



Program Review Committee Minutes for November 21, 2024

2:30- 3:45 pm
Operations Center (OC) 116

Meeting Participants

Committee Members Present

Greg Aycock (co-chair), Quinton Bemiller, Svetlana Borissova, Caitlin Busso, Rosalio Cedillo, Araceli Covarrubias, Vivian Harris, Ashlee Johnson, Starlene Justice, Lindsay Owens, Tim Russell (co-chair) and Dana White.

Committee Members Not Present

Joseph DeGuzman, Daniela McCarson, and Kristin Rigby.

Guest

Hayley Ashby, Jason Caceres, Dan Lambros, and Bill Manges.

Recorder

Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order

- 2:33 pm
- Greg's Retirement, this is Greg's last meeting.

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda

- MSC (Dana White /Ashlee Johnson)

2.1 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

2.2 Approval of October 24, 2024, Minutes

- MSC (Lindsay Owens/Starlene Justice)

2.2 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

3. Discussion Item

3.1 Program Review Cycle

The committee continued the conversation around moving to a five-year cycle aligning with the Strategic Plan.

What would be the repercussions if we went to a 5-year plan were addressed. Reviewed the timeline, which included how the cycle aligns with the Strategic Plan and objectives. If we decide to do this, we will want to start preparing the college and sharing to be ready for the change.

Feedback provided by member areas:

Science:

- What would be expected for the annual update?
- Would we still be able to submit resource requests annually? Yes.
- There wasn't strong opposition to moving to a five-year cycle.

Math

• No comments and no questions, not really affecting anyone but the department chairs.
SBS:

- Don't have the bandwidth to take on more work when there are other areas that need attention, such as assessment and disaggregated data. Program Review is time-consuming, taking away from other necessary work.
- Program review needs to focus on other things like program creation and deletion.
- Concerns about the added workload and lack of guarantee that the updates will be read.
- Alignment to the strategic plan is a good thing.
- Concern about the assessment cycle being aligned to program review; the assessment cycle will be impacted.
- Suggestions:
 - Instead of a mandatory annual update, how about a mandatory mid-cycle update?
 - Make strategic plan 6-years instead of 5.

Committee feedback

- We need a CTE representative to ensure benefits for their areas.
 - Suggestion to include aligning activities for CTE, which include curriculum updates, advisory committees, and analyzing the data to request funding.
- Concern is that people will only be copying and pasting with a one-year mandatory annual update
- An annual update will encourage faculty to track what is happening in each program, reviewing data and goals, documenting progress, and making changes as needed.
- Other college annual updates are mandatory
 - RCC 5-year plan- mandatory annual update.
 - MVC 3-year plan- mandatory annual update. Uses a checklist model.
- The committee discussed the need for a culture shift, where faculty, administration and classified professionals are encouraged to view program review as a valuable tool for self-reflection and improvement.

- Suggestion that conducting an annual review of program data and its impact on goals makes the program review process more meaningful.
- Resources are allocated to programs, and as a practice, we should assess how these programs have improved. Are we currently doing this? If an annual update is conducted, the program has the opportunity to monitor its resources and track progress.
- Need to communicate with student services and management. Suggestion that many of the student services areas already do annual planning.
- Request that the plan and proposal be developed now so the committee has something more structured to review and reflect on in the spring.
 - The sooner we develop and present the plan to the Senate, the more time we will have for feedback.
 - Suggest clarifying how program reviews and annual updates are used after they are submitted. Make the program reviews more usable.

The committee as a whole is in favor of aligning program review with the strategic plan; the frequency of required review within the cycle is up for discussion.

- Suggestions to start thinking about how to address updates, for instance, whether to do a checklist or worksheet or come up with other options.

Follow-up items:

Members were asked to:

- Request more information about the elements that are needed for the CTE areas.
- If haven't done so already please discuss the 5-year program review cycle with their schools to do so at their next school meeting.
- Think about what should be part of an annual update to be discussed in the spring.

Co-chairs will start developing a preliminary plan for the 5-year program review cycle to present at the next meeting.

3.2 Credit for Prior Learning Addition to Program Review

The committee continued the conversation on whether to include the Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) suggested questions to program review.

Comments and Concerns:

- It makes sense that this would be added to the program review. May want to review the questions.
 - Should these questions only be included on CPL template?
- The committee expressed some confusion and concerns over the process and intent of credit for prior learning for some disciplines, especially non-CTE disciplines.
- Committee members to consider attending a Credit for Prior Learning training session when available or ask the CPL leader to provide training to the committee.
- Suggestion to not rush CPL inclusion and to seek feedback from schools before implementing.
- Suggestion to reach out to CPL representative for further information and clarification.

4. Information Items

4.1 Annual Update November 15th

- The annual update was opened on Friday, November 15th, and will stay open until March 14th, 2025. Nor-all was sent at 10:30 on the 15th.

5. Good of the Order

- College-wide retirement party Dec. 3rd at 3 pm in CSS-217.
- The committee really appreciated Greg's hard work. Greg is privileged to have had the time to get to know all the members and work with everyone.
- Townhall is on Dec. 3rd at 12:50-1:50 pm.

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Program Goals Progression Prompt
- Credit for Prior Learning Addition to Program Review

7. Adjournment

- 3:45 pm

Next Meeting

Date: February 27, 2025

Proposed Credit for Prior Learning Addition to Program Review

CPL is one of the state Chancellor's projects and part of the CCCCO Vision 2030. It is also a requirement of Title 5 and Title 38 (Veterans). The Dept. of Defense and VA are doing audits to ensure our community colleges are offering CPL to our Veterans and their families. Recently, a community college lost its financial aid funding because while it said it did, it had no proof and could not pass the audit. Other colleges are being put on notice.

Because of this, there is a request for CPL to be considered in the program review process. This would allow us to capture the data on whether schools/disciplines are offering CPL, awarding CPL, or not. This will allow us to stay in the good graces of all stakeholders involved in the legislative processes of CPL.

Four simple questions to ask our faculty writing or updating their program review:

1. Do you offer any Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) within your discipline?
2. If yes, which course/s has your discipline approved as CPL and the type (JST, Standardized Exams, Credit by Exam, Industry Credential/Certification, or Portfolio Review)?
3. If not, please explain why, and include a timeline when CPL can be discussed within your discipline.
4. How often has your discipline awarded or reviewed potential awards of CPL in the last two years?

This inclusion will help identify access and equity opportunities and make our programs stronger.

Proposal to Transition Program Review to a five-year cycle.

At present, our program review cycle ends in Spring 2027, which is Year 2 of the new strategic planning cycle.

- The new 5-year strategic plan will almost be half completed by the time we align our program reviews with the new 2030 Objectives (Blue and Green Bars on Timeline)
- The new 5-year strategic plan draft has 17 objectives, including 8 key performance indicators (KPIs); the previous/current plan has 76 objectives, including 15 KPIs – current program reviews may be aligned with objectives/KPIs that don't exist anymore.
- Ranking of resource requests is based on alignment with strategic planning objectives, which may impact the prioritization of requests due to no longer aligning with the new objectives.
- The new 5-year program review cycle would be staggered by one year from the strategic plan so the new objectives will be available when mapping to goals, etc. (Blue and Purple Bars on Timeline).

	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32	2032-33	2033-34	2034-35	2035-36	2036-37	2037-38	2038-39	2039-40	2040-41	2041-42
Current Strategic Plan	Dark Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Dark Blue	Dark Blue	Dark Blue	Dark Blue	Dark Blue		
New Program Review			Purple	Purple	Purple	Purple	Purple	Light Purple	Light Purple	Light Purple	Light Purple	Light Purple	Light Purple	Light Purple	Light Purple	Light Purple	Light Purple	
Current Program Review	Green	Green	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Green	Green	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green

- If we go to 5-year program review cycle – annual updates become required, but simple.
- Take this back to your schools for feedback.