

TO: Faculty Senate

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

DATE: April 25, 2011

RE: 2010-2011 Annual Report

Committee Members:

Jennifer Capaldo, Assistant Professor of Music; **Melinda Fowlkes**, Assistant Dean for College of Business & Economics; **Edward Kinman**, Interim Assistant Dean for Cook-Cole College of Arts & Sciences; **Susan Lynch**, Associate Professor of Therapeutic Recreation; **Eric Moore**, Associate Professor of Philosophy; **Gerald Montoya**, Assistant Professor of Nursing; **Jeannine Perry**, Assistant Dean for College of Graduate & Professional Studies; **Linda Townsend**, Assessment Coordinator, Office of Assessment & Institutional Research; **Wayne White**, Associate Dean for College of Education & Human Services; **Kristen Welch**, Assistant Professor of English, Director of the Writing Center & Composition

In September 2010, the new Committee on Academic Outcomes Assessment and Program Review (CAOAPR) became active. The Chair identified Longwood's Program Review Policy as the most critical duty that needed immediate attention. Longwood's Program Review Policy had previously been revised in 2002 and was based on the old Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Criteria for Evaluation, which is no longer used for accreditation. More importantly, the policy was not functioning well based on an audit of program reviews completed in the previous six years. The quality of self studies varied widely, external reviews weren't always being done, and mechanisms for developing action plans were weak.

To begin the revision process, committee members examined the seventy plus principles now used by the SACS for accreditation and identified those related to academic programs. We also looked at the five standards used by State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) to evaluate program viability. Further, committee members disliked the negative tone of the old policy, noting how the stated purpose of the process was a "recommendation for program termination or continuation."

In revising the policy, the entire CAOAPR met eight times over the year. In addition, the CAOAPR was subdivided into three subcommittees that met three times each over the year. The committee completely rewrote and streamlined the self-study component so that it would be aligned with SACS principles and SCHEV requirements. We also placed an emphasis on quality enhancement, which is now at the heart of SACS's accreditation philosophy. This will help programs prepare for reaffirmation by gathering and reflecting on relevant information. Our revisions change the evaluation cycle from five years to six years. This will keep programs submitting either a Biannual Report or a Program Review every two years.

The Faculty Senate approved CAOAPR's Revised Program Review Policy dated April 2011 at the April 14, 2011 meeting.

In a separate matter, the Senate Executive Committee forwarded a request in November from the Core Competency Team to the CAOAPR that would initiate a discussion on the possibility of establishing one or more "assessment days" in the university calendar. During the spring semester, the CAOAPR Chair met separately with various campus stakeholders (Ken Perkins, Onie McKenzie, Sarah Whitley, Glenn Parker, and Frank Moore). From these meetings, further stakeholders were identified that need consultation and the realization that this is complex issue that needs further investigation. The CAOAPR Chair will continue to research the topic and place this request as a high priority in fall 2011.