

## 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, or program review.

Longwood's Program Review Policy was last updated nine years ago and was based on the old SACS Criteria for Evaluation, which is 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 the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (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. After comparing these guides to Longwood's 2002 Program Review Policy, we identified nine deficiencies. 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.

### 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

**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:
  - What are they?
  - 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?
  - 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)
  - 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:

Click here to enter text.

Name of Department Chair:

Click here to enter text.

External Review Team Members:

1. Click here to enter text.

2. 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 _____