

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Steering Committee Minutes

Friday, March 1, 2024

Zoom ID: 819 9309 6383

1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Attendees:

Hai Hoang, Dina Miyoshi, Erika Higginbotham, Leticia Diaz, Yuka Brown, Mark Abajian, Kimberly Mills, Bruce Naschak, Rachel Russell, Michael Cox, Catherine Cannock, Liza Rabinovich, Lorenze Legaspi, Lisa Burgert, Linda Hensley

A. Call to Order

- The meeting was called to order by Committee Chair Hai Hoang at 1:05 PM

B. Approval of February 2, 2024, Minutes

- **Motion:** The motion for the approval of the minutes from February 2, 2024, was presented by Kimberly Mills
- **Second:** The motion was seconded by Erika Higginbotham
- **Abstention:** N/A
- **Opposed:** N/A
- **In Favor:** (Number) votes
- **Approved on:** March 1, 2024

C. Continuing Business

1. Update from committee members

- N/A

2. Update from co-chairs

- The Co-chair underscored the critical nature of the shared Governance Committee process for the college, highlighting the necessity for consistent and comprehensive representation at committee meetings.
- **Importance of Attendance:** Emphasized the vital role that each committee member plays in representing their area, ensuring that all perspectives are considered in discussions and decisions.
- **Proxy Representation:** In cases where direct participation is not possible, the co-chair urged members to appoint a proxy or send a

representative. This ensures that all areas remain informed and contribute to the collective decision-making process.

- **Action Item:**
 - Members who anticipate being unable to attend a meeting are asked to notify the committee in advance and arrange for a proxy or representative to participate on their behalf.

3. Update on resource committees and next steps

a) BARC (Budget Allocation and Resource Committee) Timeline update

- The BARC Committee successfully completed their rankings and presented them to Program Review. The transition to [Nuventive](#) program review process was notably smooth, highlighting the efficiency of the newly implemented procedures.
- **Key Points:**
 - **Rubric Development:** The task force's collaborative effort in creating a combined rubric for evaluation was effective and well-received within the BARC context.
 - **Next Steps:** The committee's recommendations will proceed to the President's Cabinet for consideration and undergo two readings. Subsequently, constituent groups will review these recommendations before a final posting is made by the Pcab upon approval.
 - **Funding:** A significant update for this year is the allocation of \$250,000 dedicated to the program list, enhancing the predictability and transparency of funding decisions. This set amount, supplemented by potential career education grants, brings the total available funds to approximately \$300,000.
 - **Safety Considerations:** Items related to safety were deliberately excluded to avoid confusion during the committee's review process. The inclusion of specific prompts aided in this clarification.
 - **Feedback and Suggestions:** While the process was successful, the committee suggests refining the instructions to better emphasize the need-based criteria at the beginning of the process. This

adjustment could enhance clarity and ensure a more targeted approach in future evaluations.

- The BARC Committee's report underscores a significant step forward in streamlining the program review process, with a clear path laid out for future actions and an improved financial framework to support these endeavors.
- **Q&A Segment:** Clarification on Non-BARC Requests
 - **Question by Committee Member:** A member inquired about the handling of requests submitted under BARC that do not fall within its purview, such as safety requests or those that should bypass the BARC process. They asked whether the BARC committee contacts the lead writers to clarify the appropriate process for these requests.
 - **Response by Lorenze Legaspi:** Lorenze affirmed the committee's proactive approach in managing such requests. He explained that for any request identified and pulled from the BARC process be it safety-related, supplies, or replacements for equipment/software otherwise covered by different processes he personally will engage in further discussions with the lead writers and overseeing managers. Lorenze highlighted that most of these removed requests could be funded through alternative means. He assured us that these instances would be noted on the full list for transparency and to facilitate further action.

b) FHP (Faculty Hiring Priority) Timeline Update

- A brief update on the FHP Committee's activities and progress was shared, highlighting the ongoing voting process and the plans for addressing broader aspects of the committee's responsibilities.
- **Key Updates:**
 - **Voting Process:** The committee is currently engaged in the voting process, a critical step in their workflow to finalize decisions on key matters under their purview.
 - **Future Meetings:** A follow-up meeting has been scheduled to delve into additional aspects of the

group's focus. This meeting is expected to facilitate further discussions and resolutions on pending topics.

- **Communication with Leadership:** The update was based on a conversation with Andrew, who serves as the Co-Chair of the FHP Committee, ensuring that the information reflects the committee's status and next steps accurately.
- **Overall Progress:** Indications are that the committee's work is progressing smoothly, with positive outcomes anticipated from the scheduled discussions and decisions.

c) CHP (Classified Hiring Priority) Timeline Update

- The CHP Committee shared insights and progress following their presentation of the initial list to the Program Review, emphasizing the utility and effectiveness of the current rubric.
- **Key Points:**
 - **Rubric Evaluation:** The committee commended the simplicity and consistency of the rubric used for evaluation, noting that, similar to the BARC committee's feedback, there were no suggestions for changes in the questions or scoring system for the upcoming year. The effectiveness of the rubric suggests a well-aligned assessment tool with the committee's objectives.
 - **Future Steps:** As with the BARC report, the CHP's recommendations are slated for presentation to the President's Cabinet for two readings. This step will precede the discussion among constituency groups, facilitating broader engagement and feedback on the committee's findings and recommendations.
 - **Conclusion on Changes:** The committee sees no immediate need to adjust the rubric, or the evaluation process based on the current cycle's experience, indicating a smooth and effective operation that aligns well with their goals.
- The CHP Committee's report reflects a successful review process, underscoring the effectiveness of the existing rubric

and evaluation procedures. The absence of recommended changes denotes satisfaction with the current methodology and anticipates a similar approach in the next cycle.

4. Program Review Feedback Survey

a. Preliminary data

- The committee revisited the topic of the Program Review Feedback Survey, with Hai Hoang presenting the current status of responses and seeking input on the survey's duration and the implications of the response rate.
- **Current Status:**
 - The survey has collected 25 responses over six weeks, a decrease from previous years. This has prompted a discussion on whether to extend the survey period to increase participation.
- **Concerns and Considerations:**
 - **Timing for Improvements:** Hai Hoang explained the importance of timely feedback analysis to implement improvements or changes for the next semester. The committee aims to review the survey results and discuss potential actions in the remaining meetings of the semester, scheduled for April 5th and May 3rd.
 - It was noted that the survey design facilitates straightforward data extraction, allowing for efficient review and discussion by the committee.
- **Timing for Improvements:** A committee member highlighted the importance of reviewing the survey feedback promptly to make necessary improvements or changes for the next semester. The committee plans to review the survey results and discuss potential actions in the remaining meetings of the semester.
- **Suggestions and Feedback Quality**
 - One member suggested that interest in providing feedback might increase as more details about the program review process become available. However, there was concern about not leaving the survey open too long to ensure there is enough time for discussion and decision-making.

- The lower response rate compared to previous years was discussed. One interpretation offered was that this could indicate fewer complaints or issues, potentially reflecting satisfaction with the current processes.
- **NA Responses:** A substantial number of responses were rated as not applicable (NA), prompting a discussion on what this could indicate about the survey questions or the respondents' experiences.
- **Analysis of Preliminary Data:** Preliminary data showed strong responses in some areas, while highlighting potential areas for improvement in others, such as the timeline process and the connection between program review and resource allocation.
- **Small Sample Size Concerns:** The discussion acknowledged the limitations posed by the small sample size, especially for questions with a small number of responses, making it challenging to draw definitive conclusions.
- **Future Survey Analysis:** Suggestions were made to possibly combine questions from different sections for a more comprehensive analysis, considering the similarities in questions across different categories.
- **Training Modalities:**
 - Feedback on the training sessions was positive, with most responses indicating that the sessions were scheduled at convenient times and offered frequently enough. This is evidenced by the absence of negative (red) responses and the presence of some areas of concern (orange), suggesting minor issues that could be addressed for further improvement.
 - Specific aspects evaluated included the organization of the training, its perceived usefulness, and the adequacy of its frequency, with overall feedback indicating satisfaction among respondents.
 - The presence of some uncertainty or moderate concern (yellow responses) suggests areas where further refinement in scheduling or frequency might enhance the overall effectiveness of the training sessions.

- The committee noted the importance of continuing to monitor feedback to ensure training remains aligned with participants' needs and to identify areas for enhancement.
- **Next Steps:**
- The committee discussed extending the survey for a few more weeks to improve response rates, with a plan to revisit and review the data at the next meeting. There was a consensus on the need to balance seeking more feedback with having adequate time for analysis and planning for improvements.
- The discussion concluded with an agreement on the strategic importance of managing the survey period effectively. The committee plans to further examine the preliminary data for insights into participant satisfaction and areas for improvement, ensuring a well-informed approach to future actions.

D. New Business

1. ACCJCC Update

- **ACCJC Inquiry:** The discussion touched on the recent ACCJC inquiries, focusing on outcomes assessments and the integration of curricular processes with program review efforts.
- **Accreditation Process Update:** An update was provided on the college's ACCJC accreditation process, noting that the final decision will not be available until June. Preliminary feedback suggests a positive outlook, with anticipation of commendations for various college initiatives.
- An update was shared on the college's ACCJC accreditation process. While the writing phase is still underway, feedback is anticipated within two weeks, with a final decision expected in June. The committee expressed optimism about maintaining accreditation status and receiving positive feedback on various initiatives.

2. Discussion on potential changes to PR questions

- The agenda included a point on potential changes to the program review questions, though specifics were not recalled at the moment. It was noted that further clarification might be needed to proceed with this discussion.
- The discussion opened about reintegrating outcome-related questions into the program review process, acknowledging past practices and considering the necessity due to ACCJC focus areas. There was no definitive decision, but a commitment was made to explore this further, especially considering feedback from ACCJC and discussions at the Committee on Outcome Assessment.
- **Key Points:**
- The committee deliberated on whether to add outcome assessment questions back into the program review process, considering past removals aimed at reducing workload.
- Concerns were raised about adding to the workload of faculty, especially for CTE (Career Technical Education) programs with multiple review requirements.
- The possibility of streamlining or automating parts of the process using the new [Nuventive](#) platform was discussed, with a commitment to explore functional capabilities and reduce duplication of efforts.

E. Follow-up on action items from the last meeting

- It was agreed to schedule further discussions with the new [Nuventive](#) consultants to explore how the platform can support streamlined outcome assessment integration without increasing the workload.
- The committee plans to review ACCJC feedback and other input to inform any decision about changes to program review questions, with a focus on simplicity, relevance, and minimizing workload.

F. Announcements/Adjournment

G. Resources

- [Program Review Resources page](#)
- [Program Review Training Schedule](#)
- [Membership 2023-2024](#)
- [2023-2024 Meeting Schedule](#)

- [Deliverables for 2023-2024](#)

H. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 1:04:30

Minutes

- Minutes Submitted by: Sahar Mona King
- Approved on:

Next Meeting

- April 5, 2024