TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Ed Kinman, Chair of Committee on Academic Outcomes Assessment & Program Review

DATE: April 8, 2014

RE: 2013-2014 Annual Report

Committee Members:

Charles Blauvelt, Associate Dean for College of Education & Human Services ; **Kathy Charleston**, Assistant Dean for College of Graduate & Professional Studies; **Melinda Fowlkes**, Assistant Dean for College of Business & Economics; **Edward Kinman**, Assistant Dean for Cook-Cole College of Arts & Sciences; **David Locascio**, Associate Professor; **Virginia Lewis**, Assistant Professor of Mathematics Education; **Eric Moore**, Associate Professor of Philosophy; **Heather Lettner-Rust**, Assistant Professor of English; **Susan Lynch**, Associate Professor of Therapeutic Recreation; **Linda Townsend**, Assessment Coordinator, Office of Assessment & Institutional Research;

Background:

In September 2010, the new Committee on Academic Outcomes Assessment and Program Review (CAOAPR) became active. Comprised of ten members representing the academic breadth of the university, the committee is responsible for promoting the quality and effectiveness of the academic curriculum (SACS principle 3.4.12).

In the first year (2010-2011), the CAOAPR revised Longwood's Program Review Policy and presented its recommendation to the Faculty Senate. At the April 14, 2011 meeting, the Faculty Senate approved the Revised Program Review Policy (dated April 2011). In the second year (2011-12), faculty in eight programs worked on writing the Program Review Self Study Reports. The original submission deadline of June 30, 2012 was extended to September 1, 2012 as numerous programs were having difficulty in interpreting questions posed in the Revised Program Review Policy for the first time. For the third year (2012-13), the CAOAPR began the process of reviewing programs and enhancing the process for subsequent program reviews. For the fourth year (2013-14), which is the focus of this report, the CAOAPR continued reviewing programs, updated the template used for Program Review Self-Study Reports, created a document providing guidance for academic programs in entering data into WEAVEonline, and revised the CAOAPR's purpose and duties statement.

2013-2014 Report:

In the fall, the CAOAPR discussed the implications of Dr. Ken Perkins' May 24, 2013 email in which he stated, "An annual cycle that is manageable and habit forming for everyone keeps us in synchronization with the yearly planning and budgeting process. This means that all programs will be entering some assessment data in WEAVEonline every year, and the biennial reports go away." Thus, beginning 2013-14, all academic programs will report on the assessment of at least 2-3 student learning outcomes (SLO); however, a program's faculty may decide that all SLO need to be assessed annually. In response, the CAOAPR created a document to help guide programs in deciding which student learning outcomes should be entered on a yearly basis and those that can be put on a rotation cycle. This document was distributed to chairs of all academic programs.

Likewise, the Provost's email necessitated a change to the CAOAPR's purpose and duties statement. In this process, the CAOAPR also saw the need to continue a practice developed by the SACS Institutional Effectiveness Compliance Team of making recommendations on the quality and effectiveness of WEAVEOnline entries. Not only did this improve university-wide assessment practices, it provided helpful feedback to programs. A recommendation from the CAOAPR was presented to the Faculty Senate and was approved in February 2014.

In late October 2013, the CAOPR met to react and reflect on the second set of completed Self-Study Reports. After all submitted reports had been reviewed, committee members concluded that most of the submitted Self-Study Reports had areas that needed improvement. We continued the previous year's practice of giving each program an opportunity to address the recommendations documented in the Program Review Summation Report before the External Review Team Members made their final subsequent program review submission recommendation. Later in November, the assigned CAOAPR committee members met with the department chair of each program being reviewed to discuss how to address the specific recommendations contained in the report. This resulted in constructive dialog. In January, the CAOPR met to review the responses made by the programs to their self studies.

In January and February, the committee discussed how to improve the template used in creating the Program Review Self-Study Report. Based on feedback from those programs that had just used the template, some questions were reworded to add clarity. Questions were sequentially numbered to make it easier to reference which part of the Self-Study Report is being referenced in writing reports. Finally, questions in the first couple of pages were reordered for a more logical flow.

Throughout the eight meetings of the CAOAPR during the 2013-14 academic year, the emphasis has been how to make the program review process work as a positive influence for continual improvement.