

MINUTES

October 19, 2021 1:30pm ZOOM# 8182401000

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Present: Stacy Jazan (Co-Chair & Senate), Daphne Dionisio (Co-Chair & Administrator), Lilya Ohanyan (ASGCC), Helen Tahmazyan (ASGCC), Leticia Estrada (CSEA), Nonah Maffit (CSEA), Tomas Aguirre (Joint Faculty), Rosemarie Shamieh (Joint Faculty), Beth Kronbeck (Guild), Ed Karpp (Administration), Francien Rohrbacher (Resource).

Absent: Calvin Madlock (Resource), Yvette Ybarra (Resource)

Quorum: 10/10

Call to Order: Meeting called to order at: 1:30 p.m.

Review of Minutes: The Program Review Minutes from September 21, 2021 were reviewed.

It was MSC (Jazan/Maffit) that the Minutes from September 21, 2021 were approved without corrections.

New Business:

- I. Review ACCJC Accreditation Standards Relevant to Program Review
 - a. Every college and university has a regional accreditation agency that examines the work they do and evaluates it against a set of standards each college has to meet. To ensure the committee is aware of college structures, processes, and outcomes expected and required by GCC's accreditation agency, all ACCJC standards that might be relevant to the College's program review process were examined and discussed. This kind of review and discussion has been requested for all governance committees. [ACCJC Standard I.A.2, I.A.3, I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, I.B.9, II.A.2, II.B.3, II.C1, & II.C.2]
- II. PLO Statement for 2021 Program Review
 - a. The Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee has provided departments with a standardized statement that they are requesting be placed in the response box for departments' response to the PLO question this Fall semester. The statement reads: *"PLOs will be assessed in the winter of 2022 for the entire college. Full time and part time faculty who are involved in the assessment process will participate in a PLO Assessment Day wherein divisions and departments will be able to view, disaggregated information from student scores and reflection answers obtained from SLO/course level assessments. The SLO/course level data will be reviewed and reflection questions answered to properly assess PLOs and encourage both disciplinary and institutional dialogue. This coincides with curricular revisions to programs and PLOs, allowing for updates in eLumen."* [ACCJC Standard I.A.2, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, II.A.2, II.B.3, II.C.1, & II.C.2]
- III. Report Out and Q&A on 2021 Program Review & Scan for Loop-Closing Evidence
 - a. It was observed that one-on-one appointments with departments were taking 2.5 hours.
 - b. It was discussed that while we are aiming to acquire documentation of data dialog by November 1, we would be happy to receive that documentation during the winter break if necessary.
 - c. Although the Budget Committee had agreed to help departments be made aware of which resource requests were funded the previous year in time to know what to resubmit the subsequent year, we are uncertain whether the results of personnel decisions were posted at the Human Resources website and whether the results of nonpersonnel decisions were posted at the Budget Committee website as had been agreed to. At

IPCC, this may be agendaized for discussion so that a process can be identified which will ensure greater transparency so departments can be informed and therefore sufficiently able to plan.

- d. For evidence of loop-closing, it was suggested that the DE program review might provide a good examples. A few years ago, course completion for DE courses was in the mid-60s which was 10% lower than face-to-face. The faculty coordinator of DE had included in the department's program review strategic plan, a number of needed actions and resources (e.g. hiring of personnel, acquisition of resources for technology, space, and professional development, etc.) After the instructional designer and faculty coordinator of DE professional development were hired, a greater degree of support, assistance, guidance, and required training were available to faculty. Today, the course completion rate for DE courses is in the mid-70's. Similarly, it was suggested that the Student Equity could provide evidence examples for standard I.B.6. since their work is specific to identifying equity gaps, implementing projects to address close those gaps, and tracking improvement in a variety of performance indicators.

[ACCJC Standard I.A.2, I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.9]

Other The Enrollment Management Committee requests that we agendaize a discussion to review a new template created by one of their task forces, and possibly integrate it into the program review process.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: November 16, 2021

Minutes Recorded by: Gordon Lui & Daphne Dionisio