

ADOPTED

MINUTES

May 15, 2018 1:30PM AD121
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Present: Austin Kemie (CSEA), Patrik Namagardi (CSEA proxy for Meg Chil-Gevorkyan), Julie Gamberg (Guild), John Leland (Joint Faculty), Rosemarie Shamieh (Joint Faculty), Ed Karpp (Administration), Daphne Dionisio (Manager/Confidential), Anna Manukian (ASGCC), Anna Parsamyan (ASGCC), Beth Kronbeck (Resource), Francien Rohrbacher (Resource), Linda Welz (Resource)

Absent: Meg Chil-Gevorkyan (CSEA), Stacy Jazan (Senate), Yvette Ybarra (Resource)

Guest:

Quorum: 9/10

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

Announcements

Approval of Minutes The Minutes from the April 10, 2018 Program Review meeting were reviewed.
 ➤ ***MSC (Parsamyan/Gamberg) that the Minutes from April 10, 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]

Technology Report was compiled and sent to relevant administrator (Linda Welz) and VP (Anthony Culpepper). Facilities Report was compiled and sent to relevant administrators (Nelson Oliveira & Patrick Shahnazarian) and VP (Anthony Culpepper). Staffing Report was compiled and sent to Teyanna Williams. A Distance Ed Report and Learning Outcomes Report will also be generated and forwarded to their associated coordinators. If the Program Review Committee observes any notable trends among the reports, that information will be shared with IPCC and/or the Master Planning Committee.

Insights derived from content analysis of program reviews.

Through program review and these cross-sectional reports, insights will be derived and shared to inform campus decision making. This summer, it would be good to similarly examine the data dashboards (e.g. if course completion is inordinately high for certain departments, the processes of those departments could serve as a model for others).

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]

Guidance on completing PR.

Rosemarie reminded the committee that we will want to provide workshops on best 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. Beth suggested that members of the committee attend the June 1st Guided Pathways event to become familiar with the Chancellor's Office Launchboard data, especially for CE data.

Dean & VP review of program reviews.

Administrators Reports will be provided to relevant administrator for feedback. The reports will consist of all Full Reviews completed that year. This is necessary for several reasons: administrator will review to ensure: submitted information is accurate, that departments plans and resource requests are supportable, administrator is apprised of department information and can ask any questions. Daphne circulated a hard copy sample of how program reviews display the comments of the administrator.

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]

The committee has had discussions about augmenting the PR form to include specific questions about equity. However, in discussions with the eLumen tech, Ed and Daphne discovered that the matrix that links department goals to actions for improvement to resource requests, is tied to the PR form template and not the department. This is an unexpected setback as it means that updating the PR form template (e.g. with equity questions) will result in a new PR form that does not preserve any of the matrix contents. Consequently, the second year of use with eLumen will need to continue using the first year's form. Daphne and Ed will work to create a solution that will preserve the matrix. In the meantime, we could try to add a focus on equity within the guidance given to departments.

Guidance for PR completers by resource request prioritization committees.

It was a big step forward that now, department chairs are submitting program reviews (rather than just division chairs). However, one of the hiring allocation committee chairs would like hiring requests to only be submitted by the division chairs since personnel report to them. We will need to check with the division chairs for their input on this. Discussion ensued regarding whether personnel and non-personnel resource requests require division chair review before being submitted. Both Beth and Linda voiced the need for the division chair to review and approve or disapprove of the requests since they are the manager of the budget. This is especially important if Dr. Culpepper will be having each resource request entered in the Planning Based Cloud Service. Others in the committee warned of instances where a division chair might quash a request. John suggested a formal rotation process or tracking of requests that are having to be repeatedly submitted and this could be subject to the division's vote. Ed noted that the college has been plagued by this issue for 15 years. Perhaps each division should collectively discuss and decide what their process will be for submitting requests.

- New Business:
- I. 2018-2019 Validation Team's Department Assignments
We will continue assigning validation team members to departments that they have familiarity with.
 - II. 2018-2019 Cycle's Timeline
Non-instructional department can begin their program reviews in Summer 2018. Our CSEA validation team reps can validate those in the summer and if they want, can help validate instructional program reviews in the Fall. The committee agreed that we will try for a November 1st deadline. Linda pointed out that the college budget is ready in March so it would be ideal to have prioritization rankings done before then. The committee agreed that the IHAC and CHAC process suffers from a long delay between request submission and hiring. Steps will need to be taken to raise discussion about this. Ed said that December or January is when faculty job announcements need to go out.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: 9/18

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui, Administrative Assistant III Confidential
D. Dionisio, Interim Program Manager I of Accreditation & Institutional Effectiveness