

Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes  
(GE118)  
March 1, 2018  
3:15pm – 4:45pm

Present: Judith Bell, Dorothy Pucay, Jagrup Kahlon, Takeo Kubo, Valentin Garcia, Doug Robb, Joe Lugo, Lena Tran, Yelena Lipilina, Barry Del Buono, (members were not all present at the same time. There was a CTE Advisory Board meeting at the same time as this meeting)

Absent: Gina Del Rosario-Fontela, Graciela Cochran, Edina Rutland, Edna Dolatre, Kristen Ruano

1. No quorum; no actions taken
2. Public Comments: none
3. Discussion
  - ii. Discussion of eLumen as a possible software for Program Review
    1. Question: Can eLumen get access to student data?
    2. Data can only be breached if someone gives their password to someone else.
    3. It's important to talk to other colleges
      - a. Cabrillo is still building; not on line yet
      - b. Maybe Mission would be a good visit
    4. Disaggregation of data is possible in eLumen – important for accreditation
      - a. It integrates with Canvas
    5. Question – what is a program?
      - a. We can't put everything in one area
        - i. Degree and certificate programs
        - ii. Transfer oriented programs
        - iii. Student Services programs
        - iv. Administrative Services
        - v. Hybrids
      - b. You can use different “bricks” to build different modules.
      - c. SAOs are also provided.
      - d. What other solutions are possible?
        - i. TracDat has a PR module, but no curriculum module
        - ii. We should invite someone from Nunentive to demonstrate the PR module.
    6. eLumen support – every college gets a specific person as their contact.
      - a. We need to have someone in charge of whatever platform we choose.
    7. What is the timeline?
      - a. We have to build the modules.
      - b. Program Review is under Strategic Initiatives in eLumen.
      - c. Data flow seems very robust – it can bring in lots of data and also output data in many formats.
      - d. We won't be off Word this coming year.
  - iii. Idea – there were several PRs that had complaints buried in the narrative
    1. Should we put a “suggestions” section?

2. The editorial comments seemed to be a natural part of the narrative to other committee members
  - a. Maybe we should send it out as a separate form. Anything that is put in the document is public.
  - b. Some PRs had way more information than necessary in their program descriptions, for example. Should we limit that to the catalog descriptions for degree/certificate programs?
  - c. Should every academic program have a description even if they are not degree/certificate?
3. Committee should look at the AA form and determine what can stay the same from year to year, until the comprehensive.
  - a. Things like the program description should not need to be updated.
  - b. The main things that need to be updated are:
    - i. Data
    - ii. Curriculum
    - iii. Goals
      1. Should we make the planning section mandatory? Not every program will want or need to use it.
      2. We can tie some funding to planning as an incentive
      3. PIE is taking the plans out of PR to identify trends
  - c. Not every college does program review every year.
    - i. Cabrillo's process for comprehensive PRs is much more robust.
  - d. The fact that we have tied PR to budget makes it necessary to continue submitting them yearly.
    - i. We can't have people do nothing, but whatever we can do to simplify the process would be good.
    - ii. The purpose of the Annual is to report any changes, including data analysis.
    - iii. We need the components of the form for a number of reasons.
    - iv. When we get to the end of the year, it would be nice to give our writers a better product.
    - v. Everything has to go through Senate.
    - vi. Senate needs annual PRs for faculty hires.
  - e. How prescriptive do we want to be?
    - i. Do we want degree/certificate programs to use the catalog description?
  - f. What is Program Review for?
    - i. Should there be a space for issues?
  - g. Guided Pathways is going to be a big thing
    - i. All the barriers to students would be addressed
    - ii. Was described at a workshop as a "complete remodel"
  - h. Completion of Program Review Process for 2017-18
    - i. We are close, but there are still outstanding
    - ii. Spreadsheet – has all the information
- iv. Meeting adjourned at 4:45