

Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes
(A213)

October 5, 2017

3:15pm – 4:45pm

Present: Judith Bell, Joe Lugo, Barry Del Buono, Joyce Lui, Jagrup Kahlon, Yelena Lipilina, Edna Dolatre, Takeo Kubo, Edina Rutland, Kristen Ruano,

Absent: Dorothy Pucay, Gina Del Rosario-Fontela, Valentin Garcia (excused), Lena Tran (excused)

1. Approval of Agenda from 9/21/17 – passed
2. Approval of today's agenda – passed
3. Approval of Minutes from 9/21/17 - passed
4. Public Comments: no public comments
5. Discussion
 - b. Update from Joyce Lui on Program Awards
 - i. Summer awards were not being included in Datamart, so data is inaccurate
 - ii. Our number of awards and certificates will be going up
 - iii. Recommend that when we are reading program reviews, that we don't focus on Program Awards
 1. This is a new section; not a huge part of Program Awards
 - iv. She is working on correcting the problem
 - v. She will be meeting with managers and Academic Senate, then send out an all-campus email
 - vi. 2016-17 awards are up to date and accurate
 - vii. Joe: Question – how do instructors know who is getting awards?
 1. That will vary from program to program – many CTE programs track their graduating students
 2. Jagrup's program was off by 45%; it will impact her funding
 - viii. We want to know how this will impact our allocations
 - ix. Joyce – this is a result of working in silos; we need to work more closely together for transparency.
 - x. Barry: Question – is Joyce concerned there might be other holes in the campus data?
 1. Yes – she wants a district-wide timeline. For example, EVC doesn't graduate students in the summer, but we do. DO wasn't reporting our numbers.
 2. Barry – need a memo from Joyce that gives a timeline for when things need to get done.

- a. Joyce would like to work with Kristen about course updates as well. There are lots of pieces coming from different places. We need a master calendar.
- c. Membership and division into teams
 - i. Dorothy contacted the Senate to request support in getting more members
 - ii. Number of PRs in each category: academic, student services, admin services:
 - 1. Academic: 55
 - 2. Student Services: 19
 - 3. Administrative Services: 7
 - 4. Total: 81
 - iii. Judith: should we have teams of 2 or 3?
 - 1. Joe – liked 3 because it’s really thorough
 - 2. Joyce: she was on a team of 3, but one person didn’t show up
 - a. Pairs might make easier to make people accountable
 - 3. 2 will give us 8 teams – we are almost to 16 members
 - a. That would mean approximately 10 PRs per team
 - 4. Scheduling 2 would be easier
 - 5. Motion – Joe – 2 per group instead of 3, Yelena seconded
 - 6. Motion passed.
 - iv. Joe: question – why are Computer Applications and Computer Information Systems not both comprehensive?
 - 1. Judith – that was done on purpose to stagger the work.
 - v. Judith: will try to pair new members with longer term members.
 - 1. Will try to balance the distribution of PRs in terms of areas.
 - vi. Idea – have more people from across the campus read program reviews to increase program literacy
 - 1. Would decrease silos
 - 2. Lighten the load
 - 3. Future discussion – not this year.
 - vii. Joyce: question – who reads program reviews?
 - 1. CurricUNET – might make it easier to encourage inclusion
 - 2. Barry – thinks we could informally start this by including an instruction sheet. Pick 3 people across campus to read your PR.
 - a. Would increase cross-campus dialog
 - viii. CurricUNET
 - 1. Judith will be working with Robert Gutierrez and Kristen Ruano on the migration
 - 2. Joyce asked if we are taking this to Senate for a vote
 - 3. Kristen said she has emails from Lenora Pinkston regarding the approval of the move to CurricUNET. She will send them to Judith
 - ix. Senate and Committees

1. Judith feels the Senate needs to take a more strategic approach to committees
 - a. The re-up is good, but the timeline is problematic – could we shift it?
 - b. Committee structures need to be considered
- x. Yelena – can we pay people to read PRs?
 1. There isn't necessarily a "right way" to write program review – need to take that into consideration
 2. Democratization – spread out rather than having just few people.
- xi. Area specialists who read just one part of the PR document– problem is that you don't get the whole picture
 1. A certain subset of the campus population is gaining knowledge of programs across campus – we would like to expand that group.
- xii. Data automation – possible in CurricUNET?
 1. We currently have 3 sources of data available with information that people can copy and paste
- xiii. Joe: Question – what is the accreditation team looking for in Program Review?
 1. Joyce – looking at data; does data support requests, etc.
 2. Everyone should be working towards the same goals – it should all make sense
 3. Dialog – this is an area that needs work
 4. Program Review didn't get written up for anything
- xiv. PDD should have elements of Program Review – opportunity to showcase programs
 - a. Barry – SLOAC also wants to do something for PDD; maybe we can collaborate.
 - b. We want to make Program Review more useful to programs and the college
 - c. Idea – have a "poster session" at PDD that highlights programs – maybe 10 programs, with a Professional Development stipend.
 2. PRvC needs to work closely with SLOAC and Finance
- xv. Redesign of Student Services and Administrative Services forms
 1. Needs to be led by people who use the form
 2. Joyce - Does the form make you feel like you are telling your story?
 3. Judith – reading these forms seems a little dry.
 4. Judith asked Takeo to ask people for feedback on what's working and what's not working.
 5. Takeo - SAOs need to be more robust, refined. People need more guidance on developing them. They would tell the story a little more.
 6. Judith: question – how are SAOs developed
 - a. Takeo – the head of the service area writes them and asks for feedback

- b. Within Student Services, are there the equivalent of Program Learning Outcomes?
 - c. Takeo – we need to develop them. They have been using the ISLOs (GESLOs). Hard to map.
 - d. Should we develop more specialized PR forms – for example, Counseling, CTE.
 - e. CurricUNET will make more options possible. We might want to consider how we structure that.
 - f. Training for specific areas.
 - g. SLOAC will be taking a look at CCSF’s CurricUNET model.
 - i. As CurricUNET becomes more accessible, we will be looking at more forms
 - ii. Can we show the progress of Program Review on CurricUNET
 - h. High degree of planning in SS and AS forms – can we use the same type of planning on the academic side?
 - i. Strategic Planning Session pilot – facilitated, train people in strategic planning; tied in with funding.
 - i. Innovation fund – part of our mission and vision
 - ii. To be eligible for Innovation funding, you need to have a plan.
 - iii. District-wide foundation – can we tap into some of the grant writers to help craft the mission and vision of the innovation fund.
 - iv. Foundation needs to play a role, but the innovation fund needs to be controlled by the college.
 - v. Different types of proposals would fall under different funding sources.
 - vi. Education piece needs to happen – need to pilot this.
 - vii. Should be open to SS and AS as well
7. Committee charge (will be discussed at a later meeting)
- a. Maybe our membership number should reflect how many program reviews we have to validate
 - b. Joyce – there could be more classified members.
 - c. Set a minimum number, but be able to add that.
 - d. Outreach idea – have one other person on campus read a program review.

d. Meeting adjourned 4:15.