

TO: Faculty Senate

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

DATE: April 11, 2013

RE: 2012-2013 Annual Report

Committee Members:

Charles Blauvelt, Associate Dean for College of Education & Human Services ; **Jennifer Capaldo**, Assistant Professor of Music; **Kathy Charleston**, Assistant Dean for College of Graduate & Professional Studies; **Larissa Fergeson** (fall), Associate Professor of History; **Melinda Fowlkes**, Assistant Dean for College of Business & Economics; **Edward Kinman**, Interim Assistant Dean for Cook-Cole College of Arts & Sciences; **Eric Moore**, Associate Professor of Philosophy; **Melissa Rhoten** (spring), Professor of Chemistry; **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). The committee's duties include monitoring, overseeing, and evaluating academic Biennial Reports and Program Reviews to ascertain the extent of compliance with Longwood's assessment policy. In addition, CAOAPR is to make recommendations to the Senate on issues related to assessment of academic programs, or program review.

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), which is the focus of this report, the CAOAPR began the process of reviewing programs and enhancing the process for subsequent program reviews.

2012-2013 Report:

In late September 2012, the CAOAPR met to react and reflect on the first set of completed Self-Study Reports. There was discussion about how to review and make commendations and recommendations, which would become the basis for the subsequent program review submission. Further, we discussed at length many of the issues raised by some department chairs related to completing the Program Review Self-Study Report. As a result, the CAOAPR employed a matrix to record comments, both good and "needs improvement," for each component of the completed Program Review Self-Study Report. In addition, committee members made notes on possible ways to improve the Revised Program Review Policy based on the observed responses in the Self-Study Reports.

In late October, after all of eight reports had been reviewed, committee members concluded that most of the submitted Self-Study Reports had areas that needed improvement. At the same time, we recognized the challenge of writing these studies based on the new SACS Standards. Given the importance of Self-Study Reports for the upcoming SACS review, the CAOAPR decided to give 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.

In early November, most CAOAPR members attended a mini assessment workshop led by Susan Bosworth sponsored by Academic Affairs. Dr. Bosworth, who heads institutional assessment at the College of William and Mary, commented on Longwood's revised Program Review Policy and stated it was sound as it directly addressed SACS and SCHEV issues. She challenged us to focus more on the process of providing constructive feedback to programs undertaking Program Review, recommending that we have a face-to-face meeting with each program chair when giving the Program Review Summation Report. After a brief discussion, the CAOAPR concurred that we should hand the Program Review Summation Report at the meeting with the department chair

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 December, the CAOAPR met to review the responses made by the programs to their self studies.

In January the committee discussed whether modifications were needed to the Program Review Policy. Given the favorable external review of Longwood's Program Review Policy by Susan Bosworth, the consensus was that the policy does not need changing at this time. Procedure, on the other hand, needed attention. A subgroup met several times to make suggestions. In late February, COAPR approved an undergraduate and graduate template that will assist in the writing of the Self-Study Report. This idea was based on one of the submitted Self-Study Reports and contained the following:

- only the pertinent questions to the type of program under review is included in each template,
- formatting that is helpful to the person(s) composing and reviewing the Self-Study Report,
- useful tips for formulating responses to questions,
- references to specific SACS principles that can be found in the SACS' Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement,
- rewording of some questions,
- and removal of redundant questions.

Throughout the eleven meetings of the CAOAPR during the 2012-13 academic year, the emphasis has been how to make the program review process work as a positive influence for continual improvement.