

Present: Daphne Dionisio (Chair), Tatiana Avedisian (ASGCC), Meg Chil-Gevorkyan (CSEA), Julie Gamberg (Guild), Rolan Issac (ASGCC), Ed Karpp (Administration), Beth Kronbeck (Resource), John Leland (Joint Faculty), Rosemarie Shamieh (Joint Faculty), Ricroasha Thomas (CSEA)

Absent: Sarah McLemore (Resource), Piper Rooney (Senate), Linda Welz (Resource), Yvette Ybarra (Resource)

Guest:

Quorum: 9/10

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

I. Announcements

- a. Trends identified across all program learning outcomes assessment findings reported in the 2016-2017 program reviews were presented to the Master Planning Committee on September 29, 2017 and considered as the committee discussed the SWOT analysis and draft of the subgoals for the Institutional Master Plan 2018-2025.
 - i. Across Student Services and Administrative Services departments of Curriculum Office, CalWORKS, Communications & Community Relations, EOPS, and Admissions & Records, an identified trend was the more leveraging of online technology and its positive impact on students' educational experience. For example, in EOPS, typical functions are all online now (e.g. can access and monitor their EOPS counseling contact info) and this has resulted in students spending less time waiting in line and instead experiencing more comprehensive and streamlined support services. Prior to meeting with counselors, students complete an electronic quiz that covers EOPS info and the Mutual Responsibility Contract; this has resulted in more of students' appointment time being spent doing educational planning with counselors. Also, for Admissions & Records, students receive email notifications and To Do List through MYGCC student portal, get notifications regarding being on probation, possible dismissal, or if on verge of loss of enrollment priority. Consequently, student have increased their number of appointments with academic counselors to complete their Student Education Plan.
 - ii. Across instructional departments, an identified trend was enhanced student engagement through contextualized and authentic learning assessments. For example, Biology department created an internship course with the Natural History Museum, Alcohol & Drug Studies department offers capstone courses that have final projects focused on ensuring graduates will have the skills to be able to enter the workforce with competencies to meet job requirements, Baja Field Studies students outperform their classroom counterparts by one or two letter grades, and various departments across the Social Sciences Division use active learning approaches (e.g. Model UN).

II. Approval of Minutes

- a. The Minutes from the September 19, 2017 Program Review meeting were reviewed.
 - ***It was MSC (Gamberg/Thomas) that the Minutes from September 19, 2017 be approved.***

Old Business:

New Business:

III. Guidance to Departments: writing department mission, goals, and action items & submitting resource requests

- a. We are trying to provide a lot more guidance for departments by creating a sheet that provides concrete examples of department goals that are too vague or too specific, giving guidance on how to write goals, some discussion on what might really be action items, and concrete examples of mission statements. The sheet is available on the Program Review website.
- b. Guidance was sent out regarding Resource Requests. Hopefully this will allow areas to get their requests faster by asking the offices responsible for those requests directly and less of those requests will go to Program Review.

- IV. Validation Team Training: New Online System
 - a. Daphne Dionisio provided training on the new online system, e-Lumen
 - b. Program review committee members are the validating team and will login with their Outlook username and password once it is ready

- V. Discussion of Validation Process and Rubric
 - a. A deadline was given of December 1 for the submission of Program Reviews.
 - b. Is it possible to begin the Validation Process on December 1 and finish before the start of Finals?
 - c. The committee reviewed the questions that are being asked in the online form
 - d. It might be a good idea to discuss data fluency prior to validation work.
 - e. How are notes to be taken?
 - i. There is a way to enter feedback however anyone who has access can edit and delete it.
 - f. A discussion was had as to whether or not there would be an opportunity for a submitter to fix any issues which make the Program Review not validatable.
 - i. It would depend on what the issue is and if it is something that could be corrected quickly.
 - g. Another meeting will be scheduled prior to the November meeting in order to discuss a rubric, what type of answers we are looking for, what would not get validated, etc. The process needs to be simple because we are in a transition year.

- VI. Support to Departments
 - a. Daphne Dionisio has been working since summer to provide support to departments through our website, e-mails, and presentations for all the Division Chairs and Managers.
 - b. Begin Personal check-ins with those due for a Full Review
 - c. Targeted and preemptive support to certain departments
 - i. Daphne Dionisio has reached out and is working with areas that have had difficulties submitting their Program Reviews in the past.
 - ii. Beth Kronbeck is sitting down with the Social Sciences Division on Friday, October 20, 2017.
 - d. There was discussion on whether or not Validators should validate for the areas they are supporting.
 - i. General consensus was that you validate who you support.
 - ii. We can do it this way this year and then have dialogue to see what worked and didn't next year.

- VII. Other
 - a. Next year, departments will be able to begin accessing and completing their Program Review forms during the summer.
 - b. An observation was made that it would be a good idea to get at CTE person onto the committee.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 2:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: TBA

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui & D. Dionisio