Program Review Committee
9-9-2008 - Agenda

Devotional
Orientation to the Committee’s Work
  o The charge
  o The 2007 concerns and last year’s accomplishments
  o The work ahead

I. Devotional: the man in the mirror

II. Orientation: why are we here?

  o The Charge: Handbook - revised Spring 2008

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. in collaboration with the Director of Assessment
   (a) work with departments as needed in the development of their plan for program review;
   (b) assist departments with the implementation of their plan to ensure timely progress toward its completion;
   (c) 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;
   (d) as needed, provide the department with comments or suggestions to assist them in their preparation for the next review cycle;
   (e) 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 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.
Four areas of concerns: strategic vision, assessment and program review, sustained leadership support, defining and implementing diversity

Assessment and Program Review:

In summary:
- variability in assessment efforts and depth
- program review for all academic programs
- six learning standards: departmental ownership, GE and measures for each standard

2007 response:
- Revised schedule for departments and programs for program review (6 year cycle)
- Revised template for annual assessment reports
- New template for program review
- Clarification of responsibilities: Revision of handbook description of chair responsibilities
- Faculty training: new faculty and chair workshops included sections on assessment and program review
- Appointment of a ½ then 2/3 time Director of Assessment charged with leading individual departments as well as non-academic areas, being available to new faculty, chairing the PRC — new template for Student life
- Creation of a new website
- Articulation of a new General Education Program assessment plan
- Establishment of a compensation system on a rotating basis (course reduction or stipend) and stipends awarded 7 departments
- Discussion of Six Learning standards in Senate and in Faculty meeting
The work ahead

Remaining issues:
- Some “whats”
  1. Six learning standards – departmental ownership and relationship to the GE program
  2. Refine and clarify standards for adequate proposals for compensation
  3. Continue refining the website to include resources, timeline
  4. Recruit a new and improved Director of Educational Effectiveness
  5. Include areas such as off-campus and athletics in the process of program review
  6. Review template for non-academic areas (in progress)
  7. Address the report’s concern about diversity
  8. Address the “revised standards”

- Mostly “hows”, i.e. Implementation issues:
  1. Continue working with individual departments and faculty on strategies for assessment and “spirit” of program review
  2. Promote a culture of outside reviews
  3. How does the committee handle “poor” reports?

An Initial Strategy
- Collective reading of program review reports (chemistry and mathematics)
- Work with individual departments:
  - Ray – Kinesiology
  - Dave – Biology
  - Andrew – History
  - John – Philosophy?
  - Marianne – everyone else
- All members read the GE report, as well as reports from departments due for program review this coming year (Communication Studies, Biology, Education, Religious Studies)
- Institutional Assessment (see grid on back)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Where published?</th>
<th>Other than GPA what measures or indicators are used?</th>
<th>Time frame for gathering data</th>
<th>Date of last/next Program Review</th>
<th>Has the data been applied to create change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>Historical literacy</td>
<td>Geographical literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Yes-under revision</td>
<td>In assessment reports</td>
<td>Sophomore and Senior Art shows</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising and Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>