Report of the Committee on Academic Outcomes Assessment and Program Review on Revising Longwood's Program Review Policy

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. 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 (program review).

Longwood's Program Review Policy was last updated nine years ago and was based on the old Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Criteria for Evaluation, which are no longer used for accreditation. More importantly, the policy was not functioning well. The quality of self studies varied widely, external reviews weren't always being done, and mechanisms for developing action plans were weak. Some questions required data that were difficult to obtain, e.g., alumni satisfaction, employer satisfaction, program efficiency costs relative to college norms. As a result, many programs did not respond to parts of the Self-Study Report.

To begin the revision process, committee members examined the seventy plus principles now used by SACS for accreditation and identified those related to academic programs. We also looked at the five standards used by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) to evaluate program viability. We identified nine areas that are not sufficiently addressed in Longwood's 2002 Program Review Policy. On the other hand, there were seven items in Longwood's 2002 policy that neither SACS nor SCHEV currently require. 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." As a result, CAOAPR members reorganized the policy and placed an emphasis on quality enhancement, which is now at the heart of SACS's philosophy of accreditation.

In revising the policy, CAOAPR members rewrote and streamlined the self-study component so that it would be aligned with SACS principles and SCHEV requirements. This will help programs prepare for reaffirmation by gathering and reflecting on relevant information, but also providing a helpful tool (all SACS principles are referenced in the policy and interested persons can read the rationale and sample documentation for each principle in SACS's *Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*). 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 proposed revised policy also contains two appendices to help programs organize data.

This policy is only for those programs that are not accredited. Self-studies conducted for professional accrediting agencies substitute for Program Review.

Recommendations

1. The CAOAPR recommends the approval of the Longwood University Program Review Policy dated April 2011. *Both the outdated 2002 policy (pages 2-9) and the new proposed policy (pages 10-19) are attached.*
2. Separately from the Longwood University Program Review Policy dated April 2011, the CAOAPR recommends all programs complete Appendices 1 and 2 annually and store the results on WEAVEOnline.

CAOAPR members

Jennifer Capaldo, Assistant Professor of Music; **Melinda Fowlkes**, Assistant Dean for College of Business & Economics; **Edward Kinman**, CAOAPR Chair and 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

Revised Program Review Policy
January 2002

Purpose:
To insure educational quality and continued vitality, Longwood College will review each state-approved degree program on a five-year cycle. The review will serve as a means to evaluate overall program quality as well as productivity. Each review will result in a recommendation for program termination or continuation, including in the latter case, a recommendation for maintained or enhance funding.

Principles:
- The review should be aligned with the priorities specified in the Strategic Plan.
- Self-studies conducted for professional accrediting agencies (e.g., NCATE, AACSB) may, with the approval of the Provost, substitute for Program Review.
- The review should address issues of concern to both the State Council of High Education for Virginia (as reflected in their Productivity Guidelines and Performance Indicator Project requirements) and accrediting agencies (e.g., SACS, AACSB, NCATE, etc.).
- The review should reflect on the program's mission, goals, assessment data (reflecting the extent to which program goals are being achieved), and recent program changes (with rationales for those changes).
- The process should include an internal, reflective self-study phase followed by formal analysis by a group external to the program.
- The review should result in a decision for program termination or continuation.

Components of the Self-Study Report

Longwood's model of academic program review is based on an evaluation of three program aspects – its centrality and need; quality; and resources and costs.

PART I: INDICATORS OF PROGRAM CENTRALITY AND DEMAND

    Section A: Mission of Program and Service to the College
        1. How does the mission of the program support the mission of the College?
        2. Beyond education students in the major, how does the program contribute to the College? For example, does the program offer courses in the general education program or the honors program? Or provide service courses for other majors (e.g., Liberal Studies) or graduate programs? Or provide co-curricular programs, such as plays or concerts? If so, what is the extent of this involvement?

    Section B: Indicators of Student Demand
        1. In reviewing the number of freshmen admitted to your program in the last five years and the retention of those students in your program, how would you evaluate the success of your program in attracting and retaining students?
        2. In reviewing the number of program graduates in the past five years (and program graduates as a percent of total graduates in that time), how would you evaluate the demand for your program given your mission and resources?

PART II: INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY

    Section A: Program Goals and Objectives
        1. How are the program goals and expected outcomes determined? How often are they reviewed? Are discipline-specific technology competencies included in these goals and expected outcomes? How clearly are these goals communicated to students?

2. How well are assessments aligned with expected outcomes? How often are these assessments conducted?

Section B: Curriculum/Instruction and Program Structure
1. How well is the curriculum aligned with the program goals? In which courses are each of the goals addressed and how? How well are joint-degree or cooperative programs (if any) aligned with the program goals?
2. How well does the program meet the demand for courses? Are course demand and course availability equal? Describe any situations in which students are prevented from timely progress toward a degree. How frequently are directed studies arranged due to course unavailability or scheduling conflicts?
3. How well do indicators of section size compare with College norms? What percent of fall sections have enrollments below 20 students? What percent of fall sections have enrollments above 50 students? How do typical section sizes in writing-intensive courses compare with policy guidelines for such courses?
4. What is the percent of lower-division courses taught by full-time faculty? How well does this value compare with the College norm?
5. How well is the program meeting the Strategic Plan initiative to involve students in the practical application of knowledge through an internship, a field experience and/or a faculty-directed research project or creative activity?
6. How well is the program meeting the Strategic Plan initiative that requires all undergraduates to have an electronic (technology-based) portfolio to document their accomplishments?

Section C: Evidence of Student Outcomes and Student-Alumni Satisfaction
1. After reviewing evidence from recent senior and alumni surveys, how would you evaluate the success of your program in satisfying student expectations in regard to advising, course availability, and instruction? Based on results from the most recent alumni survey, how would you evaluate the success of your program in preparing students for work and graduate study, and their preparation for responsible citizenship? Professional programs sometimes conduct surveys of employers to assess preparation of graduates: if you have conducted a survey of employers, what conclusions can you draw from these data?
2. After reviewing recent assessment data, how would you evaluate the success of your program in meeting the program goals and expected outcomes?
3. How have you used assessment data to improve your program?

Section D: Characteristics of the Faculty
1. Based on evidence collected during the most recent annual faculty performance evaluations, how would you evaluate the levels of faculty teaching, scholarship, and service relative to the mission of the department and relative to departmental and College standards?

PART III: INDICATORS OF PROGRAM RESOURCES AND COSTS

Section A: Program Resources and Equipment
1. Given the program's current level of full-time equivalent students, how does your faculty staffing (including adjuncts) compare with the projected level or needed staffing from the Commonwealth's Base Funding Guidelines? Are all aspects of the current curriculum adequately supported by faculty expertise? Describe any gaps in expertise.
2. How would you evaluate the adequacy of library holdings and information access for your program?
3. How would you evaluate the adequacy of facilities (i.e., classrooms, laboratories, furnishings) and equipment?

4. How would you evaluate the adequacy of the classroom instructional technology available to your program? How would you evaluate the adequacy of the technology available to your faculty?
5. How would you evaluate the level of information provided by the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research for decision support?

Section B: Program Costs
1. After reviewing evidence of program costs per full-time equivalent student, how would you evaluate program efficiency relative to College norms?

Process

Role of the Department Chair and Internal Self-Study Report Team:
The Internal Self-Study Team, chaired by the Department Chair, conducts a self-study focusing on three program aspects – its centrality and need; quality; and resources and costs. The Report and supporting documentation are to be forwarded to the External Review Team by April 1.

Roll of the External Review Team:
The External Review Team must include at minimum two designated representatives from the Longwood faculty (appointed by the Educational Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate). Members from Longwood's external constituents (e.g., alumni, employers, members of the Board of Visitors) are encouraged as team members as well.

Once the Self-Study Report is received, the team has one month to review the documents and make substantive, evaluative comments regarding each section. The role of the External Review Team is to provide an objective and constructive external review of the program. The external reviewers will provide substantive recommendations that should be forwarded to the Dean and Provost by May 1.

Role of the Dean and Provost:
The Dean and Provost will review the original Self-Study Report, the External Review Team Report, and any supporting materials. The Provost will meet with the Dean and the Chair of the Department to discuss these materials. *The Provost will inform all parties of the program's continuation or the recommendation for termination by May 15.* When programs are to be continued, the Department Chair and Dean in consultation with the Provost are responsible for developing an action plan based on recommendations set forth. The Provost works in conjunction with the Dean and Department Chair to incorporate review recommendations into the planning and budgeting process.

CRITERIA FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW EVALUATION

Based on the description and evidence provided in the program's Self-Study Report, the external review committee should assign a rating of "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" for each section which reflects the centrality and demand, the quality, and the resources and costs for the program. The following should be considered:

PART I: INDICATORS OF PROGRAM CENTRALITY AND DEMAND

      A):   Mission of Program and Service to the College

      B):   Indicators of Student Demand

PART II: INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY

      A):   Program Goals and Objectives

      B):   Curriculum/Instruction and Program Structure

      C):   Evidence of Student Outcomes and Student/Alumni Satisfaction

      D):   Characteristics of the Faculty

PART III: INDICATORS OF PROGRAM RESOURCES AND COSTS

      A):   Program Resources and Equipment

      B):   Program Costs

EXTERNAL COMMITTEE'S POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

As a result of the review process, each program will be assigned one of the following categories, which will be used to guide planning and decision making over the next three to five years. The objective is to align the programmatic expectations and needs with allocation of resources.

    1.   **CONTINUE WITH COMMENDATION**

        Signifies an outstanding program with the possibility of priority in resource allocation.

    2.   **CONTINUE WITH COMMENT**

        Signifies a program with potential for improvement which may be considered for more resources to help achieve excellence or a stable program that will continue to be funded at the current level.

    3.   **TERMINATE**

        Program will be terminated.

Major Program Assessments

All Programs
Internship or Equivalent (Research Study, Performance/Recital, Student Teaching)
Writing Assessment
Speaking Proficiency
Critical Thinking
Technology Skills Assessment
Scientific Reasoning
Quantitative Skills
Student Teacher Evaluations
Senior Survey
Alumni Survey
Retention Rates
Graduation Rates
Enrollment

Assessments

Art
Critique of art exhibits each spring during freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior years
Senior comprehensive exam
Supervisor Internship Ratings
Web Portfolio
Alumni Advisory Focus Group

Athletic Training, Therapeutic Recreation, Physical Education & Community Health
Athletics
Athletic Training Student Evaluation
Student Athletic Trainer Clinical Evaluation
General Medical Observation Evaluation Form
General Medical Site Evaluation
Student Evaluation of Supervisory Athletic Trainer
NATA-BOC Exam
Annual Program Evaluation
Department Alumni Survey

Exercise Science
Internship
American College of Sports Medicine Certification (ACSM)
Health Fitness Instructor Certification
National Strength and Conditioning Association Certification (NSCA)
Personal Training Certification
Certified Strength & Conditioning Specialist

Physical Education
Senior Research Study
Liberal Studies Assessments

Community Health
Internship
Certified Health Education Specialist

Therapeutic Recreation
Professional Portfolio
Research Study
Dispositions—video-taped therapeutic interview
Comprehensive examination (implement in 2007)
Agency Interview Evaluation (pre-internship course)
Behavioral Assessment of Internship Training (junior and senior internship)
Student Evaluation of the Internship (narrative)
Student Evaluation of the University Supervisor (senior internship)
Certification as Certified Therapeutic Recreation Specialist

Business Management & Economics
Supervisor Internship Evaluations (software program in development)
Major Field Test (10% of grade in senior seminar)
Employer Focus Groups/Advisory Board
Ethics Rubric
AACSB/EBI Undergraduate Business Exit Survey
Comprehensive Exam (Economics)
Capstone Project (Economics)
Web Portfolio

Communications Disorders
Supervisor Internship Evaluations
Demonstrations
Research Paper Ratings
Journal Entry Ratings
Web Portfolio

Communications & Theatre
Supervisor Internship Evaluations (Communications & Theatre)
Senior Thesis & Presentation (Communications & Theatre)
Exit Survey (Communications & Theatre)
Annual performance evaluations by professional performers (BFA) (Theatre)
Portfolios of work (Theatre)
Comprehensive Exam (Communications & Theatre)
Web-based portfolio

English & Modern Languages (French, German, Spanish)
Supervisor Internship Evaluations
Freshman English Writing Evaluation
English 400 Writing Course Evaluation
Major Field Test (English Literature)
Oral Proficiency Interview (Modern Languages)
Capstone Project
Web Portfolio

History, Philosophy, & Political Science
Supervisor Internship Evaluations
Major Field Test (History)
Major Field Test (Political Science)
Senior Research Project (History)
Departmental Senior Survey
Survey of Employers (Political Science)
Web Portfolio
Oral Presentation (History)

Liberal Studies (Elementary, Middle and Special Education; P-12—Physical Education, Music, and Art; Secondary Education--Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, English, History, History and Social Science, Mathematics, Physics, Political Science)
Field Experiences
Student Teaching Evaluation
Supervisor Internship Evaluation (school library media, guidance and counseling)
Teacher Work Samples (portfolio) & Evaluation
Dispositions
Praxis I & II—Title II Reporting
Counseling Internships
Professional Licensure
Portfolio Teacher as Leader (Elementary, Special Education)
Student Journals
Diversity Survey
National Benchmarking Survey
Department Employer Survey

Mathematics & Computer Science
Supervisor Internship Evaluations (Mathematics & Computer Science)
Major Field Test (Mathematics)
Major Field Test (Computer Science)
Quantitative Reasoning—common exam questions Math 121, 131, 164, 171
Web Portfolio

Music
Juried Performances—freshman, sophomores, juniors, seniors
Freshmen Performance Proficiency (B.M. performance only)
Sophomore Promotional
Praxis
Web-based portfolio
Piano Proficiency Exam
Senior Recital Hearing
Senior Exit Survey and Interview
Liberal Studies Assessments (90% teacher education)

Natural Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Physics)
Common Exam Questions (pre & post testing)

Major Field Test (Biology & Chemistry)
American Chemical Society Standardized Test
Degree Completion at Dual Program Institution (Pre-engineering)
Exit Interviews
Research Papers (Biology & Physics)
Web Portfolio
Scientific Reasoning Core Competency
Force Concepts Tests (Physics)
Laboratory Reports (Physics)

Psychology
Major Field Test
Internship
Web Portfolio
Research Paper
Senior capstone presentation
Peer Ratings of Group Work

Social Work
Field Assignment Evaluation (junior & senior)
Department Employer Survey
Senior Exit Survey
Web Portfolio

Sociology, Anthropology, Criminal Justice
Major Field Test (Sociology, Criminal Justice) (20% grade senior seminar)
Portfolio (Anthropology)
Internship/Field Experience
Sociology Research Study
Web Portfolios
Sociology Senior Seminar Project

Masters Level
Communications Disorders
Education
English
Environmental Science
Sociology

Comprehensive Exam
Thesis/Research Study
Professional Semester

Longwood University Program Review Policy
(Revised April 2011)

Purpose:

To ensure educational quality and continued vitality, Longwood University will review each state-approved degree program on a six-year cycle. Self-studies conducted for professional accrediting agencies substitute for Program Review. The review will serve as a means to evaluate overall program quality as well as productivity. As part of the review process, commendations and recommendations will be provided to the department chair in a summation report.

The concept of quality enhancement is at the heart of the program review process and presumes programs to be engaged in an ongoing effort of improvement and demonstration of how well it fulfills its stated mission. Although evaluation of a program's educational quality and its effectiveness in achieving its mission, goals, and objectives are a difficult task requiring careful analysis and professional judgment, a program is expected to document quality and effectiveness.

Principles for the Review:
- Address issues of concern to both the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) and the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools (SACS).
- Be aligned with the priorities specified in the Longwood Strategic Plan.
- Reflect on the program's mission, goals, assessment data and recent program changes.
- Include an internal, reflective self-study phase and an external group analysis.
- Promote quality enhancement.

COMPONENTS OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

I. Program
  A. Focus
    1. Mission, Goals, and Objectives/Outcomes
      a. Program's mission, goals, and objectives/outcomes
        - What is the program's mission statement?
        - What are the program's goals?
        - How are expected objectives clearly defined (outcomes/objectives)?

      b. Relates to institution's mission
        - How do the mission, goals, and objectives of the program support that of the university? (SACS 3.3.1)
        - If the program includes outreach, service, and/or continuing education, how does it relate to/support the program's mission? (SACS 3.4.2)

    2. Specific program admissions policy (SACS 3.4.3)
        - Does the program have admissions policies that differ from the university? If so:
          o What are they?
          o What evidence exists that the standards for admissions to the program are clear, reasonable, and consistently implemented?

  B. Effectiveness
    1. Undergraduate

a. Evidence of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement (SACS 3.3.1)
- How does the program assess achievement of learning outcomes (measures/targets)?
- Based on program assessment data, what is the evidence of student learning (findings)?
- How does the program utilize assessment data for program improvement (action plan)?

Sample Documentation
Detailed assessment report in WEAVE online

b. Technology (SACS 3.4.12)
- How does the program use technology to enhance student learning?
- What evidence exists that technology is appropriate for meeting the objectives of the program?
- How does the program ensure student access to technology and training?

c. Consortial Relationships (SACS 3.4.7)
- Does the program involve consortial relationships or contractual agreements? (A Consortial Relationship typically is one in which two or more institutions share in the responsibility to develop courses and programs. A Contractual Agreement typically is one in which an institution enters an agreement for receipt of courses/programs delivered by another institution.)
- How does the program's contract or agreement provide for the following: (1) a clear indication of the responsibilities of all parties to the agreement; (2) provision for ensuring the quality of the program and courses offered through the agreement; and (3) provision for evaluating the agreement in relation to the purposes of the institution?
- What is the program's process for ensuring the quality of the courses offered through contract or consortial agreement?

2. Graduate
   a. Rigor
   - How has the program clearly defined that graduate academic content is progressively more advanced than undergraduate academic content? (SACS 3.6.1)
   - How has the program clearly defined graduate learning outcomes that are progressively more advanced than undergraduate learning outcomes?
   - What evidence exists to demonstrate that graduate academic content and learning outcomes are progressively more advanced than undergraduate academic content and learning outcomes.
   - What evidence exists that the syllabi and degree requirements include activities that foster independent learning? (SACS 3.6.2)
   - How does the program evaluate students' independent learning skills?

Sample Documentation
Course syllabi, research projects, portfolios, theses, or other projects

b. Evidence of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement (SACS 3.3.1)

- How does the program assess achievement of learning outcomes (measures/targets)?
- Based on program assessment data, what is the evidence of student learning (findings)?
- How does the program utilize assessment data for program improvement (action plan)?

Sample Documentation
Detailed assessment report in WEAVE online

c.   Technology (SACS 3.4.12)
- How does the program use technology to enhance student learning?
- What evidence exists that technology is appropriate for meeting the objectives of the program?
- How does the program ensure student access to technology and training?

d.   Consortial Relationships (SACS 3.4.7)
- Does the program involve consortial relationships or contractual agreements? (A Consortial Relationship typically is one in which two or more institutions share in the responsibility to develop courses and programs. A Contractual Agreement typically is one in which an institution enters an agreement for receipt of courses/programs delivered by another institution.)
- How does the program's contract or agreement provide for the following: (1) a clear indication of the responsibilities of all parties to the agreement; (2) provision for ensuring the quality of the program and courses offered through the agreement; and (3) provision for evaluating the agreement in relation to the purposes of the institution?
- What is the program's process for ensuring the quality of the courses offered through contract or consortial agreement?

3.   Curriculum
a.   Faculty responsibility (SACS 3.4.10)
- What is the process of faculty involvement for the development, approval, evaluation, and improvement of the curriculum?
- How is faculty involved in this process?
- How often does faculty reevaluate the effectiveness and quality of the curriculum?
- When reviewing the quality of the curriculum, how does the program consider:
   (1) the currency and relevancy of the theories and practices in the field or discipline;
   (2) intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of the degree program;
   (3) the "connectivity" among the components of the curriculum?

Sample Documentation
Provide departmental curricular development policy and procedure for determining program content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum.

b.   Program coordination (SACS 3.4.11)

- What evidence exists that the program coordinator has the qualifications, credentials, and competencies for leadership in the development and review of the curriculum?

    C. Productivity (SCHEV)
- a. Number of degrees awarded over the most recent six years
- b. Number of majors over the most recent six years
- c. Number of students served for the most recent six years (see Appendix 1 for matrix useful in reporting data on number of students served each academic year [fall and spring semesters])
  - For major courses, number of students and credits generated by course
  - For general education course(s), number of students and credits generated by course
  - For foundational course (courses required of other programs), number of students and credits generated by course

II. Faculty
    A. Terminal Degrees of Faculty--
    The terminal degree for faculty in all departments shall be an earned doctorate from an institution accredited by a recognized regional accreditation body. There are exceptions – see FPPM
- Based on evidence collected from the review, how does the faculty meet the terminal degree standards established by the mission of the university and/or specific needs of the program?
- If there are exceptions, provide justification (as referenced in FPPM).

    B. Faculty Competence (SACS 3.7.1)
    The degree shall be in the area of specialization taught, or the Ed. D. for those teaching education methods courses or supervising student teachers. The M. F. A. shall be the recognized terminal degree for faculty teaching creative or performance courses in art, music, writing, and technical or performance areas of theatre. (FPPM)
- What is the departmental process for determining the qualification and competencies of its faculty in accordance to the mission of the department and institution?
- How does the department document and justify the qualifications of its faculty?
- How do faculty qualifications compare to the SACS guidelines listed below for faculty credentials?
  - o General education and other undergraduate courses: doctorate or master's in the teaching discipline, or master's with a concentration in the teaching discipline (minimum 18 graduate semester hours)
  - o Graduate courses: earned doctorate/terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline

    Sample Documentation:
- Full curriculum vitae for all current faculty members.
- Provide a copy of the Faculty Roster Form and summarize (see Appendix 2).

    C. Full-Time Faculty (SACS 2.8)
- How do full-time faculty constitute a sufficient resource for carrying out basic faculty responsibilities for the program?

- What percentage of course and generated credit hours are taught by full-time faculty? For each academic year (fall and spring semesters), use fulltime, tenure track (FT) and fulltime, lecturer (FL) data from Appendix 1 to calculate this percentage.
  - If less than 75% of course or generated credit hours are taught by full-time faculty, what is the justification for the use of part-time faculty?

D. Faculty Evaluation (SACS 3.7.2)
   Evaluation of faculty for annual performance review, post-tenure review, probationary review, tenure, and promotion should focus on continuing efforts by the faculty, throughout their professional careers, to integrate teaching, scholarship and service so as to develop an academic atmosphere in which learning is cherished by faculty and students alike. (FPPM)
   - How does the program follow the university policy and procedures that govern faculty evaluation according to the FPPM?
   - How does the program utilize faculty evaluations to ensure effective student learning?

E. Faculty Development (SACS 3.7.3)
   - How does the program support faculty professional development?
   - What are the program standards for professional development?
   - What evidence suggests that faculty is engaging in effective professional development activities?

   Sample Documentation:
   Full curriculum vitae for all current faculty members.

III. Resources
   A. Faculty Resources
   - Are faculty provided with appropriate supplies, well-equipped office, and updated technology to enable them to teach effectively?
     - If not, what is the need and justification(s)?

   - Is administrative staff adequate to support the program?
     - If not, what is the need and justification(s)?

   - Are the classrooms that are used by the program conducive to student learning with the latest technologies?
     - If not, what is the need and justification(s)?

   B. Obtaining and Using Resources
   - Does your program receive funding or a budget?
     - If not, how does your program obtain technology, supplies, professional development, and other necessary resources?

   - Document how program resources (such as technology, supplies, professional development, etc.) have been utilized by the program.

PROGRAM REPORT REVIEW PROCESS

Role of the Department Chair and Department Program Review Team:
The Department Program Review Team, chaired by the Department Chair, conducts a self-study focusing on the aspects of program, faculty and resources. The Program Review Report and supporting documentation are to be submitted in WEAVEonline by July 1 for review by the External Review Team, Dean, and Associate/Assistant Dean responsible for assessment. As the team reflects on the items to address from the outline above, the associated SACS principles are provided. The team may want to use the *Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement* published by SACS as a resource to better understand the rationale behind each principle and sample documentation that will help address it. This document can be found at: http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/handbooks/Exhibit%2031.Resource%20Manual.pdf

Role of the External Review Team:
The External Review Team consists of three members of the Committee on Academic Outcomes Assessment and Program Review. A Program Review Summation Report including explicit commendations and recommendations is to be completed and signed by the team. If the Program Review Report is complete with minimal recommendations, the External Review Team makes a recommendation of submission of the subsequent Program Review in six years. If the Report is incomplete or the Team believes there are areas needing immediate attention, the External Review Team makes a recommendation and justification for resubmission of the Program Review Report within two years. The Program Review Summation Report is sent to the Dean, Associate/Assistant Dean, and Department Chair by November 1.

Role of the Dean and Associate/Assistant Dean responsible for assessment:
The Dean and Associate/Assistant Dean meet with the Department Chair to discuss the Program Review Report and Program Review Summation Report. The Dean, Associate/Assistant Dean, and Department Chair document comments and plans of action on the Program Review Summation Report sent by the External Review Team. By February 1, the Dean signs for authorization of the subsequent Program Review Report submission to be in six years or within two years.

Role of the Dean and Provost:
The Dean and Provost will review the original Program Review Report, the Summation Report, and any supporting materials. In conjunction with the Dean, the Provost incorporates Program Review plans of action into the planning and budgeting process. A letter from the Provost is sent to the Chair and Program Review Report Team on the results of the program review by June 1. This document is uploaded into WEAVEonline for association to the Program Review Report.

APPENDIX 1

MATRIX FOR REPORTING NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED BY PROGRAM UNDER REVIEW

Section*	Term	Faculty Status**	Credit Hours	Total Enrollment	Credits Generated***	Enrollment Categories****			
						Majors	Gen Ed	Foundational	Other

*For Section, include the course prefix, the course number, and the course title.

**Faculty Status Codes:
> FT= Person teaching section is fulltime, tenure track
> FL = Person teaching section is fulltime, lecturer
> PA = Person teaching section is part time, adjunct
> PP = Person teaching section is AP administrative professional and counted as part-time

*** Credits Generated:
> Multiply Credit Hours by Total Enrollment

**** Enrollment Categories:
- Majors = Number of students in a section that are part of the program major
- Gen Ed = Number of students in a section taking course for General Education Requirement
- Foundational = Number of students in a section taking the course as requirement for another program
- Other = Number of students in a section taking course for any other reason

APPENDIX 2

FACULTY ROSTER

1. Extract from Appendix 1 all sections for the previous fall and spring semesters.
2. Add a column for the faculty name and fill in the names of the instructors for those sections.
3. Sort by faculty name and then course.
4. Eliminate duplicates of faculty and course combinations.
5. Delete the term column.
6. Add a column for faculty qualifications.
7. Complete the qualifications column for each row.
   a. List the degree (including discipline, concentration and institution) from the CV that meets departmental and SACS guidelines for the course.
   b. If additional justification is required, list all relevant additional qualifications, such as specific course titles and number of semester hours in those degrees relevant to the course, diplomas or certificates earned (with discipline indicated); related work or professional experience; licensure and certifications; continuous documented excellence in teaching; honors and awards; scholarly publications and presented papers; and other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. Indicate the dates for these additional qualifications and *clearly describe the relationship between these qualifications and the course content and/or expected outcomes of the course.*

Sample Faculty Roster

Section	Faculty Status*	Credit Hours	Name	Qualifications
BUS 2001 Principles of Accounting	FT	3	Joe Alvarez	MBA (General), Good University included the following coursework: BUS 516 Cost Accounting (3) BUS 572 Federal Income Tax (3) BUS 573 Accounting Information Systems (3) Total: 9 Graduate Semester Hrs BBA (Accounting), Greenhill University Current CPA license, NC 1999-2009 Accountant, Big Four Accounting Inc., Durham, NC 3 years Auditing experience 7 years Income Tax experience
GEO 222, Latin America	FL	3	Yolanda Bing	MA (History), Good University Included the following coursework: GEO 512, Hist of Cartography GEO 516, Latin American Geography GEO 640, Geo Info Sys GEO 651, Migration
Music Composition	PA	3	Steig Cederholm	BM (Music Composition), University of Louisville Published composer, including four produced symphonies and one opera, which debuted last winter at the Houston Metropolitan Opera Formerly the composer in residence for the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra

APPENDIX 3

PROGRAM REVIEW SUMMATION REPORT

Name of Academic Program: External Review Team Members:

Click here to enter text.   1. Click here to enter text.

Name of Department Chair: 2. Click here to enter text.

Click here to enter text.   3. Click here to enter text.

Program Review Commendations:

Click here to enter text.

Program Review Recommendations:

Click here to enter text.

Subsequent Program Review Submission

Choose an item.

Justification:

Click here to enter text.

External Review Team Signatures:

_____   Date _____

_____   Date_____

_____   Date_____

Meeting of the Dean, Associate/Assistant Dean, and Department Chair

Comments:

Click here to enter text.

Plan of Action:

Click here to enter text.

Decision of the Dean on Subsequent Program Review Submission:

Choose an item.

Signatures of Dean, Associate/Assistant Dean, and Department Chair:

_____   Date _____

_____   Date_____

_____   Date_____