

Present: Daphne Dionisio (Chair), Marc Drescher (Resource), Julie Gamberg (Guild), Ed Karpp (Administration), Beth Kronbeck (Resource), John Leland (Joint Faculty), Piper Rooney (Senate), Rosemarie Shamieh (Joint Faculty), Frankie Strong (CSEA)

Absent: Meg Chil-Gevorkyan (CSEA), Sarah McLemore (Resource), Yvette Ybarra (Resource)

Guest: Ricroasha Thomas

Quorum: 7/8

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Daphne Dionisio at approximately 1:35 p.m.

#### Announcements

1. There are currently no Student Representatives assigned to the Program Review committee. They will be assigned during the third week of the semester.

#### Approval of Minutes

1. The minutes from the November 15, 2016 Program Review meeting were reviewed.  
**It was MSC (Gamberg/Rooney) that the Minutes from November 18, 2016 be approved with a correction so that, "it would help" reads, "it would be helpful to".**

#### Old Business

#### New Business

1. Close-Out 2016-2017 Cycle (Data for Governance Survey & Forwarding of Resource Requests)
  - a. Received a lot of help during the break getting program review submissions all validated.
  - b. At the last meeting, we decided upon the committee's indicators for the Governance Survey.
  - c. Program Review Submissions
    - i. The 2016-2017 cycle had a completion rate of 95% (This means that 95% were submitted. It does not mean that after review they received Validated status.)
    - ii. There were 15 areas that submitted but were not validated.
      - Submissions that were not validated because they were missing information were given another opportunity to submit that information.
      - If an adequate response was later provided, those submissions were switched from "Not Validated" to "Validated".
    - iii. Additionally, there were 30 departments that the database showed as having not submitted when in fact many of them had submitted. To correct this, Daphne Dionisio had to log in as the submitter and click the Submit button.
  - d. Validated resource requests will be forwarded to the appropriate standing committee or hiring allocation committee for ranking and possible funding.
    - i. We need to clarify which items go to which standing committees for ranking.
    - ii. There should be data to back up decisions as to why something is not funded.
    - iii. At the next meeting, we will discuss how we might change the process for improvement.
2. Relevant Accreditation Recommendations
  - a. The college was just re-affirmed for accreditation with no 18-month follow-up.
  - b. There were some recommendations that were relevant for Program Review.
    - i. Our college has Institution-Set Standards that include Job Placement Rates for programs. When gaps occur between those set-standards and performance, the college must make changes to improve performance. Some programs had performance drop below the set-standards. The accreditation site team that evaluated the college in October had checked the Program Review database to see if those departments mentioned this and indicated how they were going to improve. On their next Program Review submission, we should encourage these departments to indicate plans for improvement. (Regarding a new

- database system, a suggested feature would be the inability of a user to move forward in their program review if they do not answer a required field.)
- c. Another recommendation that the college received was to improve our documenting of discussions about learning outcomes data. However, this recommendation about documentation is relevant for the college in other ways. We need to get better at documenting discussions about data. The accreditation core group of the Research & Planning Office will try to increase opportunities at division and department meetings for discussions about data and will encourage the documentation of those discussions.
  - d. The accreditation recommendations need to be addressed in the college's midterm report in about three years.
3. Use of Program Review Findings at the Institution Level
    - a. Program review allows departments to demonstrate, at the program level, decisions and changes made for improvement.
    - b. Program review findings might be informative at the institution level. Daphne Dionisio will try to address this by conducting a needs analysis from the sections on Currency, Distance Ed, Technology, and Staffing and Resource Requests. Any trends for the most commonly-cited needs across programs will be reported to deans and vice presidents for consideration in decision-making or actions.
  4. Research Continues on Potential New Database
    - a. There may be a replacement of the homegrown Filemaker Pro system.
    - b. On Feb 10, there was a demonstration event for three commercial systems.
    - c. It was asked whether or not there would be any coordination between a new system and the new C&I database. Of the potential systems, one has the ability to receive learning outcomes statements from the new C&I system.
    - d. One of the advantages of a new system is the ability to see learning outcomes information within program review.
    - e. The decision is expected to be made in April 2017 with the goal to begin implementation in summer for a potential fall rollout. It is not known who will be making the decision.
  5. Preparation for 2017-2018 Cycle
    - a. At the next meeting, we will begin to have more discussion on how to improve the form and process.
    - b. We will discuss ideas on how to get people better prepared to complete their program reviews.
    - c. We have programs that are supposed to submit but perhaps not all of them are programs (and therefore shouldn't need to submit). We need to better clarify what constitutes a program and which courses belong in what programs.
    - d. We will discuss how to give more guidance to submitters regarding how their program's mission links to the college's mission.
    - e. We will seek input from the campus on how to improve the process.
    - f. Someone mentioned accreditation Substantive Changes. In April, the ACCJC will be publishing a revised procedure for reporting Substantive Changes. This new information will be incorporated into the program review process.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 2:15 p.m.

Next Meeting: March 21, 2017

Minutes Recorded by G. Gui and D. Dionisio

### **Program Review Committee Mission Statement**

Program Review will develop articulate processes, tools, validation, and guidance for all programmatic self-assessment at Glendale Community College. The self-assessment process will become the foundation upon which programs develop a platform to advocate for their needs in achieving educational excellence.

The product of self-assessment will provide fundamental information for college wide decision-making and resource allocation. Through a constant scanning of the internal and external environment, the program review process will continually improve and adjust to the changing needs of all college programs.

Aligning the Program Review process with the college's Mission Statement, Educational Master Plan, and the Standards for Accreditation will direct all assessment toward student learning.

---

ACCJC Standard I.B.5 assess accomplishment of mission through program review

ACCJC Standard I.B.9 integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation to accomplish mission

### **Program Review Committee**

**Time & Location: 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday, 1:30 – 2:30PM, AD121**

Senate:	Piper Rooney (18-19)
Guild:	Julie Gamberg (18-19)
Joint Faculty: [2]	John Leland (19-20), Rosemarie Shamieh (18-19)
CSEA: [2]	Meg Chil-Gevorkyan (16-17), Frankie Strong (16-17)
Administration:	Ed Karpp, Dean of Research, Planning, and Grants
Manager/Confidential:	Daphne Dionisio, (Chair)
ASGCC: [2]	VACANT
Resource: (Non-voting)	Beth Kronbeck, Faculty Accreditation Coordinator ± Sarah McLemore, C&I Faculty Coordinator ± Yvette Ybarra, Learning Outcomes Faculty Coordinator ±
Minutes Recorder:	Gordon Lui, Office of Research, Planning and Grants