Program Review Committee
Minutes
November 20, 2007

Present: Marianne Robins, Warren Rogers, Eileen McMahon, Ray Rosentrater, Tim Wilson, Mark Nelson, Andrew Mullen, Bill Wright and Barb Kennedy

Bill Wright opened with prayer.

Marianne stated that to date the Committee has established a basic schedule for Program Review and we will suspend our discussions in how to work with departments. Goals for today's meeting are to define a procedure we can recommend for review of the 6 Learning Standards and to revise the Program Review Committee goals which are published in the Faculty Handbook.

Ray reported that he has solicited opinions on the 6 Learning Standards from faculty and he reports that “they are going in very different directions”. He passed out a handout summarizing comments from some departments as well as comments sent to him by departments. Bill observed that we seem to find ourselves in a situation similar to the process of revising the General Education Program. Faculty had to continue working with the “old General Education Program”. We need to communicate to the faculty, that while we are re-working the 6 Learning Standards, we need to move forward with departmental Program Review and continue working with the standards we have. We can’t, at the moment, set aside program review to take on the all-consuming task of rewriting the 6 Learning Standards.

The Committee discussed faculty’s overall discontent with the standards. Clearly we need to “own” them better. The requirement that they be incorporated into course syllabi is sometimes viewed as problematic. Some faculty don’t like the language of certain standards. The new Program Review template asks departments to connect their departmental standards to the 6 Learning Standards.

Also, the Long Range Planning group has recommended that the College re-write its mission statement. If we revise the 6 Learning Standards before this is done we may be putting the “cart before the horse”. A possible solution would be to ask departments to submit a “sketch” rather than a full proposal to describe college standards. This would give faculty a voice, help inform the Long Range group working on a new mission statement, as well as allow the faculty to start reworking the standards.*

Marianne said that she considered hiring an outside consultant who could be helpful in reconciling the GE categories with the 6 Learning Standards. Could the 4 categories of the GE be translated into learning standards? Unfortunately, the GE language consists mostly of inputs—we have had a limited way in the past of measuring what a student
has acquired in the GE Program. Marianne noted that the GE Committee is also in the process of defining learning outcomes and assessment strategies for all the GE categories with the goal of assessing all the courses by 2010. The Committee seemed to conclude that we should hold off on hiring an outside consultant until we had greater clarity ourselves.

Ray agreed to explain the structure of the plan above* to the Senate which will allow us to move forward with Program Review. A Senate report will then be made to the greater faculty.

Marianne passed out copies of the Faculty Handbook related to Program Review. The committee agreed that “departments” does not adequately describe our “units of assessment”—the 19 academic departments and 8 service programs. The Committee agreed to title the 27 groups as “program areas”. We first reviewed the membership list and agreed to the following changes:

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 and Dean of Students (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

1. To develop an institutional plan for program review and in consultation with the Academic Senate and program areas develop reporting procedures. (formerly item 6)  
2. To work with Director of Assessment and program areas in devising and implementing an on-going process of program review (formerly item 1)  
3. To work with the Director of Assessment to provide resources and recommendations to program areas pertaining to the means and methods of program review (formerly item 2)  
4. To encourage a campus conversation that establishes the value of a college-wide program review process for our own use. (formerly item 3)  
5. To monitor concerns over the review process and respond to expressed concerns as appropriate (formerly item 4)  
6. To work with and advise the Director of Institutional Research in establishing institutional goals and priorities for the collection and reporting of student data. (formerly item 5)
7. To submit an annual report to the Provost’s Office that summarizes program activity of the prior year (Note: some discussion about deleting this item as this now might fall under job responsibilities for the Director of Assessment).

There was some discussion regarding the need for Co-Chairs. Members noted that we may not always have a Director of Assessment coming from the faculty ranks and that by having a faculty member as a co-chair we would diminish the possibility of distrust toward a committee that has so many administrators.

Committee members were asked to review the proposed changes in the Handbook, both ones we collectively reviewed and those we didn’t get to, and suggest any wording changes at the next meeting, December 4, 2007.

Recorded by,

Barb Kennedy