Program Review Committee
September 25, 2007
Minutes

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

Ray opened the meeting with prayer. Marianne indicated that our task this morning was to review the Template for Program Review. Corrections were made to unify the document to read 6 years throughout.

In response to Marianne's question about whether there were any issues with sections I and II, Andrew noted that the Education Department really has two programs to report on. Although there are aspects of the document which draw departmental information such as the budget, the document should be reviewing programs—not departments. The group then talked at length about how this translated to the issue of different majors within the departments. While there might be a common set of goals, departments with more than one program will need to create separate charts for the “alignment” (matrix showing how student outcomes for the major are aligned with courses offered by the department). If majors are sufficiently different, departments will have to provide separate statements.

Marianne is very concerned about asking departments to reformat the annual reports for this section. Warren proposed that we combine the sections of Program and Assessment into one large section with 3 major parts: Student Learning Outcomes, Assessment Activities and Reflection. This will help departments organize the data and make a connection between the outcomes, the data and conclusions. Mark Nelson noted that the order of thought might depend on the discipline. Marianne felt we should have an introductory paragraph stating a clear connection between the various parts of the section. Is there evidence you have collected the right data? Is your evidence speaking to your goals?

We need to remind departments to document their meetings. While there is a certain amount of informal conversation on these topics, departments will have to be specific and intentional about record keeping. Perhaps there should be a template for reviewing issues/evidence/institutional data. Should the PRC provide a lectionary on how to schedule discussions? Perhaps a systematized reminder stratégic approach at Faculty Meetings? Finally, Eileen raised the question of bringing curriculum comparison nationwide. How do our programs measure up to similar schools? Should this be part of number 6—Future Plans?

The group discussed the format for the assessment section. Eileen asked why we weren't using the template for the annual assessment reports which would seem rational and systematic from year to year in preparation for the 6 year review. Mark provided the analogy of “stacking up slices to make the sandwich”. The missing pieces would be the external reviews, comparisons to peer institutions. There does seem to be value in a collection of the reports with a summary, especially due to changes in department chairs.
Marianne proposed that Ray take a draft of the report to Executive Senate later today to get their recommendations. We will need to continue the discussion on GE and Resources. Three weeks from now, we need to have a final version. The group asked Barb to look for an additional meeting time in the next few days.

Recorded by,
Barb Kennedy
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