



# Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, November 21, 2022  
 via ZOOM 991 5688 4024  
<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/99156884024>  
 Time – 3pm – 4:30pm

**Type of Meeting:** *Regular*  
**Note Taker:** Stacey Adams

**Committee Members:**

- Stacey Adams, Faculty Co-Chair
- Dr. Meeta Goel, Co-Chair
- Dr. Gary Heaton-Smith, Outcomes Committee Chair, A&H Division Representative
- Vanessa Escobar, Research Analyst
- Dr. Svetlana Deplazes, eLumen Data Steward
- Cindy Vargas, Athletics & Kinesiology Division Representative
- Reina Burgos, Counseling Division Representative
- Samuel Padilla, CTE Division Representative
- Richard Fleishman, S&BS Division Representative
- Dr. Cynthia Lehman, S&BS Division Representative
- Joshua Strong, MSE Division Representative
- Ronda Nogales (Karen Heinzman), Language & Comm Arts Division Representative
- Wendy Stout, HSS Division Representative
- Van Rider, Library Division Representative
- Megan Owens, Faculty at Large Representative
- LaDonna Trimble, Student Services
- VACANT, Classified Representative
- Christos Valiotis, Academic Dean, Academic Affairs
- VACANT, ASO Representative

*Present: Stacey, Rich, Cindy, Joshua, LaDonna, Megan, Wendy, Samuel, Vanessa, Cynthia, Gary, Svetlana, Reina*

*Absent: Karen, Meeta, Van, Christos*

*Guests:*

Items	Person	Action
I. Opening Comments from the Co-Chairs	<i>Meeta / Stacey</i>	<b>Issues Discussed:</b> Stacey shared the status of Program Review reports received, which were due 11/15.
II. Open Comments from the Public		<b>Issues Discussed:</b> none
III. Action Item: Approval of Meeting Minutes -11/7/2022	<i>Stacey</i>	<b>Issues Discussed:</b> <b>Action Taken:</b> approved unanimously <b>Follow Up Items:</b> Stacey to post to PR webpage
IV. Discussion: Program Review & Your Role	<i>Stacey</i>	<b>Issues Discussed:</b> Stacey shared anecdotal comments and feedback received from Deans, Department Chairs and other faculty about the work of their PR Division Reps, some of which was very good and

		<p>others were not aware of their PR Divisions Reps, which means improvement is needed.</p> <p><b>Follow Up Items:</b> Before next Program Review (Fall 2023) we need to better define the work expected of PR Division Reps, consider requiring each rep to host at least one workshop / work session for their Division, and better define the role as to how reps should work with Deans, Chairs and division faculty.</p>
<p>V. Action Item: Changing the Peer Review Process &amp; Form</p>	<p>Stacey</p>	<p><b>Issues Discussed:</b> Stacey shared the working draft of a new Peer Review form that was started at the previous meeting and further developed with descriptions. Robust conversation ensued including discussion of each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the descriptions for each area (Exemplary, Adequate, Needs Improvement) clear and appropriate?</li> <li>• Is a Word doc the best way to do this? Other suggestions?</li> <li>• Is the form easy to use?</li> <li>• What do you think about REVISION REQUIRED checkbox? (We generally want to accept reports and provide constructive feedback for next time, and I'm hoping that we would use the checkbox very sparingly.)</li> <li>• Should we list the peer reviewers or remain anonymous with the feedback coming from the PRC in general?</li> <li>• Should there just be two choices instead of three (possibly 2: "meets requirements" or "needs improvement" instead of 3: "Exemplary," "Adequate" and "Needs Improvement")</li> <li>• Do we need the "Overall" rating box at the bottom or should it be removed?</li> <li>• Do we need "Additional Comments" space at the end or should it be removed?</li> </ul> <p><b>Action Taken:</b> The committee approved the Peer Review form (as discussed and edited during committee) and the proposed Peer Review process (describe below) unanimously.</p> <p>The new Peer Review form would be used to provide feedback on each individual report (by discipline for Academic Divisions), while eliminating the need to write detailed comments, so peer reviewers can check the suitable box (more like a rubric) and get the work done efficiently while providing meaningful feedback to each report writer in an easy-to-understand format. Peer review teams could be 2-3 people and one form would be completed (together, in collaboration) for each report. Peer review assignments would be sent to committee members via Canvas and each team/group would submit their completed peer review forms as attachments in Canvas. The committee can spend time working on peer reviews during a few PRC meetings early in the Spring semester and/or have a Peer</p>

	<p>Review day (possibly a few hours on a Friday morning for example) and get the work done together in collaboration.</p> <p><b>Follow Up Items:</b> Stacey will distribute the Peer Review form, as well as Program Review reports to be reviewed, via Program Review Committee Canvas when we start Peer Review in the Spring semester. There was a notable minority of committee members that preferred having just two choices on the peer review form instead of three (possibly 2: “meets requirements” or “needs improvement” instead of 3: “Exemplary,” “Adequate” and “Needs Improvement”). This should be considered and discussed again in the future after we have worked with the current version of the form.</p>
<p>VI. Information Item: What’s Ahead This Year</p>	<p><b>FALL:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Provide updated PR Handbook</li> <li>✓ Provide CIP instructions &amp; training, due 9/30</li> <li>✓ Update and provide Program Review Training</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</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> <li>▪ Consider changes needed to Program Review process, forms, committee, etc.</li> </ul>
<p>VII. NEXT MEETING DATES:</p>	<p><b>Future Meeting Dates:</b>  <del>8/15/22 (cancel)</del>  <del>8/29/22* 5th Monday</del>  <del>9/5/22 (Labor Day, no meeting)</del>  <del>9/19/22</del>  <del>10/3/22</del>  <del>10/17/22</del>  <del>11/7/22</del>  <del>11/21/22</del>  <del>1/16/23 (MLK Day, no meeting)</del>  <del>2/6/23</del>  <del>2/20/23 (President's Day, no meeting)</del>  <del>3/6/23 (Spring Break, no meeting)</del>  3/20/23  4/3/23  4/17/23  5/1/23</p>



## **Program Review Goals for 2022-2023**

- 1) Work toward better alignment of resource requests with the Budget Committee.
- 2) Utilize the Program Review process to strengthen connections between success, retention and equity data trends, and actual actions taken for continuous improvement.
- 3) Improve communication about Program Review with the campus community.