

### Issues concerning *curriculum*

- A core curriculum may need to be established to pull out recommendation from departmental reports
- Criteria must assess not only the ability of students to find a job but the ability to develop a career and to be educated citizens
- How does core curriculum fit in because it is not owned by any one department
- How will the discussion about the core impact the process?
- Interdepartmental courses (e.g., environmental science interdisciplinary sequence)
- Internal demand for departmental service courses to support the core
- Program contributes to student abilities in the areas of critical thinking, creative problem solving, communications skills, good citizenship (ethics, cultural sensitivity, etc)
- Program exposes students to new perspectives/broadens world view
- Tailor courses to students re core curriculum - example - Comp I - menu of course options e.g. music, literature, scientific writing
- Undergraduate research/portfolio presentations/creative projects

### Issues concerning *definition*

- Diversity of program focus - unclear where to go...look same or more diverse?
- Does strengthening one program mean weakening another, given limited resources?
- How would ranking be done?
- Is there a difference between a program and a concentration?
- Questions: Governance? Review team - stakeholders?
- What is meant by "ranking" by the review team?
- What is productivity?
- What is student success ? Competencies? Retention Rates - career/jobs in fields
- What is the definition of program (...flow sheet?)
- Will our decision-making hurt us during our audit/criteria (ex. Enrollments in between 250-200; researchers vs. enrollment)

### Issues concerning *criteria*

- Added criteria: community involvement and civic engagement (strategic planning goal)
- Be wary of rigid application or emphasis on job placement
- Con - outside review criteria may not be the same as internal reviews
- Cost as a criterion
- Criteria must assess not only the ability of students to find a job but the ability to develop a career and to be educated citizens
- Criteria must not unfairly disadvantage smaller departments/programs
- Criteria should be developed out of mission and strategic plan

- Criteria should not be numbers-driven
- Demographic trends?
- Essentiality
- External demand
- Faculty create program assessment criteria - how to apply to different types of programs (liberal arts mission) - values driven vs. data driven
- Faculty decide the criteria
- Faculty develop evaluation criteria - values-driven vs. data-driven
- Faculty, student, alumni satisfaction should be included as criteria
- Good teaching DESPITE inadequate "inputs" . These need to be documented but not held against programs. Barriers to student growth.
- How do criteria dovetail with NEASC criteria for evaluation
- Internal demand (core)
- Outputs that are unique to individual programs along with standardized measures
- Program assessment - accreditation? External reviews?
- Program contributes to student abilities in the areas of critical thinking, creative problem solving, communications skills, good citizenship (ethics, cultural sensitivity, etc)
- Program elimination/reduction - what are the benefits of elimination? How will it hurt the college?
- Program exposes students to new perspectives/broadens world view
- Regional impact
- Revenue Generation should not be a driving force. Other resources generated by programs may be more intangible, adding to intellectual and cultural life of community
- Size, Scope and productivity
- Some criteria may apply to some programs but not others
- Student outcomes - Program prepares students for future careers and professional growth
- The value of a program must be assessed relative to the mission of SSC and the strategic plan, not by market - revenue factors
- Undergraduate research/portfolio presentations/creative projects
- Use the NEASC criteria
- Who develops the criteria for the process?

Issues concerning *data*

- Be wary of rigid application or emphasis on job placement
- Con - outside review criteria may not be the same as internal reviews
- Costs
- Criteria must assess not only the ability of students to find a job but the ability to develop a career and to be educated citizens
- Criteria must not unfairly disadvantage smaller departments/programs
- Criteria should be developed out of mission and strategic plan
- Criteria should not be numbers-driven
- Demographic trends?
- Essentiality
- External demand
- Faculty create program assessment criteria - how to apply to different types of programs (liberal arts mission) - values driven vs. data driven
- Faculty decide the criteria
- Faculty develop evaluation criteria - values-driven vs. data-driven
- Faculty, student, alumni satisfaction should be included as criteria
- Good teaching DESPITE inadequate "inputs" . These need to be documented but not held against programs. Barriers to student growth.
- How do criteria dovetail with NEASC criteria for evaluation
- Internal demand (core)
- Outputs that are unique to individual programs along with standardized measures
- Program assessment - accreditation? External reviews?
- Program contributes to student abilities in the areas of critical thinking, creative problem solving, communications skills, good citizenship (ethics, cultural sensitivity, etc)
- Program elimination/reduction - what are the benefits of elimination? How will it hurt the college?
- Program exposes students to new perspectives/broadens world view
- Regional impact
- Revenue Generation should not be a driving force. Other resources generated by programs may be more intangible, adding to intellectual and cultural life of community
- Be wary of rigid application or emphasis on job placement
- con - concern about market-driven cuts
- Data we need should find a way to get it - double majors
- Demographic trends?
- Each department provides list of programs that are vibrant/growing which would benefit from resources
- Good teaching DESPITE inadequate "inputs" . These need to be documented but not held against programs. Barriers to student growth.
- Hire and outside "data gatherer"
- How long to we look at data set to measure outcomes?

- Outputs that are unique to individual programs along with standardized measures
- Regional impact
- Some programs/curriculum are so new they have not been able to generate evidence of success
- Threshold data - Nancy's model
- Trends impact
- What type of data will come from the department that does not already exist in IR?
- What type of qualitative data should be included?

Data needs

- Regional economic indicators
- Broader economic predictors re: job projections
- Structure of other state universities (commonwality)
- Diversity data – campuswide and student
- Student progress data to better predict course offerings needed
- Where do our students go after they graduate. Where are they several years out? (Institutional Advancement/Alumni Afafirs)
- Why do students change their major>?
- For new transfer students, what areas/majors are they interested in.
- After registration, list of majors who have not yet registered.
- Capture students who may withdraw and refer to Chair for intervention.
- Data on the success of SSC Succeed.
- 

Issues concerning *departments*

- con - aligning accreditation of departments with college
- Departmental self-evaluation
- Departments drafting planning report
- Departments should start
- Departments working together
- Don't get stuck in departmental discussions
- Each department provides list of programs that are vibrant/growing which would benefit from resources
- How is task force chosen? Will that impact decisions in my department?
- Interdepartmental collaboration
- What is the role of the department chair in this process? Is it to be one of simply protecting one's department?
- Will departments/programs have the opportunity to reorient themselves rather than having their future dictated to them?

Issues concerning *faculty voice/governance*

- Empower faculty

- Faculty breakouts
- Faculty create program assessment criteria - how to apply to different types of programs (liberal arts mission) - values driven vs. data driven
- Faculty decide the criteria
- Faculty develop evaluation criteria - values-driven vs. data-driven
- Faculty time constraints are very real, and so the process being "faculty driven" must truly mean something and not end up being a slogan
- Personal - "I am retiring in 5 years - will mine go?"
- Pro - good way for junior faculty to get oriented to program (counts as service...potential for scholarship if presented and written up)
- Pros - faculty voice in process
- Timeline input by the faculty
- Timeline input by the faculty
- Use senior faculty to guide process
- We need lots of faculty involvement and students - not just data and a spreadsheet
- What could happen to me? Where else would I teach?
- Forums for non-tenured faculty (safe)
- Get everyone in the conversation
- How do we get ALL faculty especially senior faculty involved in the process?
- How to get people to show up
- Questions: Governance? Review team - stakeholders?
- Several town meetings with themes
- There has to be a relationship to governance
- We need lots of faculty involvement and students - not just data and a spreadsheet

#### Issues concerning *process*

- Are other state colleges engaged in a similar process?
- Cannot let past hold you down
- Collaboration (not just "me")
- con - who makes final decisions?
- Departmental self-evaluation
- Departments drafting planning report
- Departments should start
- Departments working together
- Don't get stuck in departmental discussions
- Faculty breakouts
- Faculty time constraints are very real, and so the process being "faculty driven" must truly mean something and not end up being a slogan
- Forums for non-tenured faculty (safe)
- Get everyone in the conversation
- How do we get ALL faculty especially senior faculty involved in the process?
- How is task force chosen? Will that impact decisions in my department?

- How to get people to show up
- How will the discussion about the core impact the process?
- Institutionalize
- Interdepartmental collaboration
- Internal departmental assessment first? Interdepartmental cooperation
- Is the timeframe of this process too compressed?
- Keep it positive
- Needs for institutional assessment
- Program assessment - accreditation? External reviews?
- Program elimination/reduction - what are the benefits of elimination? How will it hurt the college?
- pros wider view of program needs/effectiveness
- Questions: Governance? Review team - stakeholders?
- Scheduling issues - is this important enough to block out time on a regular basis
- Several town meetings with themes
- Student/employer alumni, advisory board input. What would be the resources to secure this information?
- Students will be affected
- SWOT
- Task force needs to happen soon
- The process must maintain the fundamental mission of SSC as a liberal arts college
- This is about the future of SSC (this is the hook)
- Timeline input by the faculty
- Timeline input by the faculty
- What is the role of the department chair in this process? Is it to be one of simply protecting one's department?
- Who develops the criteria for the process?

Issues concerning *resources*

- Hire an outside "data gatherer"
- How do we share the load in a small department where everybody is doing everything?
- One faculty member per department - release time each semester
- Pro - potential for enhanced resources
- Scheduling issues - is this important enough to block out time on a regular basis
- Student/employer alumni, advisory board input. What would be the resources to secure this information?
- We'll need APRs for coordinating work
- What are we going to do less of? Teaching? Meetings?
- What is the impact DGCE has on the day program - how do we make that more fluid?
- What resources are available for assessment?

- Will the process allow faculty to be given time off from teaching in the spring to undertake the review
- Will there be less budget for undergraduate education at the end of the process

Issues concerning *strategic plan and accreditation*

- Going back to our mission: diversity
- pros - opportunity to change relationship between undergrad and grad program
- Pros - reduce overlap in programs across disciplines
- pros - transformation of programs to stay competitive?
- The process must maintain the fundamental mission of SSC as a liberal arts college
- The value of a program must be assessed relative to the mission of SSC and the strategic plan, not by market - revenue factors
- How do criteria dovetail with NEASC criteria for evaluation
- NEASC criteria
- Program assessment - accreditation? External reviews?
- Use the NEASC criteria

Issues concerning *value added*

- Outputs that are unique to individual programs along with standardized measures
- What unique benefits do we offer the Commonwealth? Workforce? Citizenship?
- Good teaching DESPITE inadequate "inputs" . These need to be documented but not held against programs. Barriers to student growth.
- Revenue Generation should not be a driving force. Other resources generated by programs may be more intangible, adding to intellectual and cultural life of community
- Student outcomes - Program prepares students for future careers and professional growth