records; interpret experimental results and draw reasonable conclusions; analyze data statistically and assess the reliability of the results

6. use and understand technology as it applies to chemistry, including modern instrumentation and computer-based data acquisition

7. understand and apply all standard practices necessary to insure safe working conditions in the laboratory

8. communicate effectively through oral and written reports

9. recognize the importance of the interactions among chemistry, other disciplines, technology, and society

10. possess the cumulative skills requisite for success in industry, education, or graduate school

11. apply general education skills to professional tasks and build upon general education in the process of lifelong learning.

SACS Compliance Requirements III.13
Program: Chemistry Undergraduate Program

Assessments Used for Outcomes Evaluation

Assessment Used	Year/Time Period Used	Outcomes Assessed
Faculty assessment of classes and laboratories through use of student evaluations	Continuous	Nos. 1, 2
Survey of employers	Spring 1999, every three years	All
Survey of graduating seniors	Every year	All
Survey of non-majors who took chemistry classes as a requirement for another major	Spring 1999, every three years	Nos. 1, 2
Survey of alumni	Spring 1999, every three years	All
NCATE and NSTA accreditation feedback	Spring 1995	All
Review of state program approval guidelines	Spring 1999	All
Program Review	Spring 2000	All

SACS Compliance Requirements III.13
Program: Chemistry Undergraduate Program

Evidence of Program Improvement

Program Improvement	Year Implemented	Assessment Basis
Revised list of expected learning outcomes	1998, 2000	Review of American Chemical Society standards
Developed vision statement and Department Strategic Plan	2000	Response to the new University Strategic Plan
Revision of curriculum	2001	Program Review and review of American Chemical Society standards
Addition of electives in electronics for scientists, environmental chemistry, and polymer laboratory	1996, 1998, 1999	Feedback from graduates; examination of the job market
Development of a one-semester general education chemistry course	1999	Input from the General Education Curriculum Advisory Committee
Addition of a computer laboratory	2000	Feedback from graduates and review of professional standards
Expanded use of technology throughout the curriculum	Continuous since 1996	Feedback from graduates and review of professional standards
Creation of a department web page	2000	Feed back from students, prospective students, alumni
Participation in the Supplemental Instruction Program	Continuous since 1998	Response to University retention program

Appendix B

Student Engagement and the Quality Enhancement Plan.

In developing Radford University's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), program review in academic affairs and student affairs was identified as a primary set of tools for implementing and assessing the effectiveness of the QEP at the unit level.
The institution-level assessment efforts described in the working draft of the QEP (available for review at http://www.radford.edu/~irpa/qep/QEPWorkingDraft28Nov01.pdf provide macro-level indicators of the overall effectiveness of our efforts to implement the QEP, to engage students, and the extent to which those efforts are becoming more pervasive and intentional. Summary measures of student engagement, content analyses of assessment reports from departments and units, scores on national surveys, benchmark analysis of those scores, summary analyses of reports on various inventories, and external reactions to the university are useful in determining the general trajectory of the institution as it implements the QEP. To measure student learning as a result of intentional efforts focused on student engagement, however, requires development of well-designed assessment plans at the department and unit level. As mentioned in the QEP document, academic programs have established student learning and outcome goals. Programs already assess the degree to which students achieve those goals. The results of those assessment efforts are reported as described in the assessment section above. In this section of the report, programs should report the specific strategies the program will employ to enhance student engagement, the goals or outcomes they expect to be impacted by those strategies, the process assessments they will employ to monitor implementation of the strategies, and the outcomes assessment tools (many of which are already in place) that they will use to gauge the degree to which student learning has improved.

As the QEP is implemented, departments and units will need to add reports of specific curricular or pedagogical changes that have resulted from information gained through the assessment process. As stated in the QEP, the program review process in Academic Affairs will serve as both a catalyst for implementation of the QEP and a mechanism for collecting information about assessment of both the implementation and effectiveness of the QEP at the unit level.

The reporting guidelines do not prescribe specific areas of focus or strategies for improving student engagement, nor identify specific areas of student learning. These guidelines encourage programs to identify for themselves those strategies that are most likely to result in the types of student engagement faculty in that department think will have the greatest impact on the program's learning goals. Thus, programs are asked to:

- identify activities and practices that could result in their students' becoming more engaged,
- develop strategies for improving student involvement in those activities and practices,
- implement those strategies by making appropriate changes in curriculum, pedagogy, advising, and student/faculty interaction,

- develop tools to assess the degree to which the strategies are being implemented, as well as the level of participation among faculty and students,
- continue to use sound outcomes assessment to determine the degree to which the improvements in engagement-related activities are producing desired improvements in student learning,
- Use results of the assessments to revise strategies, change pedagogy, revise curricula and so forth as results indicate.

By adding this set of expectations to the assessment reporting guidelines, programs will focus critical attention on improving student engagement, thinking intentionally about the link between that engagement and specific learning goals. Ultimately, resources can be directed toward those strategies that are having an impact, and those that prove ineffective can be replaced with new ones.

In previous program review reports, programs reported a list of learning objectives for the students enrolled in the program, the assessment tools employed, the specific outcomes assessed with each tool, when the assessment is/was conducted, and any curricular changes made as a result of assessment results. Those elements will continue to be reported in the assessment section of the report. What this section adds to the reporting guidelines are the specific elements outlined above. While there is no singular method that is most effective in reporting such efforts, one possibility programs might adopt is something like the following template:

Program XXX

QEP Implementation Objectives (What activities and practices are expected to result in students becoming more engaged?)	**Implementation Strategies** (What strategies are used to improve student involvement in those activities and practices?)	**Implementation Assessments** (How are the degree to which the strategies are implemented and the level of participation among faculty and student assessed?)	**Targeted Learning Outcome Objectives** (What Student Learning Objective from the updated SACS III.13 is related to the QEP objective?)	**Outcome Assessments** (What tools are used to assess student learning outcomes)	**Evidence of Improvements** (What revisions or changes in strategies, pedagogy, curricula, etc., have been made as a result of the assessments?) *
Improve student involvement with faculty in research	Provide additional research internship opportunities; add research participation to course requirements; encourage student participation in presentation/publication of joint research endeavors	Student and Faculty Inventories, syllabi review, review of FAR's	"Students will be able to carry out original research using experimental, comparative, and descriptive methods of science"	Review and assessment of final student capstone project; Major Field Achievement Test	

QEP Implementation Objectives (What activities and practices are expected to result in students becoming more engaged?)	**Implementation Strategies** (What strategies are used to improve student involvement in those activities and practices?)	**Implementation Assessments** (How are the degree to which the strategies are implemented and the level of participation among faculty and student assessed?)	**Targeted Learning Outcome Objectives** (What Student Learning Objective from the updated SACS III.13 is related to the QEP objective?)	**Outcome Assessments** (What tools are used to assess student learning outcomes)	**Evidence of Improvements** (What revisions or changes in strategies, pedagogy, curricula, etc., have been made as a result of the assessments?) *
Improve student opportunities to write and receive feedback on reports using a scientific format	Improve relevant writing requirements in major courses; require capstone project involving scientific writing; provide prompt feedback and opportunities to revise reports based on that feedback	Student and Faculty Inventories, syllabi review, capstone course assessment	"Student will be able to write a report using a scientific format"	Review and assessment of final capstone writing requirement; Standardized Certification Exam	
Improve student opportunities to engage in conversations with persons from diverse backgrounds	Improve opportunities for diversity forums; include discussions of diversity issues in course content; require service learning activities in diverse settings as part of course requirements	Student and Faculty Inventories; syllabi review, counts of students participating in opportunities provided	"Students will improve understanding and acceptance of persons from diverse backgrounds"	Student Surveys, Campus Climate Inventories, CSS/CIRP comparisons	
Improve student involvement in reading and discussions of readings outside of class	Improve reading assignments in courses; provide reading discussion groups or help sessions; require in-class group reports on related books not assigned as texts	Student and Faculty Inventories; syllabi review;	Students will be able to read critically and debate readings related to required subject matter	Major Field Achievement Tests, juried discussion groups; scoring of in-class reports	

Appendix C
Explanations of Program Related Data

Explanations of Program Related Data

Analysis of Credit Hours Taught by FT and PT Faculty													
			Total Credit Hours Taught Fall Semester 2002										
CIP	Discipline	FT faculty in Fall 02	Total Cr Hrs Fall 02	Lower Division Credit Hours Taught	Upper Division Credit Hours Taught	Grad Credit Hours Taught	% Cr. Hrs. at the Lower Division	% Cr. Hrs. at the Upper Division	% Cr. Hrs. at the Graduate Division	Total Credit Hours Taught by FT Faculty	Avg. # Cr. Hrs. Taught by FT Faculty	Total Credit Hours Taught by PT Faculty	% of Tot Cr. Hrs. Taught by PT Faculty
44	Public Administration	11	2,772	94	2,121	557	3%	77%	20%	1,824	166	948	34%

Importance of these data

FT faculty are the T&R faculty listed and being paid during the semester in which the data are captured. No reduction should be made unless a faculty is on a grant providing adjunct backfill monies. There is no reduction for other reassigned time.

Provides the distribution of instruction across student levels.

Indicates the extent to which instruction is program related vs. service related.

The greater the number of credit hours at the graduate level, the increased importance of having properly credentialed faculty.

Average number of credit hours per FT faculty will be used later to indicate degree to which the expectations of Schedule M are being met.

Percentage of credit hours taught by PT faculty assist in accreditation reports and, if Schedule M is met or exceeded, supports the need for additional FT faculty. Generally, universities have between 20-30 percent of instruction by PT faculty. See AAUP guidelines at http://www.aaup.org/Issues/part-time/Ptguide.htm

Analysis by Number of Majors											
			New Freshmen Declaring as a Major	Majors				FTE Majors		Average Number of Graduates Per AY Over Last 5 years	
CIP	Discipline	FT faculty in Fall 02		Grad Majors	UG Majors	Fall 02 Total Majors for Dept	Fall 02 Majors per FT Dept Faculty	Under Graduate	Graduate	Under Graduate	Graduate
44	Public Administration	11	20	178	370	548	50	20	10	58	38

Importance of these data

The number of new freshmen declaring this program as their major (or pre-major where a distinction is made) is important, as this is an indication for why student chose RU. If this number is low but the total UG major is high, then there is an indication that majors were chosen by students once they were here. On the other hand, if the number of initial majors is high but the number of total UG majors is low, then there is an indication that the program had significant attrition.

The number of majors will assist in program review to demonstrate the demand for the program at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The number of majors represents additional faculty and staff workload expectations provided through advising, mentoring, and, at the graduate level, through service on thesis committees.

The number of FTE majors is a new twist put on by SCHEV in their draft Productivity Policies and Guidelines. The numbers follow exactly the numbers on Schedule M. The calculation of this is not spelled out, but it will probably be computed as the number of credit hours earned by majors at the UG level/15 and earned by majors at the GR level/12. Some variation of this will be used by SCHEV in their program productivity analyses.

The five year average of graduates is a measure used by SCHEV in their draft Productivity Policy and Guidelines, January 2003. The 5-year average graduation rate for Public Administration is 8 at the UG level and 5 at the GR level.

Analysis by Number of Students Taught						
			Students Taught			
CIP	Discipline	FT faculty in Fall 02	Total Students Taught by FT Faculty	Avg # of Students Taught by FT Faculty	Total Students Taught by PT Faculty	% of Tot Students Taught by PT Faculty
44	Public Administration	11	608	55	316	34%

Importance of these data

The number of students taught by FT faculty is another indication of workload. It is important because the number of students translates into expectations for office hours, grading, etc. It also has an impact on departmental instructional supplies and other NPS budgetary needs regardless if the instruction was by FT or PT faculty.

New Freshmen Selecting Major												
			In-state					Out-of-State				
CIP	Discipline	Fall	Number	GPA	SAT V	SAT M	INDEX	Number	GPA	SAT V	SAT M	INDEX
44	Public Administration	2002	86	3.00	484	468	2,152	7	3.26	562	544	2,410
		2001	78	3.02	501	484	2,193	8	2.84	511	484	2,131
		2000	76	3.02	473	463	2,144	11	2.71	500	462	2,046
		1999	69	2.97	496	472	2,156	16	2.93	501	524	2,197
		1998	72	2.98	497	482	2,171	11	2.73	478	502	2,072

Importance of these data

These data show the trends in numbers and in admission's characteristics of entering freshmen entering a program.
Increasing numbers of majors as freshmen will have implications for upper division courses in 2-4 years, thus trends impact resource needs and allocations.
Increases in out-of-state students may indicate the attraction to students beyond VA.
Other

History of Program Graduates 1998-2002																
			1998-99			1999-00			2000-01			2001-02				
CIP	Discipline		1810	1820	1840	1910	1920	1940	2010	2020	2040	2110	2120	2140	Total	Average
44	Public Administration	semester	27	49	25	34	59	25	22	54	30	27	62	26	440	
		AY			101			118			106			115	440	88

Importance of these data

These data show the trends in number of graduates -- a mesure used by SCHEV in determining program viability.
Other

Enrollment History						
			Fall Semester			
CIP	Discipline		1999	2000	2001	2002
44	Public Administration	UG	250	225	198	178
		GR	325	355	380	370

Importance of these data

Enrollments have direct implication on resource needs.
Differences between graduate and undergraduate impact both workload and credentials of faculty needed.
Other

Schedule M Analysis											
			Total Credit Hours Fall 2002				Schedule M				
CIP	Discipline	FT faculty in Fall 02	Total Cr Hrs Fall 02	Lower Division Credit Hours Taught	Upper Division Credit Hours Taught	Grad Credit Hours Taught	Sch. M. Lower Division Exp.	Sch. M. Upper Division Exp.	Sch. M. Graduate Division Exp.	Wt. Schedule M Credit Hours Exp.	Avg. # Cr. Hrs. Taught by FT Faculty
44	Public Administration	11	2,772	94	2,121	557	300	210	120	195	166

Importance of these data

Schedule M is used by state finance and appropriation committees in their determination of base budget adequacy for RU. A variation of Schedule M is used by SCHEV in productivity analyses. Academic Affairs also uses Schedule M as one of the criteria used in the determination of faculty resource needs.

Weighted Schedule M Expectation	(Lower Div. Cr. Hrs./Tot. Cr. Hrs) multiplied by Schedule M. Lower Division Expectation	10
	(94/2,772)x300	
	(Upper Div. Cr. Hrs./Tot. Cr. Hrs) multiplied by Schedule M. Upper Division Expectation	161
	(2,121/2,772)x210	
	(Graduate Div. Cr. Hrs./Tot. Cr. Hrs) multiplied by Schedule M. Graduate Division Expectation	24
	(557/2,772)x120	
	Total Weighted Expectation	195

NOTE: The weighted Schedule M expectation is independent of the source of instruction, i.e. it is based on the distribution of credit hours taught regardless if the credit hours were generated by FT or PT faculty.

Average Number of Cr. Hrs. Taught by FT Faculty	(Total Credit Hours Taught by FT faculty/FT faculty in Fall 02) = 1,824/11 = 166

NOTE: This measure is totally dependent on credit hours taught by FT faculty. Faculty on grants providing backfill monies for adjuncts should not be included in the total FT faculty counts. However, reassigned time that does not have a source of replacement monies must not be subtracted from the FT faculty counts.

Determining faculty needs											
Schedule M Analysis											
			Total Credit Hours Fall 2002				Schedule M				
CIP	Discipline	FT faculty in Fall 02	Total Cr Hrs Fall 02	Lower Division Credit Hours Taught	Upper Division Credit Hours Taught	Grad Credit Hours Taught	Sch. M. Lower Division Exp.	Sch. M. Upper Division Exp.	Sch. M. Graduate Division Exp.	Wt. Schedule M Credit Hours Exp.	Avg. # Cr. Hrs. Taught by FT Faculty
44	Public Administration	11	2,772	94	2,121	557	300	210	120	195	166

	Lower Division Need	Upper Division Need	Graduate Level Need	Total Faculty Needs
Number of Faculty assuming the use of no adjuncts would be	0.31	10.10	4.64	15

	Lower Division Need	Upper Division Need	Graduate Level Need	Total Faculty Needs
Number of Faculty assuming the use of adjuncts would be	0.22	8.59	4.41	13

NOTE: With adjuncts the assumption was a usage of 30% at the lower division, 15% at the upper division and 5% at the graduate level.

Costs per Credit Hour and Major										
					COSTS/BUDGETS					
CIP	Discipline	FT faculty in Fall 02	Total Cr Hrs Fall 02	Fall 02 Total Majors for Dept	Dept Personnel Budget	PT Faculty Costs Fall 02	Non Personal Services Budget	Total Dept Budget Fall 02	Cost per Cr. Hr. Generated Fall 02	Cost per Major Fall 02
44	Public Administration	11	5,544	917	1,382,376	108,188	38,300	818,526	$148	$893

Importance of these data

Costs of a program is included in the SCHEV productivity guidelines. While personnel and NPS are not the only costs, this analysis gives comparative between programs. It is assumed that some programs will cost more than others, so there is no expectation that all programs will have the same costs. Costs not included in these data would be such things as facility costs, equipment costs, and maintenance.

Public Administration

Faculty	FTE	Courses Taught	Number of Students Taught		Number of Credit Hours Generated		Comments (comments to be provided by program)
			Graduate	Under Graduate	Graduate	Under Graduate	
Jane Smith	1.00	2	20		60	0	Department chair with a two course load
John Jones	0.75	3	90		270	0	Normal 12 hour teaching load but is teaching at an extended campus site with one course backfill paid from revenue sharing monies.
Fred Roberts	1.00	4	20	50	60	150	
Angela Thompson	1.00	2		40	0	120	Given two course reassigned time by the chair to work on a new faculty recruitment plan.
Donna James	1.00	4		40	0	120	
Thomas McClendon	1.00	4	15	35	45	105	
Mary Washington	0.75	1	25		75	0	Grant funded to study the public impact of flags. Grant provides monies for one adjunct.
George Washington	1.00	4		50	0	150	
William Clinton	1.00	4		55	0	165	
George Bush	1.00	4		50	0	150	
Franklin Roosevelt	1.00	4		56	0	168	
Thomas Jefferson	0.50	2		62	0	186	Grant funded to study public administration issues within state governments. Monies were provided for two adjunct faculty.
Betty Ford	0.00	0			0	0	100% grant funded. Grant monies provide backfill for 4 adjunct faculty.
Totals	**11.00**	**38**	**170**	**438**	**510**	**1,314**	
Adjunct Faculty							
Tony Burns		2	15		45	0	
Joyce Johnson		3		78	0	234	One course with 20 students and 60 credit hours generated was assigned to cover the course that would have been taught by John Jones if he were not assigned an Abingdon class. One course with 30 students and 90 credit hours was a backfill for mary Washington's grant reassignement. One course with 28 students and 84 credit hours was a backfill for one of the two courses reassigned to a grant for Thomas Jefferson.
Mike Adams		3		72	0	216	
Fredrick Adams		3		76	0	228	One coursewith 26 students and 78 credit hours was a backfill for Thomas Jefferson's grant reassignment. Two courses totaling 50 students and 150 credit hours were backfills for Betty Ford's grant reassignment.
William Harris		3		75	0	225	Two courses with 50 students and 150 credit hours were backfills for Betty Ford's grant reassignment.
Totals		**14**	**15**	**301**	**45**	**903**	
Fall FTE Faculty	11	52	185	739	555	2,217	
Total Program Faculty	13			924		2,772	

Importance of these data

Faculty on grants with monies provided for adjunct backfills have the proportion of reassigned time to the grant decremented from the total T&R faculty for fall semester.

Faculty teaching at an extended campus site that provides a reduction in the total number of courses expected to be taught by the faculty, will have that portion with revenue sharing adjunct backfill decremented from the total T&R faculty for the fall, e.g. Abingdon program which provides a 2 for 1 backfill.

Faculty on other internally allocated reassigned time will not have a decrement in their FTE status.

The total credit hours generated by PT faculty hired as backfills for FT T&R faculty on grants and Extended Campus programs would amount to 612 credit hours. With this taken into account, part-time monies required beyond grant or extended campus sources would be for the generation of 291 credit hours.