Program Review Committee
Minutes
January 29, 2009

Present: John Blondell, Dave Marten, Marianne Robins, Warren Rogers, Tim Wilson, Barb Kennedy, Ray Rosentrater

Barb Kennedy opened the meeting with prayer. The minutes from 1/15/09 were reviewed with no changes.

Marianne again discussed the over-due departments who have not turned in Sept. 08 reports. Two departments have been dramatically affected by the fire – Religious Studies and Psychology. She feels that these two departments should be granted permission to do a 2 year annual report. Modern Languages will also be granted permission for 2 years. Their department was affected by a chair change and the fact that one of their faculty members was off-campus in the fall; this made it hard for them to complete their report. The other two departments, Political Science and Communications Studies, will be given a Feb.15th, 2009 deadline to produce the Sept. 2008 report.

The Committee reviewed some modifications to the Annual Report Template which more closely follows the 6 year template. Departments should be able to build on reports from year to year as in our famous “sandwich” analogy. Dave Marten noted that building the faculty teaching load charts from year to year will make writing the 6 year report so much easier. He indicated he spent a great deal of time creating this data for Chemistry.

The document titled “Changes in the WASC Standards and Review Process”, dated July 2008, was reviewed. The first part relates to Institutional Research and comparing us to peer institutions. There is on-going concern about how will we know if we are doing a good job? The new Assessment Director and the new Academic VP will need to establish these benchmarks. (Table B)

Table A: We have goals for courses, we have program goals and the question is “how to articulate goals for the institution”? Resolving to up-date/change the 6 Learning Standards may have to become more central to the work of the Strategic Planning Committee. Unfortunately, Marianne reports that she has had little luck finding institutional plans on-line. She has found seminaries which have developed institutional plans.

Item 2.8 – Faculty promotion and tenure recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment and co-curricular learning (athletics and chapel). Marianne noted that the Faculty voted to change the Chair description in the handbook but defeated the motion to change the guidelines for tenure and promotion which would have addressed this point. While it is not written in our policy, faculty have been given
credit for institutional service by Personnel and we can prove that with the actual reviews. The Academic Personnel Committee should be approached to take up this discussion.

**Item 3.2 – We should have it written in our policies that adjuncts are involved in assessment.** Annual and 6 year reports should be distributed to all faculty and part-time and invited to respond.

Comment: the more people who understand the criteria for review, the better we will be able to respond to our Review Teams.

Recorded by,

Barb Kennedy
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