Meeting start: 15:31pm

1. Prayer
Diane Ziliotto offered her lead in prayer to begin our meeting.

2. Approval of PRC Minutes Sept 7, 2021
Minutes approved.

3. Language ILO
The library and academic senate here at Westmont have approved the language/word choice of the upcoming institutional learning outcome assessment of information literacy. As the library works with various departments on campus and information literacy is the only outcome that is not aligned with the general education (GE) program, it’s useful to have clear and direct goals to assess. While there’s not much we as faculty and staff can do to help students ‘effectively integrate sources,’ we can influence how they ‘ethically integrate sources.’ As assessment of
information literacy continues to unfold, the library department will lead in strategic research and wise evaluation.

4. Records (2021 Six-Year and Annual Reports Evaluation by PRC)

The committee discussed the report evaluation assignments.

Six-Year reports

The PRC committee will refresh the six-year program review report during the next meeting on October 19th.

This academic year, we are assessing only two six-year program review reports: from the Departments of Education and Athletics.

Education

An external reviewer will not be required for the Education department. The department had earned a ‘stellar report’ from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CA CTC) in 2018, representing a ‘pillar of hope in the community.’ Another CA CTC visit is scheduled for 2024-2025; the education department is constantly preparing reports and analyzing data for such visits.

Elizabeth Gardener will be serving as the assessment team leader for the Education department, while Angela D’Amour will assist as team member.

Athletics

Diane Ziliotto will be taking charge as team leader and Michelle Hughes is assigned as team member.

The Biology department requested an extra year to submit their six-year program review report; the postponed report will be submitted in September of 2022.

Communication Studies has requested to delay submission and is slated to submit report in 2022.

Annual Assessment reports

Finalized PRC’s responses to the annual assessment reports are to be uploaded to PR archives. It’s recommended that reviewers send drafts of their responses to respective department chairs.

In accordance with the rubric, the PRC expectations are for all departments to achieve at least “developed” level in all categories of the rubric; if a department has achieved a “highly developed” level it needs to be praised for this accomplishment.

6. Meeting with the departments undergoing program review

Tatiana met with the English department to discuss their six-year program review report preparation on September 21st.
She is meeting with the Religious Studies department regarding the same matter on October 19th.

7. Evaluating Annual Assessment Report

**Physics and Engineering**

Two annual assessment reports were used as samples for the report evaluation conversation.

Maryke and Tatiana met to discuss the Physics and Engineering department’s report. The report was evaluated against the rubric. Both reviewers agreed that the department submitted an excellent annual assessment report, which as reflected in the PRC that they shared with the committee and while going over the annual report evaluation process.

**Theatre arts**

Maryke and Tatiana also evaluated the Theatre Arts department’s annual assessment report based on key-questions. Theatre Arts have communicated they are focusing on diversity issues in their department; the PRC decided that the department is doing well in addressing their KQs. Maryke and Tatiana shared their PRC’s response to the TA’s annual assessment report and went over the process of evaluating key-question-based reports.

8. Program Review Handbook updates

The committee expressed their gratitude to Andrew for the redesign of the PR Handbook. All comments and suggestions should be sent to him for update and redistribution. There were several questions regarding the Alumni Survey and Diversity Component of the program review:

**Alumni Survey:**
- should data for alumni be grouped in years of four? This may be especially helpful for small departments with few graduates.
- is the wording for Q22 in the program review handbook appropriate?

**Diversity:**
- while data for introductory courses and GPAs is available, is it necessary to include grad and retention rates?
  - request from Michelle for retention data, but not expected to retrieve
  - Program Review Archive -> department -> demographic data -> latest 2019-20
  - possible date: sept 1 2022

9. Other business

COVID-19 was unprecedented and led to many delays in campus business. It is important for the committee to complete the evaluation of submitted annual and six-year reports this semester.

Meeting adjourned

At 4:56pm

Minutes submitted by Andrew Sulayao