

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Committee

**Meeting – Friday, November 2, 2012, 11:00 a.m. -12:30 pm
LRC, Room 435**

PRESENT: Jill Baker (Co-chair), Manny Bautista, Anar Brahmhatt, Kristan Clark (co-chair), Brian Cushing, Anne Geller, Ashanti Hands, Brianna Hays, Ian Kay, Angela Liewen, Cesar Lopez, Andrew MacNeill, Marichu Magana, Laura Mathis, Jonathan McLeod, Dina Miyoshi, Claude Mona, Caterina Palestini, Monica Romero (co-chair) Sue Saetia, Ebony Tyree, Robin Watkins, Kathleen Wells (Co-chair).

ABSENT: Jill Moreno-Ikari, Bruce Naschak, Robert Will.

GUEST: None.

The meeting was called to order at 11:10 a.m. by Dr. Jill Baker, Dean, Business and Technology, Co-chair, in LRC 435. An agenda was previously distributed.

1. Review and Approval of Agenda ().** No items were added to the agenda.

2. Welcome & Introduction of New Members. Baker welcomed new Committee members: Anar Brahmhatt, Cesar Lopez, Claude Mona and Sue Saetia and Robert Will (ASG).

3. Minutes of August 31 (meeting), September 7 (liaison training) and October 5 (virtual meeting). The minutes of these meetings are under review and will be posted online.

4. Update on Program Review Liaison Guide. Baker indicated a revised Liaison Guide was sent to assist liaisons with reading the program review documents. There have been some minor issues with lead writers submitting the form as “final” instead of “preliminary” at this time. Caterina Palestini has worked behind the scenes to resolve these issues. The due date is November 26th and after that date, the system will not accept submission to be considered for resource allocation. Kathleen Wells relayed her experience as a lead writer, indicating some areas were locked and inaccessible. Bri Hays explained the submission process, using the “check out/check in” feature.

Baker indicated a follow up email containing further instructions about the submission process will be sent to the Committee and the lead writers. Palestini reminded the Committee members who play multiple roles such as department chairs/ supervisors and lead writers/liaisons to be aware of the messages generated by TaskStream and for which role they relate. For example, they may see work spaces for their role as liaison, but they would not review as supervisor.

Jonathan McLeod indicated additional training would be helpful in terms of the review process to include the lead writer submission, liaison feedback, etc. In his case, he provided feedback in the form of a Word document to the lead writer.

Discussion followed as to addressing the issue of a lead writer who does not submit the program review but it is the timeframe for liaison review. To assist with input and submission of the program review, Baker noted a 3-hour “drop in” session may be scheduled for lead writers.

Dina Miyoshi inquired about the importance of the liaison preliminary feedback suggesting that the goal is to give feedback regardless of the format used. Wells reminded the Committee that the purpose of the liaison preliminary feedback was to ensure the liaisons were involved and giving feedback during the process.

Geller reported there appears to not be a section on the update form to note that new goals were submitted. She noted the ease of communication about these matters via email with the lead writer. Baker noted a question of this nature may be added to the update form. Wells noted she saw an icon in the form that indicated information was in the new goal area. Hays added a status of "in progress" is listed under the "Submission and Read Reviews" section. Cesar Lopez reported the use of screen shots and the Guide were very helpful and easy to follow. Ebony Tyree added it has been helpful to her lead writers if she works alongside them.

Wells thanked Hays and Palestini for their availability to provide assistance as needed.

Baker indicated a follow up email will be sent to lead writers about requests for faculty.

5. Next Steps.

- **Final Liaison Feedback.** Baker noted this is the final feedback that becomes the official Annual Report.
- **Program Review Due Dates.**
 - **Lead Writers: November 26, 2012.** The final program review is due by November 26th.
 - **Chairs/Supervisors: November 27, 2012.** The chairs/supervisors review is due by November 27th.
 - **Deans/Managers: November 30, 2012.** The deans/managers review is due by November 30th.
 - **Liaisons: December 3, 2012.** The liaison final review is due by December 3rd. The Committee will review feedback at the December meeting.

Palestini and Baker will be monitoring submission of the program reviews to ensure adherence with the timeline. Email reminders will be sent at intervals to assist with the next steps.

6. Roundtable. Manny Bautista inquired about the next steps with the liaison process once he provided feedback. Baker indicated the lead writer may ask questions about the feedback but the next steps involve the final submission and review. Anar Brahmhatt inquired about feedback to lead writers about goals. Baker noted it is appropriate to provide feedback to lead writers that would strengthen their goals. McLeod suggested with the transition from the process used last year to the automated version this year that a sentence or two added by the lead writer to summarize and connect last year's program review to this year's.

Palestini noted LRC 435 is not available for the December meeting and it is currently scheduled in G105. With the opening of the new Student Services building, she has requested use of I4-207. The room number will be communicated with the December Notice of Meeting.

7. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 pm.

Submitted by Caterina Palestini, Senior Secretary,
Ex-Officio Administrative Support
Reviewed and approved by Jill Baker, Co-Chair