

LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

Meeting Minutes

Date: November 6, 2025

Time: 2:00 – 4:00 pm

Location: President's Conference Room SS4-409 (Pittsburg) & BRT-125 (Brentwood), Via Zoom (for non-committee members)

Committee Chair: Ryan Pedersen

Recorder: Ryan Pedersen

Members Present: Christina Goff, John Schall, Bill Bankhead, Tanisha Maxwell (remote), Nicole Trager, Sheri Woltz, Tanita Richardson

Members Absent: Paula Gunder, Richard Stanfield, Shannah Hermano

1. Welcome and Public Comments

- The committee welcomed Tanita as the new classified Senate-approved representative and encouraged attendance at an upcoming author event featuring Percival Everett hosted by the Library.

2. AB2449 Teleconference Waiver Request

- The group approved a teleconference waiver request from Dr. Maxwell, allowing her to participate remotely in future meetings. M/S (Bankhead/Trager) – Unanimous.

3. Agenda and Minutes from September 4, 2025, and October 9, 2025, Planning Meeting

- It was proposed to add the Instructional Program Review guide to item 5 of the agenda. With this amendment, the agenda was approved. M/S (Goff/Woltz) – Unanimous.
- The committee reviewed and approved the October minutes with the amendment that the title “James” be put in italics. M/S (Goff/Schall) – Unanimous with abstentions by Bankhead and Maxwell.

- The committee reviewed and approved the September minutes M/S (Goff/Schall) – Unanimous with abstentions by Bankhead and Maxwell.

4. District Updates

Program review dashboards are now public and linked to the new instructional guide, which will be distributed during an upcoming assembly and training session. A limitation was noted regarding the dashboards' ability to accommodate student service areas without course-based cohorts, with plans to develop a student ID-based dashboard system in the future.

- Ryan submitted a test case to the District using student IDs from past learning community cohorts to mimic program review data for templates. The District initially planned to develop a dashboard process starting in January, but Ryan is pressing them to provide a solution for student services and ad hoc areas sooner. Tanisha expressed concern about student services team members needing data to identify goals, and Ryan confirmed plans to create a student services document similar to the instructional one, hoping for district assurance on data submission processes before the LSO meeting on Monday.

5. Potential Modifications to Program Review Template and Timeline

- The group also discussed concerns about the misalignment between program review and PSLO assessment cycles, which Ryan explained was due to changes in the educational strategic planning cycle and the program review pause.
- The conversation focused on addressing faculty confusion regarding the instructional program review template, particularly page 4, which asks for reflection on assessment results and goal-building. Randi, as TLC chair, highlighted faculty concerns about repeating processes and the perceived requirement to start over despite having recently completed a program review. LMC and colleagues discussed drafting a revised guide to clarify connections between the current review and previous assessments, emphasizing that faculty should review their most current data and consider using previous goals if applicable. They also considered the possibility of labeling the current year as Year 1 or Year 3 to better align with the PSLO assessment cycle, though the exact approach remains to be determined.
- The group discussed aligning program review cycles with PSLO assessment and strategic planning. Randi proposed having faculty review and update their existing program goals from Cohort 1, rather than writing new ones, while LMC suggested simplifying the template to focus on goals and activities without specific year designations. The discussion centered on whether to maintain the year 1/3/5 structure or simplify to a single program review cycle, with concerns raised about faculty workload and the need to communicate clear expectations about goal updates and outcome assessment data.

- The group discussed streamlining the program review process by potentially removing dates and using a simplified template that focuses on goal achievement and activities without strict year-based cycles. Randi suggested reusing previous templates with minimal changes, while Tanisha emphasized the importance of long-term goals and alignment with institutional planning cycles. The discussion highlighted concerns about consistency across departments and the need to balance faculty input with institutional goals, with both options being considered to find a middle ground that maintains meaningful assessment while reducing administrative burden.
- The group discussed the program review template and its alignment with strategic planning. They debated whether to maintain the 1-3-5 year structure or move to a simpler two-year cycle. LMC emphasized the importance of keeping the approved template that went through shared governance, while others suggested making the process more flexible for departments to recycle goals from previous reviews. The group agreed to focus on educating departments on how to use the template effectively rather than making major changes to the structure. The group voted to retain the current template with increased professional development and training for faculty on its use. Randi raised concerns about misaligned cycles in program reviews and suggested a more collaborative approach. M/S (Goff/Maxwell) – Unanimous.
- The meeting shifted focus to due dates. The committee also discussed the conflict between the program review due date of February 2nd and the one-year scheduling drafts due February 6th, considering a potential later date for program reviews to allow more time for completion and training.
- The group discussed and approved changing the program review due date to February 27th, with LMC explaining the need to avoid March deadlines due to data collection activities and spring break. The due date change to February 27, 2026, was approved. M/S (Trager/Bankhead) – Unanimous.

6. Goals Survey and Planning for November Assembly

- The committee reviewed a draft survey for college goals with concerns about making it too complex for students and suggesting instead to gather student feedback through a Mentimeter at LMCAS with student senators.
- The committee reviewed the survey format. Tanisha raised concerns about the involvement of different constituency groups in the strategic planning process, particularly noting the absence of classified staff in college assemblies.
- The group agreed to clarify the survey's purpose and instructions, as well as to include sample goal statements for each theme to help participants understand the objectives.
- The Committee agreed to simplify the survey by focusing on goal areas and includes sections, with participants rating each item and selecting up to four goals. Tanisha noted the overlap of the goal areas (for example - career and workforce development goals), and it was acknowledged that the goals were intentionally not mutually exclusive and that part of the process would be to both narrow and combine goal areas through college-wide feedback.

7. Plan for Outcomes for December Meeting

- The Committee Chair will send homework to members. Tabled for time.

8. Campus Communications/Constituency Reports

- Academic Senate, Classified Senate, SGC, and TLC items were not discussed.
- Meeting summary with key items will be sent out to the Planning Committee.

9. Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 pm.