

# Program Review and Assessment Cycle Proposal – Updated Draft Document

Los Medanos College  
Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC)  
Proposal for Program Review Process Alignment  
Updated November 2025

---

## Background

At Los Medanos College, the Program Review process is designed to support continuous improvement through the review of course and program learning outcomes, student success data, and goal-setting aligned with institutional priorities. Historically, this process was intentionally aligned with both our five-year **Assessment Cycle** and **Curriculum Review Cycle** to promote coherence and professional growth.

Under the original model:

- **Year 1:** Faculty assess course-level learning outcomes and revise curriculum. Faculty complete the Program Review to reflect on assessment data and set new goals based on the program-level assessments that took place in Year 5.
- **Years 2-4:** Faculty assess course-level learning outcomes and revise curriculum.
- **Year 5:** Faculty assess program-level outcomes and prepare to complete Program Review in Year 1.

Program Review “Year One” reports were completed after a full assessment cycle, followed by **Year Three and Year Five updates** to report progress on goals.

Our **Curriculum Review Cycle** also follows a five-year pattern, ideally syncing with assessment and program review timelines (e.g., courses assessed during year 1 of the cycle are reviewed and revised in year 2).

---

## Current Context

The COVID-19 pandemic and new software adoptions disrupted both assessment and curriculum cycles. A “pause” in the Program Review process was implemented to re-evaluate reporting tools and timing.

The most recent full **Year One Program Review** was completed in **2022–2023**, meaning:

- **2024–2025** should have been a **Year Three Update**, and
- **2026–2027** would have been the **Year Five Update**.

However, the new **Planning Committee** process introduces a revised Program Review template (approved through Shared Governance) and directs all departments to complete a **Year One Program Review by February 2026** — two years ahead of schedule.

This change misaligns the established **Program Review**, **Assessment**, and **Curriculum** cycles. Faculty have expressed concern about the sustainability of operating three cycles on different timelines.

---

## Proposals for Consideration

The Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) leadership seeks faculty input on three possible approaches:

---

### Option 1: Resume from the Pause (Year Three Update)

- Complete a **Year Three Update** in 2025–2026 instead of a new Year One Review.
- Use the new Program Review template, transferring relevant information from the 2022–2023 review and updating goals/progress.
- Complete the next **Year One Program Review** in **2027–2028**, maintaining the intended five-year sequence.

### Rationale:

- Preserves the logic and alignment of the existing cycles.
  - Honors the 22/23 Program Review as the legitimate Year One.
  - Reduces unnecessary workload duplication.
-

## Option 2: Realign the Assessment Cycle to Match the New Program Review Timeline (Revised Based on Committee Feedback)

- Accept the new Program Review timeline requiring a **Year One Program Review in 2025–2026**.
- **Realign the Assessment Cycle** by *stretching or extending the current assessment cohorts* to sync with the new Program Review cycle.
- During 2025–2027, departments would focus on completing outstanding **course-level assessments**, allowing the assessment cohorts to catch up and recalibrate.
- The next **program-level assessments** would occur in **2029–2030**, aligning with a new **Year One Program Review in 2030–2031**.

### Rationale:

- Clarifies that this is a realignment rather than a “pause.”
  - Provides a structured way to bring course, program, and curriculum cycles back into harmony.
  - Reduces overlap and redundancy by ensuring that program-level assessment informs Program Review as intended.
  - Works within the new Program Review schedule while maintaining long-term cycle integrity.
- 

## Option 3: Proceed As-Is (Cycles Out of Sync)

- Follow the Planning Committee directive to complete a **new Year One Program Review by February 2026**.
- Continue the Assessment and Curriculum cycles on their current timelines, accepting that the three will remain misaligned.

### Rationale:

- Fully aligns with the newly approved Shared Governance process.
  - Requires no immediate structural changes.
  - May lead to ongoing misalignment, increased faculty workload, and diminished coherence across planning cycles.
- 

## **Next Steps**

The Teaching and Learning Committee is gathering faculty feedback to determine whether the faculty body would like TLC leadership to advocate for realignment or to proceed with the Planning Committee's current structure.

Please review the three options and share your department's perspective.