

MINUTES

March 20, 2018 1:30PM AD121

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Present: Piper Rooney (Senate proxy for Stacy Jazan), Julie Gamberg (Guild), John Leland (Joint Faculty), Rosemarie Shamieh (Joint Faculty), Austin Kemie (CSEA), Ed Karpp (Administration), Daphne Dionisio (Manager/Confidential), Anna Manukian (ASGCC), Anna Parsamyan (ASGCC), Beth Kronbeck (Resource), Francien Rohrbacher (Resource)

Absent: Meg Chil-Gevorkyan (CSEA), 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.

Announcements Introductions

Approval of Minutes The Minutes from the November 21, 2017 Program Review meeting were reviewed.
 ➤ **MSC (Leland/Gamberg) that the Minutes from November 21, 2017 be approved**

New Business:

- I. Meeting dates for April and May
The committee will meet on April 10 and May 15.
- II. Validation Team compensation for 2017-2018 cycle
Classified members were paid January 2018 and faculty members were paid in March 2018.

III. 2017-2018 cycle summary

Program Reviews completed and validated:

100% of the Administrative Services departments (7 were due for Full Review),

100% of Instructional departments (24 were due for Full Review)

83% of Student Services departments (6 were due for Full Review) EOPS didn't have time

Rosemarie noted how beneficial it was that the entire validation team was learning the process collaboratively (e.g. giving each other tips) while simultaneously providing support to departments. Beth commented that the validation process went much faster because each validation team member was assigned to validate the very departments she/he had given guidance to. Julie said that we operated with "high standards while providing a high level of support" and while this was harder and more time consuming, she was very proud of how awesome the process and results were. Piper noted that she had no way to know when a department was done entering their information and ready to have their form reviewed. Daphne shared that eLumen doesn't have any "submit" button or mechanism for submitters to indicate that the form is ready. Instead, validators must wait until the submission deadline before attempting to officially review forms. John had a unique technical problem where he was no longer able to access Geology's form although Daphne and others could access it. Both Rosemarie and John had expressed that our team created an environment that assured form completers that we were working along with them and there to help them rather than being punitive. She believes this was much appreciated. Julie reflected on how individuals in some departments might not have considered the value of comparing academic performance data for demographic groups but that we provide that expertise in a way that is not explicit.

IV. Technology Report, Facilities Report, and Administrators Report

[BP&AR 3250 Institutional Planning, BP 3225 Institutional Effectiveness, ACCJC Standard I.A.2 uses data to determine effectiveness, I.B.1 sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about institutional effectiveness and improvement, I.B.2 uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, I.B.9 addresses needs for physical and technology resources, III.B physical resources, III.C technology resources]

From all submitted program review forms, Daphne will compile a Technology Report consisting of all the responses to the technology questions. This report will be shared with ITS and the Executive Vice President of Administrative Services. Likewise, a Facilities Report will be created

and shared with relevant entities. Recently Dr. Viar suggested that justifications for resource requests should go to the relevant supervising dean for feedback and crosschecking for accuracy before the dean then forwards the program review up to the Vice President. Rosemarie expressed a concern that some requests might be discouraged by the administrator. John asked if members could have a non-voting presence at hiring allocation committee meetings to increase understanding of and transparency in those committees' processes. Ed said it might be alright for a program review committee member to serve as a resource to represent the program review process but that it would be inappropriate to advocate for one's own departmental requests. Austin requested clarity regarding the review workflow for non-instructional departments that do not have a dean. Also, as a CHAC member, he had been concerned about the completeness and accuracy of responses in request forms. As a solution, he suggested that we provide "best teach the rest" training for resource request submitters where we provide them with examples of model resource requests as well as guidance for best practices derived directly from the hiring allocation committees. Piper mentioned that IHAC would like all questions answered rather than receiving responses like "See last year's form". Beth said that, in GCC's accreditation report, HR had committed to using data to determine appropriate staffing levels as well as ensuring that hiring allocation committee documents are regularly reviewed and revised as needed. Three members suggested that a dean's feedback comments should be visible within the program review and forwarded onward. Julie suggested that if data is used to justify a request, the actual reference should be cited.

V. Research & Planning's "3D: Data, Dialog, & Documentation" campaign

[I.B.1 sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about outcomes, equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement, I.B.2 uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission]

At the April Faculty meeting, Beth will present info on what program review is, the new senate policy on annual data review, dialog, and documentation, Daphne and Ed will demonstrate the Program Review Data Tools webpage which will contain the program review data dashboard, and Freddie will describe the webpage's links to data resources for CE faculty. Dialog among faculty will need to be documented and placed in eLumen's document library as accreditation evidence. This 3D campaign will need to reach the gamut of campus meetings and recorded so that adjunct faculty and others can access if unable to be present for the in-person presentation. Daphne will need to create the list that indicates which departments each validation team member is assigned to.

VI. Improvement to Process for 2018-2019 cycle

[I.B.1 sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about institutional effectiveness and improvement, I.B.7 regularly evaluates practices]

Agenda item #5 led to a robust discussion about improving processes but at next meeting, we will continue to discuss ways to improve for the next cycle. Timeline will also be discussed.

VII. Focus on Equity & Guided Pathways

[I.B.1 sustained, substantive, and collegial dialog about outcomes, equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement, I.B.4 Uses data and organizes its processes, I.B.5, quantitative data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery, I.B.6 disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students]

Daphne provided members with a copy of our current program review questions and invited them to bring to the next meeting, any suggestions for improving them. In particular, she would like to add a question about equity to the form for student services and administrative services. The instructional version already asks many equity questions about disaggregated data.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: April 10, 2018

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui & D. Dionisio