

**San Diego Mesa College
Program Review Steering Committee
Meeting Notes**

Friday, December 04, 2020
1:00pm p.m. – 2:30 p.m., Zoom

ATTENDEES/ PROXIES	Co-Chairs:	Faculty:
	Bridget Herrin - Institutional Effectiveness (IE)	Mark Abajian - Business and Technology
	Erika Higginbotham - DSPS	Kevin Branson - Technology Services (excused)
	Lorenze Legaspi –BARC	Chris Kalck – Student Services
	Dina Miyoshi – Social Behavioral Science	Bruce Naschak – Humanities
		Pegah Motaleb – English
	Administrators:	Michael Cox – Curriculum
	Linda Hensley - Humanities	James Hinton – Math and Science
	Larry Maxey – Student Equity (excused)	Consultants:
		Monica Romero – Strong Workforce
	Classified Professionals:	Isabel O'Connor – FHP (excused)
	Mona King (excused)	Ellen Engels – CHP (excused)
		Manuel Velez – FHP (excused)
		Anda McComb- IE (excused)
Administrative Support:	Students:	
Mona King – IE (excused)		

Agenda Item A: Call to Order: Approval of October 02, 2020 Minutes

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of October 02, 2020 Minutes. Minutes were M/S by Chris Kalck and Erika Higginbotham and approved.
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post approved minutes on the Program Review website. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mona King 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before next meeting

Agenda Item B: Continuing Business

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Deliverables for 2020-21 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20/21 Goals for PRSC • The 2020/2021 Goals formally approved at previous meeting.
-------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The major thing to develop the handbook and imagine how the cycle will look like for next year. Contents for handbook need to be known. • Membership vacancies in PRSC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No volunteers yet. Process of filling vacancies are in progress. ○ Now that we have our full membership expanded membership proposal has been approved by President's Cabinet. ○ The goal is to fill the vacancies as soon as possible. • Membership proposal ○ Review Handbook <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Goals for the year and the PR handbook ▪ Handbook ▪ Goals and Deliverables for this year
--	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
•	•	•

Agenda Item C: New Business

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Program Review examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a link to this Google doc and our homework assignment was to look at different institutions and look at the models. • The big structural components of what we want our program review cycle to look like, how long are their annual updates or if they're comprehensive. • if they're not comprehensive, do we have static questions that will roll over from year to year? We can start mapping out that content for the handbook and what the instructions of program review will be in September 2021. • Let's reapply the ideas to our institution. • In our current program review, we have both goals and action plans. We need to map out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the actions that your departments are going to engage in to reach those goals? ○ Every year update the status of those goals as either being completed, in progress, so on. ○ They can also add new goals. ○ They can also adjust action plans based on these goals. ○ There are some programs that have three or four goals and there
-------------------	--

are some programs that have 12 goals. we want to make sure that our goals are clearly connected to the Mesa2030 goals.

- **Chris Kalck:** [Pasadena City College](#)
 - they break it up by unit.
 - The last four years, they did something called **Unit Reviews** and 16/17 they looked at all their certificates and 17/18, their local AA degrees in 18/19, ADT in 19/20.
 - About Unit Reviews:
 - This is where everything is like a comprehensive year in parallel.
 - They had admissions and records, but they also had English division.
 - They looked at it all in one big year and then they looked at their curriculum in other years.
 - The Institutional Effectiveness Committee and their Program Review creates sub-teams that review what each of these divisions do when they turn in the work and then the sub-team gives feedback.
- **Linda Hensley:** [Southwestern College](#)
 - Their major way that they develop their budget.
 - As an example, software that's required to teach the class, so their budgets change based on their program review request.
 - Major difference is that for program reviews different divisions have different deadlines.
 - There are layers to the program review.
 - They have a comprehensive and then every year they call it a "snapshot".
- **Monica Romero:**
 - like the idea of the grouping and having that type of structure, but for CTE programs to keep the instructions and keep the ability to submit the work that they already do for Perkins.
 - This is so that CTE programs don't need to repeat the process for program review.
- **Erika Higginbotham:**
 - It would be good to have the yearly opportunity to describe what we're doing for equity as well as pathways initiatives within our departments or programs.
- **Dina Miyoshi:** [San Diego City College:](#)
 - They center their program review around their outcomes and then all the other things are tying it together with the resources with the data. They do have a comprehensive and then annual updates.
- **Mark Abajian** [Palomar College](#)
 - They don't have a comprehensive in the three years.
 - A very brief document of only two sections:

- a reflection
 - The reflection question would be a good model for Mesa to use
 - The Mesa version could be like equity and pathways, that is the consistent and the question could ask departments to update goals.
 - program goal.
 - The comprehensive review, it is definitely much larger. It's a 10-page document.
 - Part of the issue of Mesa's Program Review is that it generally falls on one person.
 - **Bridget Herrin:**
 - COA is currently reestablishing the coordinator position and reorganizing.
 - Merging Doc Reports with Program Review could allow for better outcomes.
 - There's two aspects with regards to the outcome's assessment:
 - Taskstream:
 - This is the space where the actual data entry is happening.
 - Program review:
 - The space where the outcomes questions are asked:
 - For example:
 - "What did you learn what did your program, learn about your outcomes?"
 - "How does that relate to your evaluation of how your program is doing?"
 - "Are there resources that you need based on what you learned?"
 - COA had a conversation about using canvas to collect data. So then there is a report built-in to the site.
 - If we decided to keep that same model of a comprehensive year with an annual report.
 - We can keep the idea of using "snapshots" for annual updates that allows for a short streamlined (ex. drop-down menus) that keeps things simple.
 - Regarding the timeline, the bulk of the time can be spent, in the review phases rather than the writing phase if Mesa implements a shorter timeline with a successive review system.
 - Bridget Herrin [Bakersfield College](#)
 - The annual update stays the same. Each year, departments are asked to do the same things. There are benefits to both versions,
 - One of the challenges with the new questions is continuity
 - we want some level of continuity with people where they reflect

on similar questions from year to year.

- **Lorenze Legaspi:**
 - Two consistent questions can be related to pathways and equity, between the years comprehensive.
 - we know those questions would align with our Leading College of Equity and Excellence mission statement.
 - **Bruce Naschak**
 - If we could find some way of reimbursing the lead writers for their time and energy, then it would feel less onerous to do the job.
 - **Bridget (she/her/hers) Herrin**
 - Do we want the cycle to align with 10-year plan or maybe the 2030 plan?
 - Every example we did looked at has a most updated handbook that is helpful
 - Within the handbooks, they what is the purpose of program review the handbook can serve as a reference for those completing program review.
 - We have folks in our office who spent a lot of hours, pulling everything out Taskstream and then putting it somewhere
 - Some questions:
 - “Is there other meaning that can be drawn from these are there other groups that should be reading these documents?”
 - “What is the purpose of pulling out the info from Taskstream as a report?”
 - The next phase which is next steps and the IE office can start thinking about ways that we can streamline technology, forms within Taskstream, etc.
 - From a content standpoint, we need volunteers from PRSC who draft both a set of questions that would be relevant for the comprehensive year as well as for the annual updates.
 - **Lorenze Legaspi**
 - So, if we're waiting for the next cycle for program review for this strategic plan then this year,
 - we have an opportunity to focus in how COVID has changed our landscape and education.
 - **Bridget Herrin**
 - We would kick off our cycle during the 2022-2023 for the comprehensive and we would dedicate the 2021-2022 year to a post-COVID reflection.
- [Institutional Program Review Examples](#)

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What questions do we want to ask for next year Covid-19 program review? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Members draft 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> before our next meeting in February

Agenda Item D: Announcements/Adjournment:

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Next meeting February 5,2020 Bridget Herrin adjourned the meeting at 1:40 p.m.
-------------------	---

Submitted by: (Mona) Sahar King

Approved on: _____

DRAFT