Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes
(A213)
October 19, 2017
3:15pm – 4:45pm

Present: Judith Bell, Joyce Lui, Dorothy Pucay, Jagrup Kahlon, Yelena Lipilina, Edna Dolatre, Takeo Kubo, Kristen Ruano, Gina Del Rosario-Fontela, Valentin Garcia, Doug Robb, Graciela Cochran

Absent: Joe Lugo, Barry Del Buono, Lena Tran (excused), Edina Rutland

1. Approval of today's agenda – passed
2. Approval of Minutes from 10/5/17 - passed
3. Public Comments:
    a. Momo Lahai wanted to know where the 2016 – 17 Business Program Review form is and where to find the 2017-18 form is. Judith replied that the Business form from last year was not proficient, so she will send it separately.
4. Discussion/Action
    a. Judith showed how to navigate to the Program Review Committee page and the documents for this year.
    b. Judith showed the new Validation forms, which now contain text fields and check boxes. They are color coded to match the PR forms.
    c. The forms from 2106 – 17 have not yet been posted on the website; Judith and Dee Davis are working to get those uploaded.
    d. Subgroups – Judith will be assigning the teams next week, now that the membership is at 16. She will assign the programs at that time also.
    e. Student Services and Administrative Services form revisions
        i. Joyce – one of the ACCJC recommendations has to do with the fact that SS was tasked with being more specific and data driven in their Service Area Outcomes.
        ii. We need more specific language – Joyce and Takeo can take this to the managers.
        iii. Judith – there is a big disconnect between the SLOs, SAOs and GESLOs.
        iv. Who is in charge of revising the GESLOs?
            1. SLOAC (?)
        ii. Judith – at the last Planning and Institutional Effectiveness meeting, they talked about 21st Century Skills. She feels they could provide a good framework for SLOs and SAOs.
        iii. It's going to be important for updating the forms to know if the GESLOs have been updated.
        iv. SAOs should be regularly occurring activities.
        v. Managers need more data
        vi. Financial Aid as an example:

1. SAO – students understand the impact of satisfactory academic progress on the Financial Aid process.

vii. There is confusion about how to write a good SAO. We have to be careful about the language (Joyce).

1. What is the purpose of the SLO? For example, SLOs are supposed to support Student Success.
2. What is the service you are providing?
3. It's awkward because services are not classes.
4. To make it relevant, there needs to be an ultimate goal of student success
5. Back when we put a lot of effort into creating SLOs, Student Services were encouraged to write SLO-like SAOs, and they have never transitioned away from that.
6. Student Services needs development on what they actually are, how they should be done, etc.
7. Curriculum has a whole process for developing SLOs; maybe Student Services needs something similar.
8. There is no committee for SAOs. Is it even part of the SLOAC's charge to deal with SAOs?
9. Takeo – SAOs should be incorporated into SLOAC.
   a. The whole cycle should be the same for SAOs as SLOs.
10. Joyce – we need to take this back to our colleagues
11. PRvC needs to address this problem through the forms.
12. Joyce will take this back to the President and Management Team
13. SLOAC is a Senate Committee – how would SAOs impact that?
    a. PRvC is also an Academic Senate committee but we deal with more than just academic forms
    b. We need to get together with SLOAC
    c. We need the top management level informed
14. This piece (SAOs) will drive a lot of the other pieces.
15. Question – how have past writers dealt with SAOs?
    a. Joyce – there was a lot of disparity between the answers. It was not as clear as the SLOs.
16. Joyce - Do we as managers tie the SAOs to the GESLOs directly?
    a. That was the original idea (Takeo)
17. Leslie Rice – are the SAOs tied directly to funding?
    a. Should be, but isn't really (Takeo & Judith)
18. Question – how are SLOs tied into funding (Joyce) - How
    a. The FC doesn't really use SLO data in funding decisions
    b. SLO assessment is supposed to tie into funding.
    c. Most of the stuff that the FC looks at is in the Budget Justification Worksheet.

d. There is stuff in the Academic PR document about SLOs written by SLOAC
    i. Possible question for form: Have your SLOs revealed any areas of concern that require funding to address?
    ii. Joyce: that's a good question for SAOs too.
    iii. We could add SLO data into Budget section.
    iv. Tie in also to planning section – planning is required for innovation funding
e. Leslie – Is SLOAC looking at our assessments?
    i. It's common understanding amongst the faculty that they aren't.
    ii. When we go to CurricUNET, it should be easier.
    iii. We need to invite multiple SLOAC members to discuss this.
f. Is the data provided in PR forms included in the Academic Senate's new faculty request form?
    i. Not exactly
g. Perhaps the PIE should take a look at timelines. Under the current timeline, we don't get a good crack at the best candidates (Judith)
    i. Yelena – it's a good idea because everything is done last-minute.
    ii. Leslie – the timeline needs to be firmed up and followed so that we're not hiring in the summer.
h. Part of what Program Review is for is to reveal problems.
    i. Yelena said that she puts things into Program Review, such as the need for more assistants, and then nothing happens.
    ii. Leslie – this is a very serious problem that could be fixed if we really adhered to using Program Review for funding.
    iii. Judith – just because we tightened up our process doesn't mean that we're getting enough money from the district.
    iv. If you are asking for something and nothing is happening, we want to find out why.
    v. The better we make Program Review, the better our arguments for funding are.
    vi. Dorothy – is there a way to highlight what we are asking for? Put things on the front page? Things get buried in Program Review.

19. Leslie – wanted to see if we are working towards imbedding the data directly into the PR forms. This would make it much easier.
    a. Joyce – if it's possible in CurricUNET
    b. We don't need all this data. She doesn't know why the packet has gotten bigger.
    c. If this committee can trim down what is needed, she would support that. It could be a lot more focused.
    d. Leslie – can we just get the data we need rather than the whole packet.
    e. Judith – is there a way to run data in a form that they could just plug it in.
    f. Joyce could populate the form that we have
    g. Judith – this is definitely the direction we want to go in. Once we start going onto CurricUNET, she will know more about what's possible.
    h. Joyce – Program Review migration to CurricUNET does need to be voted on by the Academic Senate
    i. Judith will put it on the 11/21 agenda
20. What's next:
    a. We need more feedback from Student Services and Administrative Services about the forms
    b. We need to talk to SLOAC about SAOs. Will they be taking them on?
    c. Would SAOs be entered into CurricUNET?
        i. Takeo thinks the answer to both questions is yes.
        ii. At this point, the volume of work will be the same. The cycle of review and assessment will be the same
        iii. The structures to handle SAOs are already in place
        iv. Judith – maybe we could add a section to the form where the SAOs could be listed. We could structure it more like the SLOs on the academic form.
        v. What's the overarching goal?
    viii. Timing for the rest of the semester.
        1. For the SS and AS forms, we could form a subcommittee to discuss the changes. Takeo could lead this.
        2. Next meeting, we will talk about the charge and goals.
            a. Possibly include a link between the number of program reviews to the number of committee members.
        3. Joyce wanted to know if she should be writing review
            a. The consensus is that she should, but start with an Annual.
b. Adjourned at 4:45