Program Review Discussion
January 30, 2019

Proposed Agenda


I. Review notes: program data, peer review process to “close the loop”

Four buckets of areas to discuss:

- What we want program review to achieve and do, which will then inform our Planning process.
- What is a program?
- Peer review process and what that means
- What is the data that needs to be changed or incorporated into program review? Need shared metrics.

(Look at the decision making handbook)

Query—Are we a formal committee and how can folks get on board to voice their perspective. Likely for us to be a subcommittee of the GP Taskforce. We should identify stakeholders to participate on this committee group. One perspective that is missing is Administrative services, so we may want to invite others to participate in the group.

Andrew’s perspective—

1. The goal of PR is improvement, like a mini accreditation.
2. The accountability and viability assessment of a program and improvement.
   a. Viability is a concern depending on how this is defined; if viability is about bottom line data and financials, then this may be a challenge for programs that serve other programs, such as English.
   b. What does improvement mean?
   c. We can utilize PR to revitalize programs and make conscious decisions and commitments by the college to support or change a program, and even eliminate it.
   d. A peer review process is important to get feedback from other faculty connected to a program. Maybe we can do a program review collaboratively, rather than in silos. Possibly use meta-majors as “programs” and prepare a collaborative PR process. There are many ways that this can look. The peer-review group would serve as an accountability voice.
   e. The peer-review process can serve as identifying funding needs.
f. Faculty are very reluctant to critique each other and provide direction for improvement. This is an iterative process.
g. Connection to planning and budget are the key aspects for PR.
h. Where does the budget committee come into play?
i. The prioritization process needs to be broader and more iterative with multiple passes from the Dean, the Budget Committee & the ET.
j. This process has to be integrated into the larger administrative services with business and student services.
k. This links to the Strategic Plan. The SP sets the funding priorities.
l. Using a rubric is helpful to identify and prioritize funding.

Summary—

1. This group is a little hesitant about a peer review process in silo, but rather there is a consensus around a committee structure like SLOAC that reviews and reports out on PR. It's self-reflection.
2. Consensus of the group that PR as an integration of multiple aspects of viability and assessment of a program and budget, but also, the PR group makes recommendations and informs the ET on prioritizations.
3. Transparency around decision making and funding resources.
4. What is a program? A degree offering program or a meta-major cluster.
   a. A degree offering program or a meta-major, or a support-program?
   b. The questions asked in PR should link back to Accreditation.

Next Steps:

Still need to define who does a PR and the data we need.
Let's flesh out what PR should accomplish.

How is this going to be different from what we already do? Why change how we do PR?

II. Process for making changes to process / peer review / a committee

1. Recommend changes to decision-making handbook
2. Incorporate changes in strategic plan
3. Who / how best to develop a written proposal for discussion

III. Process for making changes to data

1. Expectations on timeframe
2. Who / how best to develop written proposal for discussion
3. Where do changes need to be discussed?
IV. Defining a program for program review purposes