

Present: 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), Stacy Jazan (Senate), Yvette Ybarra (Resource)

Guest:

Quorum: 8/10

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Daphne Dionisio at 1:34 p.m.

Announcements

Approval of Minutes The Minutes from the March 20, 2018 Program Review meeting were reviewed.  
 ➤ **MSC (Gamberg/Parsamyan) that the Minutes from March 20, 2018 be approved**

Old Business:

I. 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]

Daphne will try to provide the committee with the cross-sectional reports at the next meeting. The committee confirmed that it prefers that feedback comments from the department's higher-level administrator (e.g. dean) be viewable in the final archived version of the program review.

II. 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]

Daphne will reach out to hiring allocation committees (for personnel requests) and prioritization committees (for non-personnel resource requests) to create guidance for program review completers on best practices and examples of model resource request justifications.

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]

Discussion continued regarding what equity-minded questions could be added to Program Review. John and Stacy suggested that we collect data to understand factors that contribute strongest to student success vs. those that serves as barriers. Is there a "pathway" that successful students tend to take? Ed and Daphne noted that this kind of inquiry is currently being done in the Guided Pathways Student Voices workgroup as well as in the Spring Student Survey. Anna Parsamyan cautioned that broad conclusions drawn from surveying groups of students might be confounded and not accurately representing all students; it is important to control for types of students who provided survey responses. Daphne shared suggestions from IPCC (e.g. # of hours students work each week) however she pointed out that Program Review questions are answered by faculty in departments, not students. Ed mentioned that data on # of hours students work is collected anonymously in the Spring Student Survey. Daphne had reached out to Yeranui (Program Manager of Student Equity) for suggestions and she requested that we specifically ask what action steps the dept has taken to address DI groups.

Beth: "For equity purposes, did you notice if there are achievement gaps for disproportionately impacted students?"

Julie: "In what aspects of your program are students doing best or poorly? And for each, why?"  
 For non-instructional departments, Yeranui submitted: "What services do you offer to help address the equity gap and can support DI students at GCC? Have these services been effective? Is there room for improvement? If so, in what ways?"

In what ways do you (or would like to) collaborate with Student Equity to provide the most effective services to our students?"

John: "Have you used student services?"

Austin asked if we currently ask students their level of satisfaction with various college services. Ed said we do that every three years. Daphne asked Ed if can add a demographic question that asks students to indicate which DI groups they belong to. Ed said that is something that can be added to next year's survey.

Julie: "What modifications have you made (or will make) in the services you offer that address equity gaps?"

Daphne: Should we ask non-instructional areas what metrics, beyond service contact counts, might best evaluate their dept's performance?

Anna: Service Contact data might not be sufficient to measure effectiveness of the service.

Linda: SARS data collecting student ID for specific services can be analyzed with educational outcomes.

Time to Degree and # of Excess Credits.

For next PR data dashboard, if there are sufficient numbers of students, it might be good to disaggregate those and degree/cert completion by ethnicity and DI groups like low income.

### III. Timeline

- New Business:
- I. Validation Team compensation for 2018-2019 cycle  
For the last Program Review cycle, HR agreed that classified members will receive time and a half with a 10 hour max and faculty will receive the non-instructional hourly rate of \$59.30. For the validation work done during the first week of December, classified members received their compensation on January 1. This was a fast turnaround since that kind of pay did not require board reporting. However, the faculty received their pay on March due to the delay associated with board reporting. Last year, our student reps did not want to participate in validation work. Ed and Daphne will continue to determine how students reps might be compensated if interested in doing validation.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: May 15, 2018

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui & D. Dionisio