

## **ANNUAL REPORT 2013-2014**

**Submitted to Collage Academic Senate by C. Aretha, Ph.D., on behalf of the**

### **Curriculum Review Committee**

The Curriculum Review Committee has had a busy but productive academic year, having worked with the Office of Curriculum and Student Learning to refine the process for review of programs and disciplines. I am happy to report that 13 of our programs or disciplines have completed their reviews under this new process and are either finished or are in various stages of drafting their action plans. . In addition to the putting the new elements of review in place, and supporting faculty through this new process, we have collaborated with CSL on a process for the evaluation of the review process itself. Finally, we end our year with continuing discussions on the results of this evaluation process and are currently helping to develop training materials for access online.

Summer of 2013 was spent reviewing results and feedback from the pilot of the most recent CRC process. Process improvements were then developed in to order to both answer weaknesses revealed by the pilot, and to better align the review process with the objectives outlined in the, then, new Educational Master Plan. The CRC chair, the Coordinator of Curriculum Review, and the Director of Curriculum and Student Learning met regularly during the summer to formulate changes that: would, for example:

1. Provide data in the review document that would aid in the review of some key performance indices
2. allow reviews to be completed in a timeline consistent with deadlines that were relevant for implementation of action plans that flowed from the reviews
3. Prompted Lead Reviewers with questions in each section that were related to the data illustrated
4. facilitate interaction between faculty members within the programs/disciplines and between these faculty and their academic dean
5. Be the basis for development of well-thought action strategies that could lead to improvement in the program or discipline
6. Take into consideration the impact of increased activity in the formal assessment of student learning .by programs/disciplines

An outline of this revised process and a sample of the review document was presented to the committee for their feedback and discussion. Thirteen programs/disciplines began their review process while the development of the process itself was being vetted by the committee.. By the beginning of the winter term, the revised review process and associated forms were completed, presented, and approved by the College Academic Senate.

In the winter of 2014, a Curriculum Review forum was held and though weather conditions likely interfered with attendance numbers, the attendees had the opportunity to discuss and ask questions about the changes to the review process.

The following programs/disciplines have submitted their completed reviews and are in various stages of drafting action strategies (\* indicates those that have been approved as complete through vote by the CRC and the others that are pending CRC vote are either in the process of being formatted by CSL, or are currently in the voting phase):

Psychology\*

Chemistry\*

Massage Therapy”

Alternative Energy\*

Surgical Technology\*

Paralegal\*

Interior Design\*

Computer Information Systems\*

Gerontology\*

Fine Arts Visual

Health

Emergency Medical Services

Photography

The CRC participated in the development of a plan to evaluate the curriculum review process, offering recommendations about what should be included as pieces needed for evaluation, drafting questions for lead reviewer surveys, developing and implementing the CRC rubric for scoring of review documents, and offering feedback on the evaluation tools used by CSL (with the exception of the survey sent to the CRC committee itself). The results of the evaluation process for this past year, as well as descriptions of plans that will respond to issues raised, will be presented to the senate in the fall. A few examples of the type of planned improvements already discussed are:

1. Increased communication with deans and faculty regarding interpretation of data presented in review document and offering productive approaches to address concerns about the data or its interpretation
2. Refinement of the review document to increase transparency and clarity of both what is presented and what is being asked
3. Earlier preparation of forms and meetings by CSL and clear timetables for completion of the various steps of the review process
4. Use of electronic signatures
5. Workshop for lead reviewers
6. More effective outreach by CRC to lead reviewers
7. A curriculum review website

There is continuing discussion regarding the extent to which CRC should offer unsolicited feedback to faculty and deans of programs/disciplines undergoing reviews, and the impact of the new process on the focus of the work of the committee. The revised process has shifted the role of CRC from monitoring and advising on content of individual reviews toward monitoring and advising on the

review process itself. This summer, we have plans for continued conversation to better define our standards upon which we vote to approve reviews, which will entail a revision of the CRC rubric for assessment of reviews, and revisiting the idea of CRC mentors.

The CRC will also participate this summer in the development of a fall workshop for faculty undergoing review. There is early discussion that this workshop may take the form of an online presentation that would be accessible to anyone interested.

CRC and CSL continue to collaborate and communicate extensively. The Director of the office of CSL continues to solicit feedback and ideas from CRC members, as does the Coordinator of Curriculum review. There are no conflicts thus far with the committee's ability to serve as both standing senate committee and as members of the Curriculum review implementation team. Although discussions did take place between CRC and CSL regarding what would happen in the event such a conflict of interest would arise, every effort is made to blend the objectives of both the CRC and CSL so that a single process that serves the needs of all groups involved is available to programs/disciplines.

The Chair wishes to thank the committee members for their excellent work and the entire committee recognizes the impressive amount of work and support given by Marty Orlowski, Kelly Perez-Vergara, Mike Kramer, Maria Blugerman, and everyone at CSL. Their willingness to share their expertise and openness to ideas has made this collaboration successful. The fact that all the Lead reviewer respondents of the surveys indicated that they felt the process has led to identification of areas of improvement within their programs and disciplines is a positive outcome for this year.

The list of programs/disciplines scheduled for review in the 2014-2015 academic year and those lead reviewers that have been identified are as follows:

<b>Review</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Awarded?</b>
ANT	Anthropology	Cheryl Neely	Yes
CAD	Computer Aided Design	Tahir Kahn	Yes
CSE	Computer Support Engineering	Bernadette McAllister	Yes
DMS	Diagnostic Medical Sonography	Caroline O'neil-Nacy	Yes
ECO	Economics	Daniel Lawson	Yes
GRD	Graphic Design	Peter Schade	Yes
GSC	General Science	Richard Lamb	
HPT	Hospital Pharmacy Technology		
HUM	Humanities	Laura Kendall	Yes
MDA	Medical Assisting	Gail Mazzocco	
MHA	Mental Health/Social Work	Gail Palmer	Yes
RAD	Radiologic Technology	Caroline O'neil-Nacy	Yes
ENV	Environmental Systems	Rob Featherstone	Yes