

Present: Daphne Dionisio (Chair), Justin Smith (Proxy for Julie Gamberg) (Guild), Ed Karpp (Administration), Beth Kronbeck (Resource), John Leland (Joint Faculty), Rosemarie Shamieh (Joint Faculty), Frankie Strong (CSEA)

Absent: Meg Chil-Gevorkyan (CSEA)

Guest: Connie Lantz

Quorum: 6/7

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Daphne Dionisio at approximately 1:30 p.m.

Announcements

Approval of Minutes

1. October 18, 2016 Program Review Committee (PRC) Minutes
It was MSC (Shamieh/Smith) that the Minutes from October 18, 2016 be approved without changes.

Old Business

2. Non-voting Resource Member to PRC (Chief Info Systems Officer, Marc Drescher)
[BP & AR 3250, ACCJC Standard I.B.7, I.B.9, IIIC]
a. To increase communication and planned integration regarding units' technology-relevant requests and their impacts to ITS. The CISO can also provide input regarding how to improve the PR process.
It was MSC (Leland/Shamieh) to add the Chief Information System Officer as Non-Voting Resource to the Program Review Committee
3. Update on 2016-2017 Cycle
a. To increase Technology & Aviation Division submissions, met w/ assistant chair. Their dean sent coordinators an email strongly encouraging completion of the program reviews [ACCJC Standard I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.9]
b. PR deadline to complete
i. November 10 for all units; November 15 for Student Services units
4. Improvements to Program Review (form, process, and database)
[From ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Appendix B, Part I: Program Review
The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.
There is investigative dialogue about what data or process should be used for program review.
There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals
a. Next curriculum database may track & export reports for technology planning, learning outcomes, accreditation, institutional planning, and program review
[BP & AR 3250, Standard I.B.4]
i. discussion occurred regarding confusion over whether technology-relevant resource requests should be submitted by ITS or departments. This issue will be worked on in 2017 with input from the Chief Info Systems Officer. Similarly, confusion regarding who submits facilities-relevant requests.
- b. Misc:
 - i. The current PR database doesn't auto-save and end users would lose their information if they didn't click save before having a technical problem. If we switch to a new database, it would be helpful to end users if the system auto-saves data.
 - ii. Give guidance on how to write mission statements [ACCJC Standard I.A.3]

- c. Suggestion: instructional units' summer retreats should include dialog & evidence of previous year's data (trend analysis, performance outcomes, learning outcomes etc.) and plans. Maybe this would require that PR form is ready in summer
[ACCJC Standard I.A.2, I.B.1, ACCJC 2016 Recommendation for Improvement]
 - i. It was suggested that learning outcomes dialog or updates be agendaized as a line item at department or division meetings, in the same way Senate Report or Guild Report are.
- d. PR database needs to be updated with curriculum & LO changes prior to PR season
- e. Potential database for institutional processes
[BP & AR 3225, BP & AR 3250, BP & AR 3200, ACCJC Standard I.A.3, I.B.4; I.A.2]
 - i. we would like a new PR database that can display current courses (not show courses that shouldn't be there, or only show courses that should be there)
 - ii. would collect accreditation evidence
 - iii. would allow units to show their linkage to Institutional Master Plan, BPs/ARs, Instructional Goals, and accreditation standards
[ACCJC Standard I.C.1, I.B.4, I.C.3]
- f. Add section for ACCJC Substantive Change to next PR database form
[BP & AR 3200]
- g. Committee survey (see draft proposal) [ACCJC Standard I.B.1]
 - i. previously, the PRC had problems w/attendance but this has been resolved by establishing a set day and time to meet each month like other governance committees
 - ii. better communicate to depts & divisions their program review's purpose, importance, how it benefits them, PR linkage to acquiring resources [ACCJC Standard I.B.5, I.B.8]
 - iii. increase student participation on committee [ACCJC Standard IV.A.2]
 - iv. had to select "never" for frequency of discussing student equity. When PR database is restructured, trend data regarding DI groups can be included [ACCJC Standard I.B.6]

It was MSC (Strong/Karpp) to approve the committee survey.
- h. Rubric form vs. online fields (getting validation feedback to units)
 - i. instead of rubric form, we'll use validation team comment boxes in PR form
- 5. Schedule Group Validation Sessions (1st Round in Nov, 2nd Round in Jan)
 - i. teams will be assigned submissions to review and validate asynchronously
- 6. Validation Training & Norming
 - i. committee members performed hands-on validation training on laptops during the meeting
 - ii. Daphne will send each validation team member an email with a link to the PR database, their batch of units to review for validation, and a link to an instructional video showing them the steps to follow when validating in the database

New Business

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 2:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: Feb 21, 2017

Minutes Recorded by G. Gui and D. Dionisio

Program Review Committee Mission Statement

Program Review will develop articulate processes, tools, validation, and guidance for all programmatic self-assessment at Glendale Community College. The self-assessment process will become the foundation upon which programs develop a platform to advocate for their needs in achieving educational excellence.

The product of self-assessment will provide fundamental information for college wide decision-making and resource allocation. Through a constant scanning of the internal and external environment, the program review process will continually improve and adjust to the changing needs of all college programs.

Aligning the Program Review process with the college's Mission Statement, Educational Master Plan, and the Standards for Accreditation will direct all assessment toward student learning.

ACCJC Standard I.B.5 assess accomplishment of mission through program review

ACCJC Standard I.B.9 integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation to accomplish mission

Program Review Committee

Time & Location: 3rd Tuesday, 1:30 – 2:30PM, AD121

Senate:	Daphne Dionisio, Chair (18-19)
Guild:	Julie Gamberg (18-19) (proxy: Justin Smith)
Joint Faculty: [2]	John Leland (19-20), Rosemarie Shamieh (18-19)
CSEA: [2]	Meg Chil-Gevorkyan (16-17), Frankie Strong (16-17)
Administration:	Ed Karpp, Dean of Research, Planning, and Grants
Manager/Confidential:	VACANT
ASGCC: [2]	VACANT
Resource: (Non-voting)	Beth Kronbeck, Faculty Accreditation Coordinator ± Sarah McLemore, C&I Faculty Coordinator ± Yvette Ybarra, Learning Outcomes Faculty Coordinator ±
Minutes Recorder:	Gordon Lui, Office of Research, Planning and Grants