We have approximately 11 faculty and staff involved in this process, while several others from the greater community participate as they can. This document however, reflects primarily the information gathered by, and the conversations among the 11 core members listed at the end of the report. This report will be sectioned to summarize first our information-gathering phase of the Fall 2010 and secondly the four areas that are being investigated.

During the Fall 2010, we gathered documents relevant to our charge. In terms of self-study we were asked to investigate four areas, which we did in sub-committee format. Existing documents were shared, and relevant work in progress by other areas of the college was recognized.

How effective is our current curriculum? A subgroup of our committee gathered data collected for HLC, NSSE, Student Satisfaction Surveys, Alumni Survey, etc.(on Moodle site) to gauge how well students performed and their satisfaction with the curricula. The group noted that while cross-college qualitative and quantitative measuring tools are not fully developed, we are currently working towards that goal in the cross-college Assessment Committee. We created a table of the student “achievement levels” for each of a number of “effectiveness elements.” Depending on how one defines effectiveness, the curriculum ranges from exemplary to satisfactory. Engagement appears to be exemplary across curriculum. Most of us perceive that students carry the mission of College into the real world and potential students are attracted to the College, yet the level at which student’s needs are met is mixed. If the curriculum is one important retention indicator, we are falling short, especially at the undergraduate levels. The College must continue to engage in a holistic review of every touch-point in the student experience, from admissions to graduation, to identify critical performance gaps.

A survey of program leadership reflected a breadth of responses from faculty in the graduate (somewhat self critical) and undergraduate (primarily positive) when gauging the effectiveness of their own programs.

How relevant is the curriculum? After much discussion of the term itself, we surveyed program leadership who reported overall that our curriculum is very relevant: notable exceptions are a) the lack of quantitative curriculum and full-time faculty in this curricular area, and b) the need to integrate the curriculum across existing programs. Some graduate faculty and alums and others from outside the teaching community described glaring needs in the curriculum that undermine relevancy. In many areas, especially the sciences and technology, the curriculum is not keeping up with the fast pace of growth in the respective fields. Most faculty members are not incorporating their own scholarship into the curriculum as a means to engage students, nor are they keeping up with their fields and updating their classes. This rather harsh critique must be considered as prepare for the future. Access to information grows exponentially and student retrieval is rapid, yet supports for faculty research and professional development declines. New faculty are rarely added to the faculty, rather attrition has reduced the size of the faculty and the collective expertise in the past two decades. The negative effect on the curriculum is recognized by the “outside”, i.e. graduates and colleagues, but not necessarily by Prescott College faculty.
Are our graduates successful? Even though there is no institutional definition of a successful graduate, faculty feel, by a multitude of criteria, that graduates are very successful; some of the graduate responses suggest otherwise. However, we all agree that a means to systematically evaluate their success is lacking and will be a solid recommendation from our committee. A plethora of calls for new classroom and lab facilities, addition of course requirements in graduate study, support for mentors/adjuncts with livable salaries, faculty professional development, links with the outside world, and many more faculty to expand the curriculum were suggested.

Are the two undergraduate programs consistent? We defined “consistency” by what components exist in ADP and RDP today and explored which component should be similar; which components were perceived as inconsistent; and began to address what should be different between the two programs given the different student populations and delivery models. Beyond the obvious differences in delivery model, the subcommittee reported that the two undergraduate programs are consistent in terms of degree requirements and expectations and values. In both programs mathematics curricula and offerings are inadequate; ADP perceives greater challenges in writing (more support through writing classes in RDP, but both utilize writing center); while RDP has noticed less integration of liberal arts in degree plans.

Are there appropriate links between the undergraduate and graduate programs? The subcommittee explored two criteria, whether both have mission driven curricula and graduate level work preparation (for PC or elsewhere) is effective. In terms of our committee work, the graduate curriculum has not been addressed in depth.

In summary, the committee did a thorough job of educating itself on the pros and cons of the curriculum during Fall 2010. In terms of specific recommendations, at the close of Fall 2010 we concluded that we must recommend:

- Faculty need time and resources for professional development to “grow” a curriculum for 2020; cross-program faculty collaboration, as evidenced in our committee, was noted as one form of professional development.
- Our current undergraduate curriculum lacks mathematics and technology and this must be immediately addressed
- Curricular-based facilities must be developed on campus to support existing and new curricular areas

We began in January, 2011 to focus our attention on creating specific recommendations for the curriculum of the next decade, with 3 year benchmarks articulated.

**Recommendation and Proposals for 2020 Curriculum**
The committee determined that we would not take up measures of achievement by each program because several other college-wide committees (outside of the Strategic Planning committees) are making progress on this and we will await their analysis and respect their recommendations. That decision allowed us to focus our attention this spring in four areas: cohesion of a unified undergraduate curriculum, possible alternative models for undergraduate delivery, enhancement of curriculum through creation of bioregional hubs and an assessment of the effectiveness, consistency of delivery, relevancy and cohesion of the graduate curriculum going forward. Variable progress has been made in each of these areas—in some cases, such as undergraduate
curriculum we have had thoughtful conversation and the creation of two models for discussion. Other work is ongoing and subcommittees are creating models and points for further discussion. A summary of ongoing work is given below with the caveat that all comments are in “discussion” mode and that solid recommendations are still to be developed.

**Undergraduate Degree Programs:** Our work has centered on creating “One-college” at the undergraduate level and two models have been drafted. Through several substantial conversations, we have established that we will recommend that there should be one, high quality and consistent undergraduate degree program with multiple delivery options. In the first model we envision one undergraduate faculty with one set of academic standards, organized by curricular areas or themes, and using two delivery models with some level of fluidity between the two (for students and for interested faculty). Appendix 1 is a paper outlining the model in draft form. Model 2 develops Model 1 by proposing that some competences could be delivered 100% online and adding many possible structural components and market analysis. We now grapple with how integrated we want the two (or three) undergraduate delivery models to be and how that integration can occur without loss of the uniqueness of each delivery and the established and effective curricular focus on our mission (see above).

We are creating definitions of “quality” and “consistency.” Elements included: baseline/core knowledge in any discipline; core components of mission in all the curricula (e.g. liberal arts, environmental and social responsibility); core competences taught and demonstrated (e.g. writing, math, self-direction, creative thinking, etc); similar student learning outcomes across the undergrad programs (being developed as “aspirational statements” by the Assessment group).

It was noted that the specifics of curricula integration (as well as any delivery integration that might emerge as a result) would come from more and frequent faculty collaboration; that many specifics will need to be pursued by future small groups of faculty and will vary with curricular area. E.g., the current Education Steering Committee is an excellent example of how ADP and RDP faculty have collaborated around one shared curriculum and two delivery models. We propose that similar initiatives be integrated across the College.

It is clear that ADP and RDP faculty share the mission and commitment to student academic (and other) success. Next step is to norm what knowledge and skills we want/expect students to demonstrate. Such collaboration will also serve as professional development for faculty. As part of this, we will want to identify what we do best in one model vs. another model. We agree that there must be more resources put towards academics, especially instructional personnel. One observation was that to do that, we need to further streamline our electronic processes. If/when we have a portal, a good website, educational technologists, etc. we hopefully will require fewer administrative functions (many will be automated), and can redirect people resources towards academics.

Does “100% online” fit Prescott College? We began this controversial discussion at our last meeting and this idea must be further considered, preferably by a larger group of the college constituents. ADP faculty with experience teaching on Moodle noted that it takes getting used to and you get better as you do it more. The current Moodle courses still imbed PC core values (critical thinking, community engagement, etc.). While some members are not comfortable with
an online model because it deviates from the hands on “alternative teaching” process that draws many students to PC, we also recognize the need to grow enrollments by reaching a broader audience of students. Many committee members feel that if we are confident enough of our mission and values, we should be able to learn/use any method available to reach and teach the students of the future. Examples of excellent colleges that offer online curriculum were given. This discussion continues.

**Bioregional Hubs:** Several members of our committee and many others from the college at large (i.e. Rick Medrick, Beth Scott, Paul Burkhardt) have already made considerable progress in the area of designing bioregional hubs that will allow distance models to become more effective in serving students and expanding curriculum. Many of the existing ideas pivot around larger urban centers such as Phoenix and Portland that would present us with greater opportunities to grow enrollments and attract high-quality mentors/graduate assistants/adjuncts. Our committee has not yet had lengthy conversation of the curricular implications of these ideas, but we have developed one model for a hub in a small town that would contribute something different (i.e. low population would not have the numbers that an urban center would provide). This model brainstorms a “small town” hub in southwestern Colorado that would provide closer access to many of the curricular “natural facilities” that we already use- namely the mountains, geography, rivers, and research areas. Such as hub might be much smaller than an urban hub, but could draw on the local population of the region (especially for adventure education, environmental studies and education curricular areas) and support the existing undergraduate and graduate curriculum in myriad ways. A third bioregional hub idea focuses around International opportunities, many of which already are active in the RDP curriculum. We will discuss how our presence and curriculum in Kenya, Nepal and other areas might be expanded. For example, if grant support were available, could we reach out to indigenous populations in these areas, perhaps recruiting them as international students to our programs to give them tools to work in their own communities? Again, this is an area that the committee as a whole has not yet discussed, but subcommittees are active and excited about the prospects.

In summary, given the breadth of the original charge from Presidents Circle, we must define what parts of that charge are realistically obtainable. We have determined that specific recommendations will be made in the following during the remainder of spring 2011:

- A “one- undergraduate curriculum
- A bioregional hub concept
- A unified graduate model

Respectfully submitted:
Lisa Floyd-Hanna and Ted Bouras, Co-chairs
Mary Trevor Keeper of the notes and process

**Active Members:** Charissa Menefee, Danny Brown, Ellen Greenblum, Jack Herring, Mary Poole, Mary Trevor, Noel Caniglia, Pramod Parajuli, Terril Shorb, Vicky Young

**Other members:** Aaron Flesch, Anita Fernandez, David Lovejoy, Dan Campbell, Eric Donley, Justin Zych, Lenka Studnicka and Jens Deichmann.
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Appendix 1
Integration of Prescott College Undergraduate Programs: Model One

Curricular Elements

Nomenclature: Prescott College serves its undergraduate students with two delivery models. The campus-based delivery model is designed for students seeking a learning experience built primarily around instructor facilitated courses, both in the classroom and in field experiences. The limited residency delivery model is designed for students seeking to complete a bachelor’s degree with community-based mentored independent study supplemented by online coursework.

Admissions: Because the different delivery models are designed to serve different students and have different expenses, there are separate admissions processes and tuition rates for both; students are admitted to enroll in coursework specific to that delivery model. Qualifying students can request, however, to transfer between delivery models for a one term exchange. Criteria for such exchanges are determined by faculty. A cross-college faculty committee reviews exchange applications. Students wishing to move permanently from one delivery model to the other must go through the appropriate admissions process.

Faculty Work: Undergraduate faculty have a primary association with one or the other delivery model, but are able to teach and serve students in the other delivery model. Due to the distinctiveness of the needs of students in the different delivery models, however, not all faculty will want to or be well suited to mixing their workload. While faculty need to meet within the delivery models to handle curriculum planning and administrative issues, there also need to be cross-college curricular groups meeting for the purposes of consistency of outcomes and planning program improvement.

Consistency of Outcomes Across the Delivery Models: One set of learning targets is used to assess the effectiveness of undergraduate instruction, across the institution. Although the two delivery models are distinctive, consistency of expectations is achieved by cross-college faculty review of degree plans. Students in both delivery models document their learning through a summative e-portfolio. An illustrative set of rubrics for the learning targets is evaluated by cross-college faculty teams conducting “eval-o-ramas” of learning artifacts collected in the portfolio.

Alignment of Mentored/Independent Study: Although students in the campus-based delivery model are primarily working in course settings, they also engage in independent study and (more rarely) hybrid courses. For both delivery models, cross-college faculty review of independent study guidelines helps ensure quality, as does IRB review of independent studies engaging in human, animal or environmental research or intercultural study. Periodic randomized review of course contracts by a cross-college committee helps ensure consistency in undergraduate independent study, as does consistent mentor training.

Joint Seminars: One possibility for cross college learning could be joint seminars. Joint seminars will be co-designed by cross college teams addressing topics within an interdisciplinary
frame so that they are relevant to multiple student competences. The seminars will include resident students and those living at a distance through internet based webinar platforms.

Students will be required to be prepared for the live seminar times by completing research activities and readings, as well as uploading artifacts to e-portfolios throughout the semester.

Faculty will participate in professional development seminars to learn how to facilitate these sessions. Topics include how to seminar (technology and facilitation), how to develop interdisciplinary curriculum through the lens of specific themes, how to connect content to home community and how to cultivate a learning community based on differing developmental stages and cultures.

This program would serve the entire college, both students and faculty. This program would not only help students learn how to learn but help them learn together simulating real world working relationships. It could also be a potential opportunity to attract funding sources because of the novelty of this program.

Organic Food for thought:
Seminars could range from 1-4 credit hours to accommodate smaller focuses.
Seminars could happen 1 time per semester or more.
More seminars could be offered in the summer.

**Calendar Alignment**
All undergraduate degree programs will have the same length semesters with course structure and course duration options designed to meet the needs of their distinctive student populations.