ADOPTED

MINUTES

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Present:	Daphne Dionisio (Chair/Manager), Kayla Regalado (ASGCC), Leeah Voskerchian (ASGCC), Leticia Estrada (CSEA), Nonah Maffit (CSEA), Rosemarie Shamieh (Joint Faculty), John Leland (Joint Faculty), Stacy Jazan (Senate), Beth Kronbeck (Guild), Gordon Lui (Minutes Taker), Ed Karpp (Administration), Francien Rohrbacher (Resource), Yvette Ybarra (Resource)
Absent:	Calvin Madlock, (Resource)
Quorum:	10/10
Call to Order:	The meeting was called to order by Daphne Dionisio at 1:31 p.m.
Announcements:	Kayla Regalado and Leeah Voskerchian attended the meeting as the permanent ASGCC representatives for the semester.
Approval of Minutes:	The Minutes from the February 18, 2020 Program Review meeting were reviewed.

> ***It was MSC (Shamieh/Maffit) that the Minutes from February 18, 2020 be approved without corrections.***

Old Business:

Revising Language & Questions in Program Review Form
In the context of New Business item #2, the committee discussed the meaning and intent of the questions in the Technology section of the program review form. Different programs hold different ideas about what "technology" means to them. We will need to restructure the Technology section of the form to differentiate between instructional technology (e.g. hardware, software, etc.) and instructional equipment (e.g. airplanes, gas chromatographs, etc.) There were suggestions for collecting nominal responses from departments that could be sorted and compiled.   We will be exploring how this might be possible, perhaps through hyperlinked surveys specific to IT and Facilities. Regarding the Learning Outcomes section of the form, Yvette Ybarra (Faculty Coordinator of Learning Outcomes), recommended that we revise the instructional PLO question to remove its specificity to degrees and certificates. It was agreed that the Program Review form can expand the applicability of the question for instructional areas that do not offer a degree or certificate. The Office of Research & Planning will work with the Learning Outcomes Committee to see if outside consultants who are well-known for expertise in learning outcomes assessment can provide input regarding whether degree and certificate programs do not need to have their own PLOs—instead allowing departments to assess learning outcomes for the entire discipline. It will be important to document in committee minutes the ultimate position of the college on this issue. The committee will continue discussing the revision of program review form questions at the next meeting. **[ACCJC Standard [ACCJC Standards I.B.5 and I.B.7]**

New Business:

I. Program Learning Outcomes
The committee was interested in getting input from the Learning Outcomes Committee leadership regarding how PLOs should be included in the program review form and how validators should evaluate department responses to the PLO question. Yvette Ybarra (Faculty Coordinator of Learning Outcomes) explained that the spilt mapping model being used for assessments will auto-generate the PLO data in eLumen because it would be derived from the course-level LO assessments that are mapped to the PLOs. Various PRC members agreed that it would be best to keep the general PLO question in the program review form (i.e. What changes have been, or will be, made as a result of learning outcomes assessments?) so that other faculty, deans, VPs could have a high-level summary. Additionally, the LO team will prepare and provide for each department, a report that describes the curriculum mapping, dialog about overall Met/Not Met results, and departmental answers to four Reflection questions about program assessments. The report provides documented evidence of department LO assessment, dialog, and planning/actions for improvement. The report will be available to anyone who wants to examine a department's LO work in detail. The PRC agreed that when validating program reviews,

validators can review the response to the PLO question and verify that the summary report supports that response.
 [ACCJC Standards I.A.2, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6]

II.   Sectional Reports
From the Technology Report, a couple of patterns emerged across departments that showed the college's progress regarding technology. First, various departments were able to identify what their technology needs were and then proceeded to find their own funding for those (e.g. Perkins and Workforce Development grants). Second, there have been developments in student-centered services due to technology. Specifically, Admissions & Records now offers online ordering and credit card payment for transcripts; QLess is being piloted and implemented to eliminate long wait lines and instead virtually queue students waiting for support services like Financial Aid; all counselors are being trained on online counseling. The committee ran out of time and will resume discussing salient trends at the next meeting. **[ACCJC Standards I.B.1, I.B.5, I.B.8, I.B.9]**

Meeting Adjourned at 2:30pm
Next Meeting: May 19, 2020
Minutes Recorded by: D. Dionisio and G. Lui