PRC Meeting Agenda
January 28, 2007

- **Prayer**
- **General concern:** only 6 meetings until the end of the semester –how we might need to work to make sure we accomplish what we need to accomplish
- **Minutes from 1/7 meeting**
- **Distribution of folders to members of the committee working with individual departments and general directions about this work**
- **Handbook Revisions –new (and hopefully final) draft**
  Does this draft address the concerns raised at our previous two meetings?
- **Final schedule for Six Year reviews and accountability proposal. General questions:**
  - When should we present this to the senate –there is some emergency here given the possible compensation for departments scheduled to turn in their report next year
  - Does this system seem to address the concerns raised by our conversations so far (lack of time for program review, concern that the compensation might not lead to better work, etc.)
Program Review Committee Handbook Revisions

a. Membership
   1. Provost and Associate Academic Dean for Curriculum (substituting and for or)
   2. Director of Institutional Research
   3. Director of Assessment
   4. Vice President for Student Life (or representative)
   5. Three faculty, one from each division, elected annually to a three-year term
   6. WASC Liaison Officer (ex officio)

b. Officers
   1. Co-Chairs: Faculty member in 3rd year on Committee and Director of Assessment
   2. Secretary selected by committee

c. Responsibilities

The Program Review Committee oversees program review in departments and programs, and develops an institutional plan for college-wide program review. It establishes policies and procedures regarding program review and assessment.

To meet this mission, the Program Review Committee will:

1. with the advice of the Director of Assessment
   • collaborate with departments as needed in the development of their plan for program review;
   • assist departments with the implementation of their plan to ensure timely progress toward its completion;
   • review the results of the program review and provides any necessary feedback for the department to consider before the department submits the final report to the Provost;
   • as needed, provide the department with comments or suggestions to assist them in their preparation for the next review cycle.
   • encourage a campus conversation that establishes the value of a college-wide program review and addresses concerns as appropriate

2. work with and advise the Director of Institutional Research in establishing institutional goals, formats and priorities for the collection and reporting of student data.

3. advise and support the Director of Assessment in organizing the data, planning a schedule for Program Review and presenting the data to the campus communities and accrediting organizations.
Proposal for Compensation and Accountability

The Nature of Program Review: a Process
A key characteristic of program review is that it is a regular process and not an intermittent event. Ideally, annual department reports should be “mini” program reviews, which feed and inform future program reviews. Change and improvement in our academic programs require a concerted effort by all parties to engage in an on-going process of assessment. Indeed, programs should not view program review as a one-time exercise. Instead, the program review process entails a series of recurring steps:

Here is a possible schedule on a six year cycle –the numbers refer to the sections of the Six year program review template:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule for a Six-year Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Review Overall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Year One:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• work on 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delegate 2 to academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secretaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 A(1) –for most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>departments, this will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be a simple revision of previous work. Make sure your outcomes are indeed outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work on 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work on 5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Year Two:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• finalize 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Student learning outcomes should be specific, measurable, and aligned with program goals.

---
- **Make sure 2 is updated**
- **Finalize 3A (1)**
- **Work on 3A (2)**
- **Update 4**
- **Update 5A and work on 5B**

- **A reflection on the assessment done the previous year and a revised strategy (even if minimally)**
- **A set of data and an analysis of this data for another goal**
- **A matrix aligning the curriculum and the goals**

All of this should be included in your annual report due September 15. Send you report to all the members of your department, to the Director of Assessment, and if applicable to your assessment coordinator.

- **Year Three:**
  - **Updates:** 1, 2, 3A (1) & 3B, 4 & 5A
  - **Finalize 3A (2)**
  - **Work on 3A (3)**
  - **Work on 5C**

If you have completed the work of the first two years, much of your work will consist in expanding the assessment to all your goals, collecting evidence and updating your assessment strategies.

All of this should be included in your annual report due September 15. Send you report to all the members of your department, to the Director of Assessment, and if relevant to your assessment coordinator. Submit a one-page proposal for a stipend (or course reduction) that explains how you are planning on spending the funds or using the time your are requesting: what do you hope to accomplish? Who will be the recipient(s) of this? How will the work be distributed? On the basis of these report and proposal, the PRC will decide whether or not to allocate a course reduction or a stipend to the person responsible for program review in the department.

- **Year Four:**
  - **Updates:** 1, 2, 3A (1,2) & 3B, 4 & 5A
  - **Finalize 3A (3)**
  - **Work on 3A (4)**
  - **Work on 5D**

Same as above

All of this should be included in your annual report due September 15. Send you report to all the members of your department, to the Director of Assessment, and if relevant to your assessment coordinator.

- **Year Five:** **Write the report**
  - **Update and finalize everything**
  - **Work on 6**

Same as above

All of this should be included in your annual report due September 15. Send you report to all the members of your department, to the Director of Assessment, and if relevant to your assessment coordinator. Submit a one-page proposal for a stipend (or course reduction) that explains how you are...
planning on spending the funds or using the
time your are requesting: what do you hope
to accomplish? Who will be the recipient(s)
of this? How will the work be distributed?

On the basis of these report and proposal,
the PRC will decide whether or not to
allocate a course reduction or a stipend to
the person responsible for program review in
the department.

• Year Six: Final Report due in
  September, at the end of the academic
  year.

Report on everything: what have you
learned? What has worked? What has not?

Who is responsible for Program Review and Assessment? A Proposal

Normally, the chair of the department will be responsible for coordinating the work of
assessment and program review. This includes:

  o Articulating a vision and a calendar for assessment and program review in
    collaboration with the Director of assessment
  o Delegating tasks to the academic secretary
  o Keeping a list of the available the evidence
  o Making sure the evidence is analyzed collectively
  o Writing annual updates and the five (six) year report

In some cases a Department coordinator (a faculty from the department, preferably tenured)
will be appointed to do the work. Particularly during the first year of a new chair, and if the
past chair has been very involved in program review, this responsibility and the equivalent
compensation for it might go to the “exiting chair”. This does not mean that this person (be
it the chair or the coordinator) will do the work on their own. The work needs to be
collectively owned and responsibilities need be shared in the department.

Compensation

The PRC will award compensation to the chair or the department coordinator on the basis
of the work accomplished in the past, and of the coherence and appropriateness of the plans
for the future. The September reports will serve as the main evidence for progress and will
constitute the main basis for compensation.

For departments who are struggling with Program Review, this money could be used to
organize a workshop to help the department make serious progress in this area.

Compensation will consist of either a course release or a stipend on the year the six-year
report is due and every other year prior to this.

Budget implications for 18 academic departments:
10 courses/year= 40,000 dollars
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Due after the Spring Semester Sept 15</th>
<th>Course reduction or stipend</th>
<th>Non-academic departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>Chemistry (formally SP08) Mathematics (formally F06)</td>
<td>(Mathematics) Chemistry</td>
<td>Academic Advising and Dis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>English (formally F06) Communication Studies (formally F08) Education (formally SP09) Religious Studies (formally SP07)</td>
<td>English Communication Studies <strong>Education</strong> Religious Studies <strong>Kinesiology</strong> Psychology <strong>Art</strong> <strong>---------</strong> (Urban) <strong>Theater</strong> Modern Languages <strong>---------</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Sociology (formally F06) Biology (formally F08) Philosophy (formally SP 08/SP05) E&amp;B (formally SP09) Physics (formally F07)</td>
<td>Sociology <strong>Biology</strong> Philosophy <strong>E&amp;B</strong> Physics <strong>---------</strong> <strong>Music</strong> <strong>History</strong> Political Science <strong>---------</strong> Mathematics &amp; CS Chemistry</td>
<td>Library General Education (report on effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Kinesiology (5 year report F04) Psychology (5 year report F04) Art (5 year report SP 05)</td>
<td>Kinesiology Psychology Art <strong>---------</strong> Urban Theater Modern Languages <strong>---------</strong></td>
<td>Chapel Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2011 WASC visit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Communication Studies</td>
<td>Education Religious Studies</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011-2012</strong></td>
<td>Music (5 year report SP06)</td>
<td>History (5 year report SP06)</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History (5 year report SP06)</td>
<td>Political Science (deficient 5 year report F05)</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E&amp;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012-2013</strong></td>
<td>Urban (new department)</td>
<td>Modern Languages (5 year report SP06)</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theater (5 year report F05)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Languages (5 year report SP06)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Communication Studies</td>
<td>Education Religious Studies</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy on Departmental Accountability for Program Review

Systematic program review is essential to the health both of individual programs and the College as a whole. Accordingly, the College expects that all departments will report in a timely and thorough manner as directed by the Program Review Committee (PRC).

All assessment reports (annual and five-year) are due to the PRC by September 15.

For reports the PRC deems adequate, no further response may be called for until the following June. In other cases, the PRC will ask for revisions to the original report, to be submitted on an individually-negotiated timetable.

Departments whose annual reports or revisions are more than one month late, or who otherwise fail to make satisfactory progress, may be subject to one or more of the following sanctions, in increasing order of severity, as determined by the Provost through the recommendation of the PRC.

- Reminders from the PRC or assigned liaison
- Request for department to meet with Provost and/or President
- Required reading on assessment, and/or conference attendance, with report due back to Provost, PRC, and/or Faculty Council.
- Assigning reviewers to the department or program from outside the department or the college.
- In extreme cases, a department’s requests for faculty development grants, sabbaticals, or discretionary professional development money could be frozen.
- In extreme cases, the chair could be asked to step down or the department would be chaired by a faculty from another department.

Please also note:

- The PRC will make available to the Academic Committee of the Board a record of departments whose program review work is exemplary or otherwise.
- Contributions to the work of program review are a major component of Institutional Service, and as such will be considered in the process of tenure and promotion.
- The Provost and/or PRC will attempt to offer special recognition, privately or publicly (as appropriate) for departments and/or individual assessment coordinators whose work is particularly effective.