

Program Review Committee
Minutes, October 2, 2014

Present

Alfred Guzman, Craig Gawlick, Roland Amit, Simon Pennington, Katie Ha, Andrew LaManque, Pat Hyland, Elaine Kuo

Absent

Cara Miyasaki, Dawn Girardelli

1) Welcome members

The meeting began with introductions, noting that there were some members new to program review and some members that had served on PRC last year.

2) Review IP&P discussions

The group reviewed the IPB discussions over the summer. Specifically, how the new proposed PRC charge was meant to address some of the ambiguity in the remediation process last year. For example, some had felt that requiring a comprehensive program review follow up was not warranted for every program. Most thought there was a need to separate those programs truly in need of improvement or having viability issues, from those that were not clear in their response to some questions.

The group talked about the purpose of program review was to focus on program viability and improvement. The process was mean to identify programs that had viability issues so that they could improve. Part of the purpose is also about transparency – going through the shared governance process also helps ensure that no one is surprised if the program discontinuance process is recommended by PaRC.

3) Review Charge (handout)

The group spoke about the intent of the proposed charge to offer the committee more flexibility in its recommendation. Each one of the 4 pieces of information reported out by the committee: color category, comments, recommendation for follow up, timing of follow up, were independent from another. For example a yellow rating would not always trigger a follow up comprehensive report. The term remediation plan is defined

broadly and might include only responding to specific sections identified as needing re-writing.

The consensus of the group was supportive of the proposed changes in the Charge.

4) Discuss Rubric (hand out)

The group walked through the rubric and the intent to do a more holistic review. The process was compared to the paper selection process on a hiring committee where the goal was to identify candidates to be interviewed. In the PRC case the goal is to identify programs that appear to have viability issues. The process was also compared to accreditation – the program review was like the self-study and PRC was like the visiting evaluation team that then reported its findings to the commission or in the program review case PaRC.

The committee agreed that individual committee member reviews will remain confidential and only the four pieces of information in the PRC charge would be made public.

The section score summary for each program would not be made public – on this point there was not total agreement on the committee but this was the consensus. It was agreed that this might be reviewed in winter.

There was a suggestion that a note be added to clarify that the color categorization summary/description on the rubric comes from the PRC charge.

The group was supportive of the proposed rubric.

The committee thought this statement would be a bit of a culture change for folks:

"Response includes ideas for improvements in program practices".

Training would need to be done to let departments know that the process was meant for them to identify areas of improvement (like a planning agenda in a self-study report). In its review, PRC will be evaluating whether the programs were being thoughtful about “growth” / enhancements in various areas of the program – new curriculum, new services, new approaching to improving student success, etc.

There were some questions on the Annual Template – and the added box for the Dean to recommend an out of cycle review. The IPB notes will need to be reviewed to clarify

the idea. Since the annual template is not connected with the comprehensive and the annual reviews do not come to PRC, some wondered who the Dean's recommendation would go to and how it would be linked back to the governance system. There was agreement that in the long term there needed to be a discussion about having PRC review the annual program reviews as well as the comprehensive.

It was suggested that the instructions come with a cover letter from President Miner outlining priorities for the PR (like equity).