

MINUTES

November 16, 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), Beth Kronbeck (Guild), Ed Karpp (Administration)

Absent: Rosemarie Shamieh (Joint Faculty), Calvin Madlock (Resource), Francien Rohrbacher (Resource), Yvette Ybarra (Resource)

Quorum: 9/10

Call to Order: Meeting called to order at: 1:32 p.m.

Review of Minutes: The Program Review Minutes from October 19, 2021 were reviewed.

It was MSC (Dionisio/Karpp) that the Minutes from October 19, 2021 were approved without corrections.

New Business:

- I. Enrollment Management Dashboard & Template
 - a. A task force of the Enrollment Management Committee created a planning template that asks programs what they can do to help with enrollment at the College and it would be presented along with a dashboard of enrollment-specific metrics. The task force is wondering if this planning tool can be incorporated into program review. The Program Review Committee members had concerns regarding: a) the applicability of the student groupings and metrics for instructional departments, b) the applicability of certain metrics to student services departments, c) the logistics for how particular metrics would be displayed to users, d) the focus on enrollment over program completion. It was suggested that the planning tool would be more meaningful if division chairs and some student services departments spearhead the effort to use it. It was suggested that perhaps a critical metric or two could replace existing metrics in the program review data dashboard. Also, it was suggested that in the next version of the program review form, a dashboard like the one proposed by the task force could be presented to student services departments with related questions in a customized student services program review form. [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.C.1, & II.C.2]
- II. Program Review 2021 Timeline & Remaining Steps
 - a. The committee examined the schedule of remaining stages in the program review process. During this discussion, it was concluded that the Nov 25 week currently slated for PR validators to assist departments in incorporating supervisor input would no longer be needed. There is sufficient specificity in notifications to supervisors and departments that they need to communicate directly with each other to get supervisor input incorporated.
[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. Q&A on Providing Departments with Support
Committee members did not have questions that needed to be addressed here.
- IV. Observations, Insights, & Suggestions for Improving Program Review Process
Two departments had provided minutes as their data dialog documentation but the minutes didn't actually state that data was reviewed and discussed. Daphne will follow up with the

departments. It was observed that quite a few instructional departments waited until the day before the deadline to complete their program review. However, the committee noted that it was an unprecedented achievement that 100% of instructional departments completed their program reviews. It was suggested that the program review form questions for administrative services and student services department be customized to more relevant to the work that they do. Perhaps we will solicit input at a student services cabinet and Administrative Affairs Committee meeting. It was noted that we should aim to have Annual Service Data submitted by non-instructional departments in the summer. This might reduce the workload on the validators during the active program review months of September through December. We will begin the process of a website redesign to : a) be styled more in keeping with the design format currently used by the rest of the College, b) be more “user design” conscious where we design the webpage functionality thinking about what users are looking for and making it easier for them, c) increase accessibility. Our PDFs and videos will require a lot of work to be made accessible so this redesign will be a long process but we need to eventually get there. After working with instructional departments on the data questions, there was a concern that quite a few faculty do not feel the need to address equity gaps. In this same vein, it was noted that our committee’s inclusion of concrete examples of actions to put in the strategic planning linkage matrix was a great help to departments at a loss for actions they could take to improve. It was also observed that departments were creating their own folders in the eLumen document library. This interfered with our ability to quickly scan the inventory to determine who provided documentation and who did not. Lastly, it was noted that there are specific programs that simply do not have sufficient disaggregated student groups to constitute data comparisons. In such instances comparisons aren’t possible.

V. Questions About Validation Process

The validation checklist was reviewed. It was concluded that we will add to the checklist, Data Dialog Documentation.

VI. Other

Meeting Adjourned at 2:24 p.m.

Next Meeting: TBA

Minutes Recorded by: Daphne Dionisio