

Academic Program Review

Data Definitions and Guidelines

The Office of Academic Planning and Accountability and the staff in Institutional Research & Planning (IRP) have worked to determine the types of data needed to best address the program review template provided by the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE). IRP knowledge of available internal and external information resources has helped to shape the data compilations provided to programs. The information provided reflects the university's official databases and reporting resources and provides an efficient approach for answering the template questions. It also helps to ensure data consistency across programs.

The Program Review Data Definitions and Guidelines document provides an explanation to help programs understand why specific data elements are selected and how the data were compiled. We ask that all faculty working on this project review the explanations before developing their reports. As the explanations below reveal, many factors enter into the selection of data, and the same piece of data will be used in different ways to address separate report questions. These interrelated questions have influenced the data extraction and will impact how this information should be used.

The information extracted from the university's data systems is only as good as the information it contains. We ask that programs use the data as provided unless major problems emerge. Tracking down minute anomalies [or what might appear to be errors] is time consuming and rarely results in significant data differences. However, an analysis of the information provided might generate clues as to how data entry processes can be improved for the future.

Program Review Committee members are asked to read the explanations below before providing feedback on their assigned reviews and to complete their work utilizing the presumption of data validity and accuracy in the information provided by IRP.

1. Time and Credit to Degree (B.3.c)

- OAPA has pre-populated the average (attempted) credit to degree data in the program's template.
- IRP provides time to degree data by semesters. The CPE template asks for years. The academic program will have to convert semesters to years (i.e., divide the number of semesters by the number of semesters a year its students usually attend--2 if students usually attend only fall and spring; 3 if fall, spring, and summer).
- Explanation of the Time and Credit to Degree data:
 - ✓ Data include first and second majors.
 - ✓ Only credit hours attempted in courses with the course subject of the program under review are included in the calculation.
 - ✓ Please note that the academic programs are provided an opportunity to review and confirm the course subjects used for this calculation before the data are compiled.
 - ✓ Time to Degree data were compiled by examining each student who graduated in a particular year and adding the number of semesters from the time the student entered the academic plan until graduation, then averaging the semesters for that year's graduates to get the semesters to degree.
 - ✓ Credits to Degree data were compiled by examining each student who graduated in a particular year and going back and summing all the credit hours that the student attempted from the time he/she entered the academic plan until graduation. (These credit hours do not take into account grades of "F" or "W" earned by the student). The attempted credit hours from all students who graduated that year are averaged to get the average credits to degree.
 - ✓ Transfer Data: Status of Transfer or Native is determined by how the student entered UofL, not necessarily the student's status at the time of entering the school or academic

program from which he/she graduated. A program may have Transfer data even if a student didn't transfer into the program.

- ✓ Programs can refer to the "4. Degrees" line listing in the program's "3. Data" folder in Sharepoint to see who is included in the credit and time to degree data for each year.
- ✓ Students with inconsistent enrollment patterns can distort the credit hour data. If students are enrolled in another academic plan when they take the program's courses for which credit hours are being pulled, then those credit hours won't be captured in the credit hours to degree report. Likewise, this can affect the time to degree numbers. This can especially be problematic for master's and PhD programs where a student graduates with the master's after completing most of the course work under the PhD academic plan.

2. UofL Survey Data (B.4.b)

- Found in the "5. Survey Data" folder in the program's "3. Data" folder in Sharepoint.
 - ✓ Provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE).
 - ✓ If no data files are in the program's "5. Survey Data" folder, it is because of one or more of the following:
 - The data is at the unit level and is not broken out by program.
 - The number of respondents to the survey was less than 5.
 - Graduate programs won't have graduating senior or other undergraduate survey data.
 - Undergraduate programs won't have graduate-level surveys.

3. Job Placement (B.5.a)

- For figuring percentage of graduating students who sought and found employment, calculate the number seeking and the number that found employment out of the total number of degrees conferred (found in the Program Demand/Unnecessary Duplication table in the next section of the report).

4. Graduate School Admission Data (B.5.c)

- Programs can find information on students who attained graduate school admission in the "4 Degrees" document in the program's "3. Data" folder in Sharepoint. This data is pulled from the National Student Clearing House (NSC), which reports on students who have applied for Financial Aid.
- Columns P through R will show if the program's graduates have applied to another institution and what school and degree they are pursuing. Programs will need to judge whether the school and degree are appropriate as a next educational step for their graduates. Don't count community or technical colleges.
- If the NSC data are not helpful, programs should identify other ways to address this section of the report.
- If a student is already in a graduate program other than the program completing the review (i.e., in a doctoral program but received the program's master's degree or certificate along the way), the student should be counted in the numbers of those who sought graduate school admission.
- For figuring percentage of graduating students seeking and attaining graduate school admission, calculate the number seeking (or attaining) out of the total number of degrees conferred (found in the Program Demand/Unnecessary Duplication table in the next section of the report).

5. Program Demand/Unnecessary Duplication (C.1)

[OAPA has pre-populated this section in the program's report template using data from the "1. Statistical Overview" file in the program's "3. Data" folder in Sharepoint.]

- Enrollment
 - ✓ Includes intended majors (i.e., students who have not yet been formally accepted into the major [identified by academic plans ending in "P"]).
 - ✓ Includes first and second majors.
 - ✓ Includes both full-time and part-time students.

- ✓ For a listing of students included in the data, see the "4. Enrollment" line listing in the program's "3. Data" folder in Sharepoint.
 - ✓ Graduation rates are a cohort-based calculation, and cohort-based methodology is the recognized standard for this data. IRP doesn't report graduation rates at the program level since there is no national definition on how to calculate the rate at the program level for students who change programs during their academic career.
- Degrees Conferred
 - ✓ Determined by Academic Plan (as provided by the program); includes first and second majors; includes both full-time and part-time students.
 - ✓ The data reflect the university's official academic year of summer, fall, spring. Often when a program thinks its degree numbers are off it's because the students they think graduated in a certain year actually graduated in the following summer and were thus not included in the academic year numbers.
 - ✓ For a listing of students included in the degrees conferred data, see the "4. Degrees" line listing in the program's "3. Data" folder in Sharepoint.
 - ✓ If a student that you think completed a degree during the time period covered by the report is missing from the line listing, please check Peoplesoft (or have someone in your department check) to determine whether the student completed the degree in the time period covered by the report, or if the student was actually awarded the degree.
 - ✓ Degree data are not final until after programs begin working on their reviews. Once the data are finalized (after August 15), if degree data for the last reporting year has changed, OAPA will replace the program's Statistical Overview PDF in Sharepoint. OAPA will also send an updated table to the program to replace the pre-populated one in the program's review template and will replace the table in the program's report template in Sharepoint).
 - Credit Hour Production
 - ✓ Represents student credit hours produced by students in the academic plan enrolled in courses with the course subject(s) previously provided by the academic program.
 - ✓ See "4. SCH" in the program's Sharepoint folder for a listing of students included in the data.
 - ✓ Since the credit hour production number is also used to determine Instructional FTE later in the report, the data reported by IRP for credit hour production includes only the course subject(s) of the program undergoing review (i.e., coursework that the program's faculty might be delivering).
 - ✓ Students with inconsistent enrollment patterns can distort the credit hour data. If students are enrolled in another academic plan when they take the program's courses for which credit hours are being pulled, then those credit hours won't be captured in the academic program's credit hours report. This can especially be problematic for master's and PhD programs where a student graduates with the master's after completing most of the course work under the PhD academic plan. It is critically important that academic advisors ensure a student's academic plan is correctly reflected in PeopleSoft.
 - ✓ In the "1. Statistical Overview" file in Sharepoint, the credit hours are broken out by both majors and non-majors. The program's review template has been pre-populated with the major credit hours numbers. Majors are defined as students in the program's academic plan.
 - ✓ The data reported in "Credit Hour Production by Actual Instructional Faculty" in the "1. Statistical Overview" file in Sharepoint represents instructional faculty who teach the courses with the course subject(s) that the program previously provided to IRP. These faculty may or may not be officially assigned in PeopleSoft to the department offering the academic program under review. To identify the program's faculty, use the "4. Faculty" line listing in Sharepoint (more information on the faculty line listing can be found in item #6 below).

6. Faculty FTE (D.1)

- The faculty line listing in Sharepoint ("4. Faculty") is provided for the program's use in determining the program's faculty over the past 5 years.
- It is difficult to report more accurate data from the IRP tools—programs would have more knowledge about their faculty than what is maintained in PeopleSoft. Consult the faculty line listing as a beginning point, but the program should use its more accurate knowledge for determining faculty associated with the program in the years covered in the program review.
- Programs should include any full-time and part-time faculty who had a teaching assignment in the program for the years of the review.
- To calculate student credit hour per instructional faculty FTE, divide the credit hour production (from "C. Program Demand/Unnecessary Duplication" in the report template) by the number of instructional faculty. $\text{Instructional faculty} = \text{FT faculty} + (\text{Part Time Faculty} \times .3 \text{ [or whatever percentage calculation the program uses for PTF]})$.
- Faculty FTE for program review refers to faculty headcount, not workload effort.