Tim Wilson opened the meeting with prayer.

Minutes from 2/11/08 were reviewed and minor changes requested.

Bill Wright asked the Committee to consider whether we should request that departments administer the Senior Survey to graduating seniors. The reliability of the data was discussed at some length. However, the survey has been very useful in terms of finding out how well students connect with the 6 Learning Standards. The College has not specified how the seniors are to be selected; the Committee concurred that the Department Chair should be the one to select students for interviews. The major concern is how faculty bias can creep into the survey results. Laura feels she could provide some instruction to faculty in a training session to minimize the bias. One technique would be to have faculty read their notes back to the student to make sure there was agreement in what is being reported. Warren will set up a time for Laura and Bill to make a short presentation in Faculty Meeting. The R.S. Administrative Assistant will be conducting interviews for the department so he will need some special training. Finally, Ray noted that we need to talk about these results and we should assign someone to act on the information gathered. There should be both departmental and institutional reflection.

Two course release requests were reviewed: Psychology and Math/Computer Science. Psychology has requested a yearly course release. The Committee agreed that the Psychology Department's request for a yearly course release will not be granted. Marianne feels that they have done really good work in the past and that their task is really to simplify their goals. Their proposal is lacking a timeline and list of accomplishments. The Committee agreed to approve their course release but asked that the promised White Paper for May of 2008 contain language that defines the timeline etc. Math/Computer Science submitted a very brief proposal/request to share a stipend between 6 faculty. They have not submitted a timeline nor proposed how the work would be accomplished. There was discussion that the Computer Science faculty have written a curriculum map and have been gathering information on assessment but there seems less visible work from the Math faculty. The Committee expressed grave concerns that they will be able to produce a 6 Year Program Review Report in September. It was decided that we would deny their request and separate the two disciplines as far as producing a report—giving Computer Science another date for a 6 Year Report. Warren agreed to schedule a special meeting with the Math Department.
The Committee reviewed the paragraph on Compensation for the document: “Program Review: Schedule, Compensation and Accountability”. Several changes were made and Marianne promised to send out copies for review.

The Committee also reviewed Chart 1 and Chart 2 of the 6 Year Program Review Template. The specifics of how faculty load should be reported was discussed. The Committee thought there should be a column which has the number of students served as well as one with the number of students per faculty member. These would be helpful numbers when looking at cross-departmental loads. Clearly there are differences in how the sciences and humanities assess loads. Contact hours are crucial to the sciences who have lab commitments. Bill passed out a sample of a report which could be generated from his office which would profile a department for a year. This report would list all faculty with their courses, # of students, units, load credit assigned and the computation for load credit times students. This profile would also provide a comparison of faculty and the numbers of students being served as well as full time, tenure-track faculty versus adjuncts.
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