Minutes
Program Review Committee
October 7, 2008


1. Andrew opened in prayer.

2. Reviewed minutes from 9/23 meeting.

3. Reviewed job description for Director of Assessment.

- Two versions in circulation, long and short

- Use language of “guide and support,” rather than supervise, when talking about director’s role vis-à-vis the faculty

- Talked about the title—Maybe eventually add “& Program Review”?

- Does having the position Tenure Track make it more, or less, attractive to applicants?

- Key point—Letter of offer has to be clear about expectations—what will count as evidence of satisfactory achievement?

- Who does the candidate answer to?

- Do we want to express the Job Position [or later, the criteria for evaluation] in terms of outcomes?

Summing up: Based on today’s discussion, Marianne will send another draft of this around before it goes out. We’ll try to work this out by e-mail, but may look at long version at next meeting?

4. Six-year Report from Math

How do we communicate with departments most effectively?

- We need to establish a consistent process—establish appropriate precedents now, as we complete our first review of a six-year report.

- Should the memo from PRC or Director of Assessment come to the department before, or AT, the face-to-face meeting? Resolution: send it ahead of time.
-What about the “wine and cheese”? Send $25 gift certificate to department?

-How do we balance the need to name hard issues, without concerns about raising unnecessary alarm?

5. Proposals for funding for course release or funds in order to undertake Program Review

—Some additional clarity needed. 1 or 2 questions raised, but no time to explore these….

6. GE assessment

-Concerns raised previously by e-mail---

  -Sustainability of whatever program is committed to. Let’s not commit ourselves to more than we can keep up with

  -We need to clarify the relationship of GE assessment to assessment of Westmont experience as a whole. As part of this larger question, what is the relationship of GE assessment to assessment of the 6 outcomes?

  -Concern about the way the historical background is framed--as described in GE report: Developing a GE, and THEN establishing outcomes. As opposed to starting with outcomes, and building a GE around them (The latter is what we originally proposed back in 2002, but over the course of time, we may have gone in a different direction. At least that’s how the current document under consideration may be read).

Can we use what’s been done so far with GE to speak to institutional-level educational effectiveness?

Can we build a plan around what we already have in place?

What if the 6 Student Learning Outcomes change?

Let’s keep the CLA.

Are there ways to better utilize the NSSE data?
Let’s list the six learning outcomes, and identify what’s currently being done under each.

Eventually, the strategizing that we’re doing here needs to be shared with the Strategic Planning cell group.
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Andrew Mullen