

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

Friday, March 2, 2018
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m., LRC432

ATTENDEES/ PROXIES	<i>Steering Committee/Liaisons</i>	Jonathan McLeod
	Madeleine Hinkes, Co-Chair	Dina Miyoshi
	Jacqueline Collins, Co-Chair (absent)	Monica Romero
	Bruce Naschak, Co-Chair	Charlie Zappia (excused)
	Genevieve Esguerra, Co-Chair (excused)	Chris Kalck
		Erika Higginbotham
	Mark Abajian	
	Juan U. Bernal (excused)	Administrative Support:
	Kevin Branson (excused)	Mona King
	Paula Gustin	Anda McComb
	Bridget Herrin	
	Ian Kay	
	Charlie Lieu (excused)	
	Marichu Magana (excused)	
Larry Maxey		

Agenda Item A: Call to Order: Approval of February 2, Minutes

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of February 2, 2018 Minutes Minutes were M/S/C by Jonathon McLeod and Chris Kalck and approved
-------------------	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON	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	<p>Integrated Planning Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closes March 8th and we will go over the results in the April meeting. As of last week there were 30 or so responses so Anda will be sending out a reminder. <p>Comprehensive Program Review: a list of 30+ categories down to about</p>
-------------------	---

12. (From 11/3/17 meeting)

1. Submission information
2. List of faculty /Staff/et al; Include adjuncts? (optional)
3. Program mission and vision (if any); align with college mission.
4. Program description (from catalog); strengths, challenges, external influences
5. Curriculum: Degree and certificates offered, earned; FTEF numbers; curriculum review
6. CTE (if applicable) Advisory group and labor market
7. Outcomes assessment (CLO, PLO, SSO,SSPO, AUO)
8. IE Data analysis (can include other data if available)
9. Goals, action plans
10. Close loop on last year
11. Resource requisitions
12. Reviews: Liaison, Manager

2018-2019 Comprehensive Program Review

- **outline for sections and questions**
- The 12 topics are based on what we have worked out on previous meetings.
- A lot of the questions will be the same for student services and instruction but since there are unique aspects they are in separate modules.
- Submission information will be the same as last year (#1).
- Executive summary will list major achievements, successes, and challenges for your program.
- This information will help inform our new Ed Master Plan and Strategic Plan.
- When placing the executive summary will we want to place it before #1, after #1, or as part of #1? Last time someone said put it between #1 and 2. We might want to put it ahead of #1.
- Maybe putting it after or even as part of #1 so that it says here are the people involved and here is the executive summary.
- Is #2 all faculty and staff or just new people since the last group? It is comprehensive so we start from scratch.
- Some programs that have dozens of adjuncts do not want to list them all so that could be optional.
- What is the purpose of that particular question? So we can keep a record of it. It is also helpful for the lead writers because it reminds them of the number of adjuncts they have in their program.
- **Mission statement:** Last comprehensive all the programs developed mission statements. There might be a couple of programs that have joined since then that do not have one yet. We align it with the college mission statement.
- PIE committee is currently looking at the college mission statement to see if there should be any changes to it.
- By the time we are getting Program Review together, we will know what the college mission statement will be and it likely won't be too different from what we have.
- **Program:**
- We took description from the catalog last time which was something that accreditation looked at. Having them align helps keep everything consistent

and even helps some programs review their own descriptions that are in the catalog.

- Instead of having separate questions about strengths and challenges we can put them here because everybody has them.
- Do we need to expand on this? Put some more prompts in parentheses to give people things to think about? Strengths and challenges related to the program.
- The challenges part can be copied into the summary too.
- Do we want to ask #4 in this way? We might get some confusion to make them think that they might have to put content there that they do not have to. It could be a grey area.
- The distinction is that #4 is a general statement whereas #9 has specific statements.
- We might possibly want to move this question about strengths and challenges to the Goals area.
- We want to help people think through the process.
- Maybe even just changing the wording of the questions will make it clearer as to what we want.
- We want to be clear that we are providing the right prompts.
- We also want to make it clear that for programs that do not fall under CBTE that there are things that they do not have to do. But we also have to get the information we want from all programs.
- IE data question is going to be under program analysis. Should it be titled something else?
- Adding to the data we provide rather than just focusing on course success, we should put our focus on progress, momentum points, and students reaching milestones.
- Student Services: Last year there was a pilot and we gave a group some data was very meaningful for them.
- We are also working with the partnership that equity has with CUE to develop a dashboard for a number of areas that are a part of student services (SSSP, Equity, Integration, etc.)
- In speaking to a variety of faculty, some faculty have requested that instead of having certain sections in which you have to answer all these questions, leave an option where you can simply have a discussion of what you are doing in this area without having to go through all of the steps just because a committee wants it to do a certain thing.
- Are we concerned here with having this look like something we can present somewhere or is it just for the departments/programs themselves? It is for the betterment of the department/program.
- We do want to leave places where you can tell us about your program.
- We just want to make sure we don't make it too complicated because this is a lot of work for lead writers.
- In terms of goals maybe have guiding prompts instead of specific questions.
- Don't know the amount of flexibility we have in Taskstream to change the goals and action plans section.
- Everyone will be rewriting their goals and mapping them to our college wide strategic goals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is the option to start over with new goals or use the same goals because half of the goals are already completed. This is mostly mapping to the strategic plan not to ILOs. • This tells us that every goal that we create as a college is being met somewhere on campus. Every program is doing their part for the success of the college. • The Goals/Action Plans: • We have some Taskstream people coming on Monday, we will see if they know about this part or not to see if we can make it not quite as complicated. • In your action plan you can say where you are and what needs to be done. • The goal is where your program wants to get to that is specific and doable and then you request the resources that will allow you to meet your goal. • Closing the loop is a part of looking at the process while asking questions like: Did you receive the resources you requested last year? How have they helped? • Resources: • FHP, CHP, and BARC will be looking at their forms and their processes as a result of the survey that we send out. • The possibility for BARC to use a different form because of the difficulty of use. • With new leadership there might be a new format for BARC, just need the surveys to tell us what they want.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address program review questions, form redundancy • Sending out a reminder for Integrated Planning Survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A • Anda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing • Before next meeting

Agenda Item C: New Business:

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource requests to committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If anyone is interested in the list of all the resource requests please let Madeleine know.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Report in progress

Agenda Item D: Announcements/Adjournment:

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Next meeting, April 13, 2018, LRC 4322. Retreat April 6, 20183. The meeting was adjourned by Hinkes at 12:35 p.m.
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• N/A

Submitted by: (Mona) Sahar King

Approved on: _____

DRAFT