

TO: Faculty Senate

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

DATE: July 28, 2015

RE: 2014-2015 Annual Report

Committee Members:

**Dale Beach**, Assistant Professor Biology; **Kathy Charleston**, Assistant Dean for College of Graduate & Professional Studies; **Cindy Crews**, Instructor, Clinical Simulation Learning Center Director; **Melinda Fowlkes**, Assistant Dean for College of Business & Economics; **David Locascio**, Associate Dean for College of Education & Human Services ; **Edward Kinman**, Assistant Dean for Cook-Cole College of Arts & Sciences; **Virginia Lewis**, Assistant Professor of Mathematics Education; **Eric Moore**, Associate Professor of Philosophy; **Susan Lynch**, Associate Professor of Therapeutic Recreation; and **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 program reviews and 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 Senate approved the Revised Program Review Policy (April 2011). In the second year (2011-12), faculty in 8 programs submitted Program Review Self Study Reports. In the third year (2012-13), the CAOAPR began the process of reviewing programs and enhancing the process for subsequent program reviews. In the third year (2013-2014), the committee's purpose and duties statement was revised for two reasons. First, revisions were needed to be consistent with recent changes in assessment policy made by the Provost that requires all programs to make entries into WEAVE on an annual basis. Second, the committee 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. The Faculty Senate approved these changes (Feb. 20, 2014).

2014-2015 Report:

Throughout the academic year, the CAOPR discussed the best manner on reviewing WEAVEOnline entries. The first problem revolved in getting entries into WEAVE. In October 2014, approximately half of the programs hadn't entered any data into WEAVE for the 2013-2014 academic (the deadline was October 1, 2014). A series of emails were sent to departments about this issue, but data entry remained slow. In February, the Office of Accreditation and Compliance assumed responsibility that entries are being made in WEAVE. The quality of entries, however, were remained the domain of CAOPR.

In March, the CAOPR divided into five subgroups to review a sampling of WEAVE entries. In April, discussion centered on findings of the WEAVE entries. Given the diversity of issues identified, the CAOPR decided not to provide immediate feedback to departments. For example, committee members had a number of concerns related to program goals and targets. The CAOPR will continue the audit process in the fall of 2015 and develop a procedure for providing information in a constructive manner.

CAOPR's activities review Program Review Self Study Reports were efficient. In late October 2014, the CAOPR met to react and reflect on six completed reports. The committee divided into three subgroups for purposes of review and making commendations and recommendations that would become the basis for the subsequent program review submission.

In November, after all six Self-Study Reports had been reviewed, the assigned CAOPR sub-committee members met with the department chair of each program to discuss specific recommendations and concerns contained in the Self-Study Report. This resulted in constructive dialog. In January, the CAOPR met to assess the responses made by the programs to their Self-Study Reports and to write the Program Review Summation Report that would be forwarded to the college dean.

Throughout the eight meetings of the CAOPR during the 2014-15 academic year, the emphasis has been how to make the program review process work as a positive influence for continual improvement.