PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES
May 17, 2016
AD 121

Present: Jill Lewis (Chair), Daphne Dionisio (Senate), Julie Gamberg (Guild), Faye Henson (Proxy)
(CSEA), Ed Karpp (Administration), Beth Kronbeck (Resource), Rosemarie Shamieh (Joint
Faculty)

Absent: Maritza Arrendondo (ASGCC), Karo Papzyan (AASGCC), Frankie Strong (CSEA), David
Yamamoto (Joint Faculty)

Quorum: 6/10

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Jill Lewis at approximately 2:07 p.m.

  I.   Approval of Minutes

  ➢ It was MSC (Dionisio/Kronbeck) that the Minutes from March 22, 2016 be approved
     without changes.

New Business:

  II.   Evaluation of Program Review Process
     a. The committee reviewed previous evaluations.
     b. The committee reviewed and discussed the evaluation for the 2014 – 2015 year.
     c. Some of the information provided included:
         i.   The percentage of programs completing program review: 21 Programs from
              Instruction did not fill it in.
        ii.   Strengths of the Program Review Process:
              1. The process forced Divisions/Departments to take a serious look at
                 their program and have a voice in respective areas.
              2. Results are linked to Resource Allocation.
              3. The new form, when properly filled out, integrates plans and provides
                 a broader outlook to how respective areas fulfill the Mission.
       iii.   Weaknesses of the Program Review Process:
              1. Too many people take the process as a way to "get to the means,"
                 only using the document to request resources and not really
                 "reviewing" their respective areas.
              2. Program Reviews are not being, "evaluated," but rather, "validated."
              3. Some of the data that already exists (i.e., SLO, PLO) could be
                 populated into the Program Review Document electronically.
       iv.   Accomplishments of the Program Review in 2014-2015:
              1. The committee reviewed all Program Reviews that were submitted.
              2. Updated and created a more comprehensive form.
        v.   Recommendations for Program Review in the next cycle:
              1. Begin extra support for individuals who fill out Program Review
                 documents.
              2. Hold workshops, instructional videos, etc. on how to fill out a good
                 Program Review document.

3. Increase the role of the Program Review Committee and have the college supply support (similar to C&I) so that the members can provide a more comprehensive qualitative evaluation of each Program Review.

    vi. It was also noted that:
1. The 2012-2013 rates were higher and they were done on paper.
2. In 2013-2014 rates declined and it was done electronically.
    a. The online document may be one of the contributors to the reason that numbers declined in completing the process.
    b. It was suggested that certain information auto-populate on the electronic form to make it easier.

III. Support / Stipends
    i. There was a discussion regarding providing extra support to get better Program Review Documents.
    ii. A question as raised as to whether or not there could be compensation for support, either Release Time, Units, or Stipend.
    iii. The contract stipulated that Faculty engaged in Program Review can receive stipends.
    iv. There is an account available to be used to pay for Release Time or Stipends for Program Review.

➢ *It was MSC (Gamberg/Kronbeck) that the Program Review Committee will develop a workshop program to assist anyone in charge of writing a Program Review Document that believes they need help. Division Chairs will be polled to determine when a good time would be for this workshop.*

IV. Other
    a. The CHAC form is being revised by Teyanna Williams and Val Dantzler.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 1:30 p.m.
Next Meeting: TBD
Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui