



Program Review Committee Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 2, 2026
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, HSS Division Representative
- Reina Burgos, Counseling Division Representative
- Samuel Padilla, Aerospace Industrial Arts & Applied Technologies Division Representative
- Dr. Cynthia Lehman, S&BS Division Representative
- Dr. Joshua Strong, MSE Division Representative
- Annamarie Perez, Language & Comm Arts 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: Reina Burgos, Linda Parker

Guests: Dr. Svetlana Deplazes

Items	Person	Action
I. Action Item: Approval of the Agenda	<i>Richie</i>	<u>Issues Discussed:</u> None. <u>Action Taken:</u> Approved.
II. Opening Comments from the Co-Chairs	<i>Richie/ Rebecca</i>	<u>Issues Discussed:</u> Richie thanked the committee for reviewing the reports. Also, reminding to finish the reviews by March 5. Rebecca thanked everyone as well.
III. Opening Comments from the Public		<u>Issues Discussed:</u> None.
IV. Action Item: Approval of Meeting Minutes (12/1/25)	<i>Richie</i>	<u>Issues Discussed:</u> None. <u>Action Taken:</u> Abstentions: Gary, Jedi, and Joshua. Approved.
V. Discussion Item: Peer Review Process	<i>Richie</i>	<u>Issues Discussed:</u> Richie reminded the committee to complete the feedback forms by March 5. Thanked those who already submitted them.

		<p>Richie reminded the importance to submit them by due date, so he can compile them and send them to deans and report submitters by the following week, especially if revision is required (which adds extra time) before he can upload them on PR webpage.</p> <p>Jedi asked the committee about how to address statements written in program review reports that could be considered inaccurate. Richie’s response was that report reviewers do the best they can to read the report carefully and offer feedback, which could include asking report authors to revise for further clarity.</p> <p>Van stated that he has seen statements that could be perceived as judgmental, but as reviewers, we need to ask ourselves if anything needs to be clarified. Gary also added that precedent is set to make sure we can review while also being mindful of how to respond appropriately. Svetlana asked if there should be a disclaimer in reports if people are concerned about how information could be interpreted differently. Richie pointed out our current process provides opportunities for deans to review the reports prior to submission so they can address concerns they may find at that time. They also have another opportunity to review the reports along with the feedback forms when these documents are returned to them after the committee finishes the review process.</p> <p>Follow Up Items: Richie will compile the reports and feedback forms and email deans and report submitters.</p>
<p>VI. Action Item: Comprehensive Review Report</p>	<p><i>Richie</i></p>	<p>Issues Discussed: Last December the committee reviewed the Comprehensive Review Report template. The committee reviewed the template and made some minor changes at the meeting. Joshua pointed out that the colors are not consistent on the form. Richie will try to fix them and email the committee for review. Despite stylistic changes, the committee decided to vote to approve the Comprehensive Report template.</p> <p>Action Taken: Approved.</p>
<p>VII. Discussion Item: Program Review Cycles</p>	<p><i>Richie</i></p>	<p>Issues Discussed: Richie found a cycle schedule many years ago when AVC did both comprehensive and annual review. He basically copied and pasted and added some non-instructional areas and updated names of some areas.</p> <p>The spreadsheet is simple, which tells you who does comprehensive review first, second, third, and fourth (with</p>

		<p>annual updates). Megan mentioned that it makes sense that it is staggered.</p> <p>Follow Up Items: The committee will review the cycle schedule again.</p>
VIII. Discussion Item: Program Review Rollout Plan	<i>Richie</i>	<p>Issues Discussed: Richie mentioned that it appears that curriculum areas are hoping to start using Coursedog in the fall, so he is not sure how soon we can use it for Program Review. Richie asked Alex about an update. Alex said that report templates could be built in the summer because curriculum needs to be prioritized first.</p> <p>Richie expressed concern about not being able to complete the development of report templates on Coursedog in the spring, since Richie needs to also develop training handouts during the summer. Richie is also concerned about the uncertainty because the committee also needs to test Coursedog and will have to train people how to use it, since no one has ever used it yet. Annamarie said that people will understand if we must wait another year for Coursedog since it's out of the committee's control. Gary agreed. Svetlana also commented that vendors like Coursedog tend to overpromise and under-deliver.</p> <p>Because of these concerns, Richie proposed to the committee to think about the possibility of rolling out the Comprehensive Report/Annual Update cycle in Fall 2026 on paper (email submissions) and transition to Coursedog in Fall 2027.</p> <p>Follow Up Items: Richie will put this item on the agenda as an action item for the next meeting.</p>
IX. Discussion Item: Program Review Handbook	<i>Richie</i>	<p>Issues Discussed: Will table until the committee decides what Program Review will look like for Fall 2026.</p> <p>Follow Up Items: Richie will add this item to discuss for next meeting's agenda.</p>
X. Information Item: What's Ahead This Year		<p>FALL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update and provide Program Review Training in Canvas • Review PR Handbook, update as necessary • Provide CIP instructions & training, due 9/30 • Division Reps will provide support in the Program Review process to their divisions. • Receive Program Review reports, due 11/15 • Define the peer review process, update forms as necessary

		<p><u>SPRING:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer review norming session, train committee members, form peer review teams, begin working on Peer Review reports. • Complete Peer Reviews of Program Review reports, provide feedback to each program. • Consider changes needed to Program Review process, forms, committee, etc.
<p>XI. NEXT MEETING DATES:</p>		<p>Future Meeting Dates: (1st & 3rd Mondays 3pm – 4:30pm)</p> <p><u>Fall 2025:</u> 8/18/25 (Cancelled) 9/1/25 (No meeting, Labor Day) 9/15/25 10/6/25 10/20/25 11/3/25 11/17/25 12/1/25</p> <p><u>Spring 2026:</u> 2/2/26 (No meeting, Spring semester has not started) 2/16/26 (No meeting, President's Day) 3/2/26 3/16/26 4/6/26 (No meeting, Spring Break) 4/20/26 5/4/26 5/18/26 6/1/26</p>

Program Review Committee Goals for 2025-2026

- 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 Program Review template based on feedback to better support operational areas.
- 4) Utilize the Program Review process evaluation data to make continuous improvements.