SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

San Diego Mesa College
Program Review Steering Committee
Meeting Notes

Friday, March 6, 2020
11:00 p.m. – 12:30 p.m., LRC432

ATTENDEES/ PROXIES	*Steering Committee/Liaisons*	Pegah Motaleb (excused)
	Bridget Herrin , Co-Chair	Isabel O'Connor (excused)
	Lorenze Legaspi, Co-Chair (excused)	Monica Romero
	Bruce Naschak, Co-Chair	Vang Thao
	Erika Higginbotham Co-Chair	Ellen Engels
	Mark Abajian (excused)	Manuel Velez
	Juan U. Bernal	Administrative Support:
	Kevin Branson (excused)	Helena Almassy
	Andrew Hoffman (absent)	Mona King
	Chris Kalck	Anda McComb
	Ian Kay	
	Larry Maxey	Guest:
	Dina Miyoshi	

Agenda Item A: **Call to Order: Approval of February 7, 2020 Minutes**

DISCUSSION	• Approval of February 7, 2020 Minutes.
	• Minutes were M/S by Monica Romero and Erika Higginbotham and approved.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Post approved minutes on the Program Review website.	• Mona King	• Before next meeting

Agenda Item B: **New Business**

DISCUSSION	1. Integrated Planning Survey Results
	• Sent to Lead Writers, Liaisons, and Managers
	o 37% Response Rate.
	• Lead Writer Experience
	o Do Lead Writers need a Liaison? Most respondents said they did not use the help of their Liaison.
	• Liaison Experience
	o 50% of the Liaisons responded (I did communicate with my

assigned Lead Writer **Less than once a month**).
- o Mainly positive responses other than the perceptions of Liaisons.
- o In previous meetings, this committee (PRSC) looked at the perception of Liaisons and whether Liaisons provide valuable feedback as well as if Liaisons are seen as useful.
- o More responses are disagreeing with the sentiment "my Liaison was useful".
- Manager Experience
  - o 9 out of 48 respondents said they served as a Manager.
- Program Review Training
  - o 23 out of 47 respondents said they attended Program Review training/meeting sessions.
- Most Valuable Aspects of Program Review Process
  - o Access to data, setting goals, training, workshops, and support from various sources when needed.
- Recommendations
  - o Make deadlines more flexible or extend them.
  - o Setting up the Cycle, but not yearly.
  - o Make Liaison and Lead Writer training mandatory.
  - o The response rate was lower than last year, 37% compared to 46%.
  - o Discussion within this committee (PRSC) about opting in/out of having a Liaison.
- Certain people may not know that they need a Liaison.
- Discussion on whether the Liaison structure isn't working or if Liaisons aren't feeling supported.
- A comment: Historically it's been difficult to fill Liaison positions, so the Liaisons are spread thin.
- ➢ 2019-2020 Integrated Planning Survey Results
2. Suggestions about Program Review Steering committee membership
- A formal proposal for the ideal representation for Program Review will be brought by next meeting.
- Co-Chairs (from committee membership and representing Faculty, Admin, & Classified) (4)
- Dean of Institutional Effectiveness
- Admin Services Rep
- Student Services Rep
- Instructional Rep
- Faculty Reps (11)
- 1 from each school
- Administrative Reps (4)
- Dean of Institutional Effectiveness
- Instruction
- Student Services

- Administrative Services
- Classified Reps (4)
- Senate Presidents (2)
- Academic Senate
- Classified Senate
- Curriculum Rep (1)
- Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee Rep (1)
- Classified Hiring Prioritization Committee Rep (1)
- Budget Allocation Recommendation Committee Rep (1)
- Strong Workforce Committee Rep (1)
- **26 total members**

3. Process Changes and Timeline for 2020-2021
   - Recommendation to begin developing a handbook.
   - Potentially adding the handbook for access on Canvas.
   - Clarify how Program Review is connected to the 10-year and the 5-year plan.
   - Discussion on resource allocation and how Program Review can help in how people make requests for things.
   - Suggestions for timeline and recommendations to simplify CTE program.
4. Program Review Process and Cycle
   Ideas for consideration -- General structure
   - Clearly connect to the Mesa2030 and the 5-year plan.
   - Allow some open text fields for a program to write in what they believe is important.
   - Consider an alternative cycle as opposed to an annual cycle.
     - If remaining at annual, consider keeping the form/question the same for the entire 5 year cycle and mapping questions clearly to the Mesa 5 year plan.
   - The Program Review Annual Report could be part of the Mesa Annual Report and should address progress towards the goals as a college and themes from the analysis of Program Review.
   Logistics
   - Open the workspaces before school starts.
   - Maintain the rollover of previous years' goals.
   - Integrate other critical deadlines into the timeline so campus understands how processes are connected (i.e. purchasing deadlines).
   - Allow a historical view of requests and whether they were funded in a portal for a program.
   Liaisons
   - Liaisons assigned only to new Lead Writers and all others will have the opportunity to opt-in via a survey of some sort at the beginning of the year.

	• PRSC serves as those Liaisons. CTE • The CTE program will have a unique workspace form other instruction units. • They will be prompted to identify what type of document they are uploading and will attach it (Accreditation, advisory board report, Perkins application, etc.). • May need to add one section mapping to Mesa 5-year Plan goals and SLOs.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Post IP Survey results	• IE Office	• May 6, 2020

Agenda Item C: Announcements/Adjournment:

DISCUSSION	1. **Next meeting April 10, 2020** 2. **Bridget Herrin adjourned the meeting at 12:35 p.m.**

Submitted by: (Mona) Sahar King

Approved on: _____