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.