

Notes from the PARC Meeting
Wednesday, April 7, 2010
12:30 to 1:30 p.m.
Sage Hall 2030

Attending: Mike Riley, Simone Aloisio, Steve Clark, Karen Jensen, Steve Lefevre (co-chair), Ed Nuhfer (co-chair), Alex McNeill, Nelle Moffett, Luda Popenhagen, Peter Smith.

Assessment Terminology - Ed Nuhfer outlined the importance for CI to have consensus on several key terms, including , *assessment of student learning, evaluation, goals, student learning outcome*. Alex McNeill, Karen Jensen, Nelle Moffett and others discussed proposed language provide to PARC members, and it was agreed that a subgroup would meet and report back with recommended language.

Mapping Course to Program Outcomes - Ed reviewed his office's progress in meeting with program faculty on the 'mapping project.' Karen described the nursing program's experience with examining its course outcomes, noting that the resulting course modifications will involve heavy program and Curriculum Committee work . Steve Clark reviewed the Spanish program's positive experience in its first faculty session on reviewing and mapping its courses, and described several lessons it has learned. Several asked what will happen to the mapping documents once created, Ed replying that that WASC asks that these be 'public,' and he recommends having programs maps available on a common website.

Course Outlines. Simone Aloisio recommended that the chairs and support coordinators have ready access to course outlines, and provide these to faculty, especially adjunct faculty, who are teaching.

Program Reviews. Steve Lefevre thanked the subcommittees that developed drafts for the four programs undergoing program review by PARC: business, biology, ESRM, and computer science. Asking how the committee wished to proceed on approving these subcommittee reports, the following was suggested:

- That the committee work by email to finalize the four drafts;
- That Steve's office invite each PARC member to provide him with suggested changes or additions;
- That he put the four reports in a common format;
- Since report recommendations are not all of equal breadth or importance, that each report conclude with a number (3 to 5) of concluding recommendations, and that these be identified as 'short term' (two year) or 'long term' (five year) objectives;
- Since sometimes 'prescriptive language' appears in the report recommendations, that this language be modified so that PARC isn't seen as dictating to a program how it ought to address issues that are identified in the review.
- That we give final approval to the PARC reports at our next meeting so that they are forwarded to the dean and provost by the end of April.