Present: Daphne Dionisio (Chair), Tatiana Avedisian (ASGCC), Meg Chil-Gevorkyan (CSEA), Barbara Flynn (Proxy for Rosemarie Shamieh) (Joint Faculty), Julie Gamberg (Guild), Ed Karpp (Administration), Beth Kronbeck (Resource), John Leland (Joint Faculty), Rolan Issac (ASGCC), Piper Rooney (Senate), Ricreasha Thomas (CSEA)

Absent: Sarah McLemore (Resource), Yvette Ybarra (Resource)

Guest:

Quorum: 10/10

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

I.   Announcements
a.   Introductions of members

II.   Approval of Minutes
a.   The Minutes from the March 21, 2017 Program Review meeting were reviewed.
➢ *It was MSC (Rooney/Gamberg) that the Minutes from March 21, 2017 be approved.*

Old Business:

New Business:

III.   Review of Mission Statement
a.   The committee reviewed the Program Review Committee's Mission Statement.
It was recommended that the Program Review Committee Mission Statement be changed to read:

Program review will develop effective 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 advocate for their needs in achieving educational excellence.

The product of validated self-assessment will provide fundamental information for college wide decision-making and resource allocation. Through a regular 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, Institutional Master Plan, and the Standards for Accreditation will direct all assessment toward student learning.

➢ *It was MSC (Gamberg/Avedisian) that the revised Mission Statement for the Program Review Committee be adopted.*
[ACCJC Standard I.B.5 program review]

IV.   Improvement to Process: Senate & IPCC approval of annual review of data & optional updates
a.   The Senate and IPCC approved a recommendation to make annual updates to Program Review optional, and instead require a thorough full review every three years plus a department review and discussion of performance data annually. This emphasis on all departments reviewing and discussing their data annually is another example of how the college is working to develop a data-driven culture of inquiry. [ACCJC Standard I.B.2 uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, I.B.1 sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about outcomes/equity, I.B.3 assesses how well it is achieving institution-set standards]

V.   2016-2017 Cycle Update: Resource Requests
a.   The resource requests were forwarded to the hiring allocation and standing committees to then be forwarded to the Budget Committee. As of today, the Budget committee has not yet given out updates on what will be funded. It is hoped that departments will be updated before the deadline for the next cycle.

b. The Office of Research & Planning has created a document (i.e. Guide to Requesting Resources) in collaboration with the VP of Instruction, Executive VP of Administrative Services, and Chief Info Systems Officer, which provides the college guidelines on requesting resources. It clarifies what must be requested through program review versus what can be requested directly and immediately from a different office using an easier process. This guidelines document will increase efficiency and effectiveness in getting departments resources that they need. The document has been posted at the program review website, embedded in the program review online form, presented to the division chairs, and emailed to everyone identified as responsible for completing a program review.

VI. 2017-2018 Cycle Launch & New interface in eLumen
The committee reviewed the eLumen interface. We have created a new, comprehensive dashboard of enrollment and course completion data for every department as well as degree/cert data for programs. The dashboard also includes a section that disaggregates data by gender, ethnicity, mode of delivery, time of day, and term. This will stimulate the review and discussion of data for subgroups of students.
[ACCJC Standard I.B.1 dialog about outcomes and equity, I.B5, quantitative data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery, I.B.6 disaggregation of data, I.B.4 use of data]
  a. There was a question as to whether program review is electronically linked to the SLOs.
      i. Yes, however the Learning Outcomes module isn't ready yet. The two will be linked once that is ready and instructors are able to enter their LO data.
  b. Department goals should not be vague. Guidance will need to be provided to ensure that goals are specific and actionable.
      [ACCJC Standard I.A.2 uses data to determine effectiveness]

VII. Improvement to Process: deans and vice presidents will review and give feedback to departments
  a. The Program Review Committee previously discussed that it would be good for deans and vice Presidents overseeing an area to participate and give feedback to departments on their program review. At a meeting with the vice presidents, they agreed to do this.
    Once the Program Review Committee is done validating, the deans and vice presidents will then have the opportunity to review and give feedback.
  b. Will deans and vice presidents have a validation role?
      i. No. The shared governance composition of the Program Review Validation Team constitutes the appropriate entity for validation.
        [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.]

VIII. Timeline
  a. The committee discussed reasonable deadlines for the Program Review Timeline for this year. Consideration needs to be given that with a new system there is going to be a learning curve. There will be approximately 40 full reviews and maybe 200 non-personnel Resource Requests to review. The committee determined that December 1, 2017 would be the submission deadline. Departments will be notified within the next few days.
  b. Next year, program review will launch in summer with a likely deadline in November. This would give departments an earlier start, much longer time to complete, and would allow the committee to validate and provide feedback before people leave for winter break.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 2:45 p.m.
Next Meeting: November 21, 2017
Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui & D. Dionisio