

# Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 7, 2025  
MH-321

Time: 3pm – 4:30pm

**Type of Meeting:** *Regular*

**Note Taker:** Richie Neil Hao

**Committee Members:**

Dr. Richie Neil Hao, Faculty Co-Chair

Dr. Rebecca Farley, Co-Chair

Dr. Gary Heaton-Smith, Outcomes Committee Chair, A&H Division Representative

**VACANT**, Research Analyst/Tech

Dr. Alex Parisky, eLumen Data Steward

Cindy Vargas, Kinesiology & Athletics Division Representative

Reina Burgos, Counseling Division Representative

Samuel Padilla, Aerospace Industrial Arts & Applied Technologies Division Representative

Dr. Cynthia Lehman, S&BS Division Representative

Joshua Strong, MSE Division Representative

Annamarie Perez, Language & Comm Arts Division Representative

Jennifer Rock, HSS Division Representative

Linda Parker, Equity & Student Achievement Representative

Megan Owens, Faculty at Large Representative

Van Rider, Workforce Development & Community Engagement

**VACANT**, Student Services

**VACANT**, Classified Representative

Dr. Jedi Lobos, Academic Dean, Academic Affairs

**VACANT**, ASO Representative

*Absent: Gary, Samuel, Jennifer, Van*

*Guests: Dr. Svetlana Deplazes*

Items	Person	Action
I. Action Item: Approval of the Agenda	<i>Richie</i>	<b><u>Issues Discussed:</u></b> None.  <b><u>Action Taken:</u></b> Approved.
II. Opening Comments from the Co-Chairs	<i>Richie/ Rebecca</i>	<b><u>Issues Discussed:</u></b> After today, we only have three meetings left! Richie thanks the committee for their insights and contributions.
III. Open Comments from the Public		<b><u>Issues Discussed:</u></b> None.
IV. Action Item: Approval of Meeting Minutes (4/7/25)	<i>Richie</i>	<b><u>Issues Discussed:</u></b> None.  <b><u>Action Taken:</u></b> Abstentions from Megan and Cindy. Minutes approved.  <b><u>Follow Up Items:</u></b> None.

V. Discussion Item: Program Review Survey	Richie	<p><b>Issues Discussed:</b> Megan mentioned two things that emerged from the survey feedback: Changing the review cycle and a few comments about not changing the report template too often. Richie agreed with Megan's findings. Even though there were comments about 3–5-year cycle, Jedi reminded that Health &amp; Safety Sciences need to do the review every two years. Richie agreed that some disciplines (CTE) need to do it every two years.</p> <p><b>Follow Up Items:</b> None.</p>
VI. Discussion & Action Item: Program Review Cycle	Richie	<p><b>Issues Discussed:</b> Richie provided the following info: Based on the survey feedback, it is clear that many people are requesting to change the review cycle. A few things to consider: Nothing in ACCJC that says we have to do PR every year as long as we're doing this regularly and systematically. Even if we move to a 3-year review cycle, nothing prevents people from submitting annual updates with budget requests. Per Title 5, CTE programs have to do 2 year reviews.</p> <p>Linda stated that she will share comparison of program review from other colleges. Rebecca said that her two previous institutions did 3-year comprehensive reviews with annual updates. Alex asked about how long people look at longitudinal data. Megan responded that it's based on trends from the last three years at AVC. Josh expressed that it's a good idea to keep program review annually.</p> <p>Jedi can see argument for both annual vs comprehensive review with annual update. We cannot have "no change" for an annual update. There has to be an explanation of what we're asking for and connect it with budget committee. Annamarie added that we need a better understanding on what's happening with Program Review after it's been submitted. Svetlana said that the committee has been trying to shift the culture of compliance to intentionality. Rebecca suggested that we need to have a flow chart showing the clear process of program review being communicated to the Budget and Strategic Planning Committees.</p> <p>Since CTE programs have to do the reviews every two years, Megan suggested that it might be a good idea to do the comprehensive reviews every four years so it's easier to track them. Richie did not think about it before, but it does make sense in that context and should be discussed further.</p>

		<p>Richie asked the committee to research what other colleges are doing, specifically looking at the differences between comprehensive reviews and annual updates.</p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b> None. Will continue the discussion for next meeting.</p> <p><b>Follow Up Items:</b> Committee will do more research and discuss how other colleges are doing program reviews, specifically understanding comprehensive reviews and annual updates, further.</p>
VII. Discussion Item: Course & Outcome Improvement Plans	Richie	<p><b>Issues Discussed:</b> Rebecca asked last time for more context on CIP/OIP and how it was transferred to Program Review.</p> <p><b>Follow Up Items:</b> Will continue discussion for next meeting.</p>
VIII. Discussion & Action Item: Program Review Report Templates	Richie	<p><b>Issues Discussed:</b> Rebecca only suggested adding a box for programs that are doing “Initial Program Review” for relevant areas with explanation. Since we don’t know yet what changes we’re going to make for the upcoming year, we can’t discuss this further productively.</p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b> Tabled until we decide on the review cycle.</p>
IX. Discussion Item: Program Review Feedback Forms	Richie	<p><b>Issues Discussed:</b> Richie brought this up for reflection purposes only, but he’s not too concerned about this right now since we’re not reviewing until next spring, but we can start thinking about how this might change.</p> <p><b>Follow Up Items:</b> None.</p>
X. Information Item: What’s Ahead This Year		<p><b>FALL:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update and provide Program Review Training in Canvas</li> <li>• Review PR Handbook, update as necessary</li> <li>• Provide CIP instructions &amp; training, due 9/30</li> <li>• Division Reps will provide support in the Program Review process to their divisions.</li> <li>• Receive Program Review reports, due 11/15</li> <li>• Define the peer review process, update forms as necessary</li> </ul> <p><b>SPRING:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer review norming session, train committee members, form peer review teams, begin working on Peer Review reports.</li> <li>• Complete Peer Reviews of Program Review reports, provide feedback to each program.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider changes needed to Program Review process, forms, committee, etc.</li> </ul>
XI. NEXT MEETING DATES:		<p><b>Future Meeting Dates:</b> (1<sup>st</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> Mondays 3pm – 4:30pm)</p> <p><u>Fall 2024:</u>  <del>8/19/24 (8/26 instead)</del>  <del>9/2/24</del> (No meeting, Labor Day)  <del>9/16/24</del>  <del>10/7/24</del>  <del>10/21/24</del>  <del>11/4/24</del>  <del>11/18/24</del>  <del>12/2/24</del> (The Committee approved to cancel this meeting.)</p> <p><u>Spring 2025:</u>  <del>2/3/25</del>  <del>2/17/25</del> (No meeting, President's Day)  <del>3/3/25</del>  <del>3/17/25</del>  <del>4/7/25</del>  <del>4/21/25</del>  <del>5/5/25</del>  <del>5/19/25</del></p>

#### Program Review Committee Goals for 2024-2025

- 1) Establish and better define the connection between the Program Review and the Budget resource allocation and approval process.
- 2) Collaborate with the campus community to enhance communication, engagement, and implementation of the program review process in alignment with the college mission thereby fostering a culture of continuous self-reflection and dialogue.
- 3) Evaluate the Non-Instructional Program Review template based on feedback to better support operational areas.
- 4) Utilize the Program Review process evaluation data to make continuous improvements.