

PROAC Meeting Notes

Friday, February 19, 2021 2:00-3:30pm

via Zoom – Meeting URL: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/3521388862>

Meeting ID: 352 138 8862

Attendees:

Coordinators		Area 2 CATs		Guests and others?
Instruction PR		William Baker	present	Delia Esquivel – Student Fees supervisor
Edward Modafferi	present	Caroline Kreide	present	
Dean OIE & Admin. Services PR		Area 3		Denise Dupree - for Adult Education, Noncredit & Workforce Development
Komal Bandyopadhyay	present	Aaron Gregory		
Student Services PR		Michael Weepers	present	
Regina Coletto	present	Craig Vilhauer	present	
Dean of Instruction		Area 4		
Sylvia Ruano - Area 4	Present	Susie Williamson	present	
SLO coordinators		Bryan Donnelly		
Brandon Tenn	Present	Suzette Norris		
Valerie Albano	present	Scott McCall		
		Kirsty Brace		
Resource Personnel		Area 5		
Luis Enrique Flores	Present	Jennifer Gardner	present	
Gabriela Garcia	Present	Matthew Warner-Davies	present	
Seferina Ramirez	present	Alana Perlin	present	
Nathaniel Brewer	present	LRC		
		Karrie Bullock	present	
Area 1 CATs		Denise Runner		
Jo Fawna Reali	present	Non-credit		
Saheba Khurana	present	Jessica Moran		

Meeting called to order at 2:05 pm

1. Comments/Announcements?

- **No major changes to Jan 2021 minutes other than fixing attendance for Susie**

2. Old Business

a. Follow up - plans for scheduling course assessments and scorecards in eLumen

- **See below under new business for discussion**

b. Updates on ITS proposal for reorganizing degrees, programs, and courses in Colleague

- **Komal reported that she has shared the information with the Senior administration and we are waiting to hear back with their approval. We are being careful because this can impact the courses, the catalog, and other systems that need to reflect the information accurately. Hopefully we can get this project completed in Summer 2021**
- **Valerie commented on the “org structure” and how it should be a part of how we think of assessments and how the outcome build on each other.**

c. Other? **NONE**

3. New Business

a. Assessment planning and modifications to the Program review cycle

- **Brandon showed a PowerPoint to be shared with faculty in order to provide a background on why we are doing assessment and some of the history of the process at Merced College**
- **Where did the twice in 5 years come from? Academic Senate resolution 05-15**

NOTE: Institutions have the flexibility to design their own assessment cycles.

- **Salient points from ACCJC Standards related to assessment were highlighted**
 - **IB 1 – demonstrate sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes**
 - **IB 2 – define and assess SLOs for all instructional programs and student and learning support services**
 - **IB3 – use assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.**
- **Komal pointed out that inviting Student Equity and other non-instructional areas to come to PROAC meetings in the future to see how we can all work together, especially when it comes to the data. For example, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) survey taking place in Spring 21 semester so faculty are aware of what is going on in student services**

- Val commented this was the reason for combining IPRSLOAC and ARC to form PROAC
 - IB6 – learning outcomes are disaggregated and analyzed for subpopulations of students
 - IB 9 – continuous, broad based systematic evaluation and planning integrating program review, planning and resource allocation
 - IC 3 – documented assessment of student learning → this is where we would like to focus our efforts now that faculty and staff are using eLumen for assessment of outcomes
 - Komal commented that we should be able to attach notes from discussions to sections within the program review in the eLumen strategic initiative
 - IIA 2 All faculty need to be involved
 - IIA 3 – regularly assess outcomes
- KEY POINT: Make assessment of learning outcomes – sustainable and continuous with quality improvement (SCQI)**
- Assessing SLOs in instruction twice every years has created complications and we would like to simplify the process – keep it super simple

Proposal:

1. Assess SLOs every other year for all regularly offered courses and every time for infrequently offered courses
2. Complete program reviews every other year, with updates to resource allocation every year

Feedback was requested

- Alana Perlin queried “Is this the comprehensive program review?”

Edward replied that this would not be considered a comprehensive program review, - those had their own problems. However, the annual IPRs seem to be too often for using data from the assessment of courses. Our hope is this would get people on a regular cycle alternating data collection and then to sit down and look at their data.

Komal commented that Student services does something different – they do not keep looking at SAOs when things are working great – they create new outcomes related to new projects that can be assessed and included in their program reviews. This is very different from the process for Course SLOs in instruction and student services has to be more flexible.
- Will there be a mirrored approach for SAO assessment?

Those groups need to consider what would work better in their areas. We don’t have completed templates in eLumen for the non-instructional areas. It was agreed that we should not be doing comprehensive program reviews every year.

- Michael Weepers commented that we should not market this as program reviews every other year because sometimes the annual data is used for resource allocation and looking at the data annually can be helpful. However, we would not have the updated SLO data to use in an annual program review process.
- Brandon commented that our hope is to get everyone on a regular cycle alternating program reviews and course SLO assessments.
- Edward said he can launch all of the instructional program reviews in eLumen as a 2-year cycle and each department can update as needed. We would like to find a process that is sustainable and continuous.
- Val pointed out that as long as the resource allocation is completed we might be able to bookmark goals for the future.
- Michael W. asked for clarification on “What is a program review?” Is it just the SLO part, or is it requiring faculty to go into eLumen and provide updates on everything?
- Edward responded that program review is what we say it is...for our purposes the program review is filling out all the fields in eLumen. With annual program reviews this seemed to happen too frequently, and instructional programs did not have a chance to collect enough new course SLO assessment data for a “good” analysis.
- Caroline Kreide pointed out “the annual PR’s are definitely a burden for departments with few full time instructors, yet many disciplines.”
- Edward commented that currently we have many disciplines writing separate program reviews even though they have related student populations. We are trying out a model based on the Guided Pathways to see if these related disciplines can work on a single program review with common core students and possibly related budget requests (for example, doing a single Agriculture Program including Agriculture, Ag Business, Animal Science, Landscape Horticulture, Mechanized Agriculture, Plant/Soil Science) Hopefully this would increase dialog between faculty in the related disciplines.
- Michael pointed out that one of the big cons with the global program review process who will be who is the person working on the combined program.
- Edward replied that this is where cohort meetings should be used to discuss what is going on with the programs, and it would be really helpful if we had a day set aside for faculty to get together and work on their program reviews.
- Brandon asked the CATs to please go back to their cohorts and get their feedback on alternating the years for course SLO assessments with the program reviews in instruction.
- Brandon discussed how this proposed cycle could facilitate tracking course SLO reports.
- Aaron Gregory wanted clarification on how we need to define IPR – in his viewpoint IPR is the documentation that SLO assessment has taken place and reflected on in the program. He feels that doing this all in one document every other year makes sense to him.
- Matthew Warner-Davies commented that “I think every other year program review with the option of updating resource allocation is a good idea as it allows for more data to be generated between program reviews.”
- Edward pointed out that we want to give people time to collect the data and discuss the data, but capturing that discussion has always been a difficult process.
- Aaron said that it needs to have a purpose - we are documenting what we are doing and this justifies the existence of the college. He doesn’t feel it is too complicated or too cumbersome.

- Edward commented that we are working on a plan, and it might not work for everyone.
- Komal discussed how the datasets prepared by OIE are the minimum for what they can do with a single dataset, yet each program has different needs. Possibly having IPRs every other year would give OIE and the programs more time to analyze their data.
- Caroline asked, “Is this proposal similar to what happens at other colleges, particularly those that have received feedback from ACCJC? Do we have any info on that?”
- Edward replied that each CCC comes up with their own plan – we are hoping this will simplify the process so faculty and staff can concentrate on the 2 aspects of program review – you are either collecting CSLO assessments or analyzing how they relate to the program.
- Sylvia pointed out that the college she came from used TracDat and they did updates to the program reviews every other year.
- Michael Weepers has been working with his cohort to set up plans for every other year which seems to be working for many of the faculty in his cohort. The only pushback he got was related to whether or not it is possible to set up a scorecard in Spring semester, and then finishing off the report in Fall semester.
- Brandon commented that this could produce problems with tracking the completion of assessment reports for each course. Also, there is a fear the analysis could have a problem as the faculty is reflecting on a class and assessment that happened months ago. We plan to discuss this at the next PROAC meeting in March.
- Val pointed out that the ACCJC annual reports are more data driven these days, and if people are not assessing at the points where we capture the data, we might lose data that could create problems in the future reports. Think of it like a teacher giving deadlines for assignments, only here they are benchmarks for accreditation use. She feels the hard deadline for completing the course assessment would be at the end of the semester. Building flexibility into a process that is supposed to be continuous and sustainable is problematic and we could run into problems with consistency. (using a “buff and fit” analogy)
- Jo Fawna Reali wondered “if we do assessments every other year, can't we be more flexible with "due dates" for the data entry?”
- Brandon said we would like to get more feedback from the cohorts on the due date for course SLO reports, but we need to be consistent for when we run reports.
- Caroline commented that it's like teaching a class and we typically have a single deadline for assignments, and she feels the an analysis needs to be fresh in your mind so she would like to see the deadline for the report set for the semester the assessment actually took place.
- There was some discussion about providing a time and place for faculty to gather together and work on their program reviews, especially for programs with a single faculty member. Flex time wouldn't always work for this but having everyone in the same “mode” might facilitate the process.
- Susie Williamson said “Once we decide on a specific time frame, I think this should be added to the Adjunct trainings. So they understand how to use ELumen to do an SLO assessment and/or that this is part of teaching a course.”
- Caroline asked for the PPT to share with cohorts
- Brandon Tenn replied that “Jenn and I will be making a video on this to get the word out to everyone.” Link to download the presentation:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/15MUJkLWYvAD0_3Pyc1OGLnmCop8mGRJz/view?usp=sharing

- **It was pointed out that we are sending in the midterm report in March and now is a good time to get this process in place so we can report on progress for the next Accreditation report in a few years.**

- b. Proposal for the Academic Senate Resolution on the “SLO Assessment Cycle” - see above
- c. Other?

4. Other Announcements?

- **Spring 2021 meeting schedule- 3rd Friday of the month, 2-3:30pm March 19th**
- **Please bring feedback from your cohorts on the proposed cycle alternating course SLO reports with instructional program reviews to the next PROAC meeting in March.**

5. Adjournment – 3:15pm