

Present: Daphne Dionisio (Chair), Marc Drescher (Resource) Julie Gamberg (Guild), Ed Karpp (Administration), Beth Kronbeck (Resource), Connie Lantz (Proxy for Frankie Strong), John Leland (Joint Faculty), Piper Rooney (Senate), Rosemarie Shamieh (Joint Faculty), Ricreasha Thomas (Proxy for Meg Chil-Gevorkyan) (CSEA)

Absent: Martin Chino (ASGCC), Sarah McLemore (Resource), Tina Tchakian(AASGCC), Yvette Ybarra (Resource)

Guest:

Quorum: 7/10

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

- I. Announcements
 - a. Daphne Dionisio and Ed Karpp are working on getting stipends for Classified Staff who worked on the validation of program review submissions over the winter. Currently awaiting a response from Human Resources.
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - a. The Minutes from the February 21, 2017 Program Review meeting were reviewed.
 - ***It was MSC (Rooney/Gamberg) that the Minutes from February 21, 2017 be approved without corrections.***

Old Business:

- III. Use of Program Review Findings at Institutional Level – Update
[ACCJC Standard I.B.1 dialog about institutional effectiveness and improvement, ACCJC Standard I.B.4 use of data, ACCJC Standard I.B.5 program review]
 - a. The analysis of program review data was initially going to examine only the Needs Assessment section (e.g. Distance Ed, Technology, Currency, Staffing, etc.) as well as find patterns among the Resource Requests.
 - i. Are trends occurring that the college needs to address?
 - ii. Which requests repeatedly do not get funding?
 - iii. Should the analysis separately examine patterns specific to Student Services, Administrative Services, and Instruction?
 - iv. In the upcoming online system for program review, we will start encoding certain fields so that we can do analyses faster.
 - v. Improvements need to be made in tracking resource requests, rolling over requests, and deleting requests that have already been funded.
- IV. Research on Potential Database Continues – Update
[ACCJC Standard I.B.6 disaggregation of data]
 - a. After a year of vetting systems, the decision has been made to go with eLumen.
 - b. eLumen integrates seamlessly with Canvas.
 - i. Canvas gradebook can auto-transfer student learning outcomes assessment data into eLumen
 - ii. The switch from Moodle to Canvas begins occurs this fall.
 - c. We received input from other schools regarding what system they were using.
 - i. East LA switched from TracDat to eLumen. TracDat requires a lot of added costs to match the functionality of eLumen.
 - ii. Cuesta College is currently using eLumen and is happy with it.
 - d. A main reason for switching systems is so that GCC can collect student learning outcomes data at the individual student unit level. TracDat is able to collect such data but will only export to Excel spreadsheets while eLumen is able to provide calculations, graphs, and tables to the user. TracDat does not perform disaggregation.
 - e. Timeline for new system:
 Decision to be made in April

Contract solidified in May
ITS works with eLumen to get the system connected and then we need to configure it
Prior to roll out, we will conduct a pilot test with the system.

V. Preparation for the 2017-2018 Cycle – Changes for Improvement

[From ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Appendix B, Part I: Program Review
The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness
There is investigative dialogue about what data or process should be used for program review
There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.]

- a. The committee discussed the purpose and use of Program Review and how the process and timeline might change. At the next meeting, we might have a technical discussion about the data elements that are going into the form.
- b. Currently, the Integrated Planning Handbook states that departments do a full review every three years with updates in years two and three. It was proposed that we switch to ensuring a thorough full review and inside of *requiring* updates, departments would instead be required to review and discuss their performance data and have the option to update when needed. Resource requests could be submitted annually by any department “in good standing” (i.e. full review was validated and department is current on their data review).
 - i. We want to develop an environment where areas are routinely checking their data. This would involve departments being required to review their data annually, discussing it, documenting the dialogue.
 - ii. Making this change would mean that only 1/3 of departments are submitting a full program review each year and only 1/3 are being reviewed.
- c. We need to clarify how we define a “program”.
- d. Should we modify the program review season timeline to provide ample time for departments to examine and discuss their data? If data is ready in late summer, departments can review it at the start of the fall semester, have discussions, and could submit documented evidence of those discussions by December.

VI. Use of the Results of Program Review

[ACCJC Standard I.B.8 communicates assessment & evaluation activities for shared understanding of strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities, ACCJC Standard IV.A.6 processes for decision-making and resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution]

- a. Who looks at the completed program reviews?
 - i. Is information being shared with the department faculty & staff?
 - ii. In a survey of colleges deemed to perform high quality assessment, 93% thought it was very important that results from program review be used to inform *department* discussions, decisions, and recommendations. 100% of these schools believed that program review results should inform *institutional* discussions, decisions, and recommendations.
 - iii. City College of San Francisco
 - Recently overhauled their process. On October 18, all departments participate in an event that is formatted similar to a conference and they discuss the previous year’s program reviews. Classrooms are assigned for the review and discussion of three departments’ program reviews; so a department must review and discuss their own as well as that of two other departments. By October 31, the deans and other department heads discuss the previous year’s performance for their area and provide input for the upcoming annual plan. By November, all units receive their current data and fill in their sections for Learning Outcomes Assessment, Curriculum Currency, and Resource Allocations. On December 9, units submit their final program review using CurricUNET and it is validated by their supervisor using a scoring rubric. CCSF’s new process is very good but perhaps more than most colleges can reasonably do.
 - iv. It was suggested that at GCC it would be beneficial if deans could get involved in the program reviews of their departments to provide feedback and recommendations. This will be further discussed at the next meeting.

New Business:

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 2:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: TBD

Minutes Recorded by: G. Lui