 **Program Review and Planning Committee**

Co-Chairs: Daniel Berumen and Mary Bogan

https://committees.fullcoll.edu/program-review/

Meetings 2nd and 4th Thursdays, 3pm in 227 (Cruz Reynoso Building)

**Program Review & Planning Committee 9/11/2025**

**Notes**

**Attendees:**

***Co-Chairs:*** Daniel Berumen and Mary Bogan

***Faculty Representatives:*** Vacant (Humanities), Val Macias (LLRISPS), Rachel Nevarez (Tech & Engineering), David Francisco Lopez (Fine Arts), Josh Ashenmiller (Social Sciences), Olivia Barajas (Counseling), Dale Craig (Business & CIS), Marcia Foster (PE), Christopher Persichilli (Natural Sciences), Luciano Rodriguez (Math & Computer Science)

***Classified Representatives*:** Tina Maertens, Sara Camacho, Matthew Muranaga, (Vacant)

***Management Representatives****:* Sam Foster, Deniz Fierro, Jeanette Rodriguez (sub for Jessica Johnson), and Kristine Nikkhoo

***Resource Members*:** Henry Hua, Sonia de la Torre, Bridget Kominek

***Student Representative:*** Ashton Seib

**Absent**: Josh Ashenmiller, Dale Craig, Henry Hua, Sonia de la Torre, Bridget Kominek

|  |
| --- |
| **MAIN AGENDA** |
| **TIME** | **TOPIC** | **ACTION & NOTES** |
| 3-3:05pm | Call to order, approval of the agenda, approval of the notes | * [Approval of notes from 8/28/2025](https://fullcolledu.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/r/sites/ProgramReviewCommittee308/Shared%20Documents/General/Meeting%20Notes%20and%20Agendas/Fall%202025%20PRPC%20Meeting%20Notes%20and%20Agenda/8.28.2025/PRPC%20Notes%208.28.25.docx?d=w0ab6b001c40046c59ed8fb45a4672177&csf=1&web=1&e=BcFGIj)
	+ A motion was made by Rachel Nevarez and seconded by Sara Camacho.
	+ The committee voted to approve the previous meeting notes.
	+ No oppositions recorded.
	+ 1 abstention: Jeannette Rodriguez
 |
| 3:05-3:10pm | Public comments | * Daniel provided an overview of the committee’s purpose to the new student representative.
 |
| 3:10-3:20pm | Co-chair report: Daniel and Mary | * Update/follow-up on training
	+ The Instructional Program Review training was held on Friday, 9/5/25, with over 50 participants in attendance. The chairs reviewed the new Program Review form, which is now live. Users must request login access through the [Microsoft form link](https://forms.cloud.microsoft/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=L3W0-CmKDk2XtfdChQWrOFczeOExRiNGmkCUdbX0CuBUNzI0RU9TUVpOMVpYSVM1TExBQ1E1V0VMMC4u) before being able to use the software.
	+ The training session was recorded, and the Zoom link, along with related materials, have been posted on both the Program Review Committee and Office of Institutional Effectiveness websites.
	+ **Action Item:** The chairs discussed creating a short tutorial video to demonstrate how to use the software. The committee chairs discussed the possibility of developing a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document to provide additional support (if needed).
	+ It was also recommended that users complete their responses in the Word version of the form and then copy and paste answers into the software, as the system does not auto-save.
* The Administrative Operations & Student Services programs will use the same Program Review form as last year, with additional information to be provided in the near future. There will be an upcoming zoom training on Friday, October 24, from 10am-11am.
* The Program Review & Planning Committee Chairs are hosting virtual [office hours](https://outlook.office.com/book/ProgramReviewOfficeHours%40fullcolledu.onmicrosoft.com/?ismsaljsauthenabled) via from 9/8 - 11/7. These office hours are intended to provide support and guidance to faculty and staff who require assistance in completing their Program Review.
* **Action Item:** The committee noted that the Humanities division still needs a position filled, Social Sciences requires a substitute, and the Ethnic Studies division will need a representative.
 |
| 3:20-3:30pm | Questions | * What questions do committee members have/or are getting about the program review process?
	+ Committee members raised questions they have received regarding the Program Review process. Common inquiries include how to read and interpret the data. In the past, a video explaining data interpretation was available, and creating a similar resource may be helpful if needed. Historically, most questions have been data-related.
	+ Adding definitions for dashboard terminology to provide clarity for users could be helpful.
	+ Student Services programs have begun inquiring about next year’s comprehensive Program Review. A draft version of the review is currently available, and the committee will review it in October.
	+ The form for Division Offices will follow the same format as previous years but will be optional this cycle. Strategic Action Plans (SAP) and operational request sections remain unchanged, and front-end questions can be easily modified. The committee discussed the possibility of creating a shorter, third version of the form that still allows operational requests to be submitted.
 |
| 3:30-3:45pm | Review the Self-Studies Rubric | **Rubric Update*** The committee discussed that the current rubric is four years old and in need of updating. Historically, members completed the rubric while reviewing Self Studies as part of their readers’ reports.
* Each question in the program review was described as a mini-argument, and the rubric should assess the persuasiveness of responses. Members discussed the importance of determining whether additional data is needed to evaluate the argument effectively and how to ensure program review writers understand the goals, whether they are achievable, and if previous years’ reflections are included.
* The committee agreed to move away from evaluative language like “does not meet expectations” toward a neutral framework that assesses whether programs address prompts and provide actionable recommendations. Descriptions for each category will also need to be created.

**Evaluation Process*** The committee discussed focusing on growth and development by highlighting exemplary areas, areas needing improvement, and alignment with college mission and goals. Members noted that some program reviews lack tangible outcomes or are too abstract, and sometimes responses do not explain the reasoning behind answers.

**Feedback Process** * The current system of detailed section-by-section comments is seen as burdensome and inconsistent. The committee discussed creating a structured feedback process for Program Reviews. Members agreed that a summary or concise narrative informed by the rubric at the end of each review would be helpful to highlight overall strengths, areas for improvement and alignment with strategic goals. This “Readers Summary” or “Committee Summary” would consist of notes taken during the review, summarized in roughly a paragraph. The committee also discussed whether programs should be asked to make edits, respond, or resubmit; past experience indicates that providing feedback in this manner has generally been well-received.

**Resource Requests*** Questions arose about whether the committee should evaluate resource requests, which PBSC will have access to and process. Regarding SAPs and program goals, the committee emphasized ensuring all program review questions are fully answered, prioritizing SAPs after review, and passing them to PBSC. Divisions will receive a list of their SAPs so deans can discuss priorities with coordinators.

**Action Items**: **Schedule a meeting before 9/25 to discuss and build the rubric.** * The committee plans to schedule a meeting before September 25 that will be open to all members to discuss and build the updated rubric. Committee members will discuss revising the approval levels to replace evaluative language. Additionally, the committee will consider what data will be collected and how it will be used to inform strategic planning.
 |
| 3:45pm-4pm | Program Review Process | * The committee began brainstorming the self-study review process for Spring 2026.
* There is a total of 60 program reviews scheduled for reading in February–March 2026. Members present in January may begin distributing the reviews.
* Historically, the committee divided into small groups, each assigned a number of program reviews. Each group would read all assigned reviews and prepare a final readers’ report.
* The committee agreed to adopt the same division of labor process used four years ago.

Meeting adjourned: 4:24pm |
|  | Next Agenda:  | * Next meeting the committee will finish the draft of the rubric/reader report and develop timeline for spring 2026
* Daniel will present on Strategic Action Plans
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **RESOURCES** |
| * NOTE: Next meeting, 9/25, will be held in Building 2400, Rm. 107
* Upcoming Fall 2025 meetings (2nd and 4th Thursdays 3pm-4:30pm) in Room 227: 10/9; 10/23; 11/13; 12/11
 |