SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Steering Committee Minutes

12.5.2025 | Zoom ID: 819 9309 6383 | 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Administrative Support: Brenna Bonikowske

Attendees

Chairs:	Hai Hoang (IE); Lucio Lira (SS); Lorenze Legaspi (Admin); ***Vacant (Inst.)***
Administration:	Hai Hoang (IE); Dina Miyoshi (Inst.); Leticia Diaz (SS);
Classified Professionals:	Ayana Woods (CS); Joel Arias (Admin.); Nicole Judd (SS); ***Vacant (Inst.)***
Faculty:	Mary Gwin (AS); Yuka Brown (A&L); Mark Abajian (B&T); Jake Portugal (ES); Bruce Naschak (HUM); Katie Palacios (LRAS); Dina Miyoshi (S&B); Lucio Lira (SSE); Alex Berry (CTE); Rachel Russell (CTE); Michael Cox (CRC)
Student Representative:	Jeremiah Tarvin
Committee Representatives	Alex Berry (SWC); Isabell O'Conner/Mary Gwin (FHP); Larry Maxey/Flordaliza Abuyo (CHP); Lorenze Legaspi (BARC); Howard Eskew (Pathways); Liza Rabinovich (COA)

1. Call to Order
1. The meeting was called to order at **12:07 p.m**. by Hai Hoang
2. Agenda was approved without objections

2. Approval of Minutes

1. Motioned – Bruce Naschak
2. Seconded – Michael Cox
3. Abstained – None
4. Agenda was Approved

3. Communication Loop
1. Liza Rabinovich: Busy support session; additional support was helpful and should be planned for future deadlines. Upcoming meetings include Dean's Council to review the manager's review form and assess dean support needs, and Student Services to provide manager support and training.
2. Shout out to Liza from Bruce
3. Dina Miyoshi: Co-Chair question about finding another person (Spring 2026). Will be voting in Spring of 2026

4. Jeremiah Tarvin: ASG Thanksgiving Feast (thank you for attending) very successful.

5. December 1st Due date, being right after thanksgiving break is not good (make this a **soft deadline** with Feb 3rd being deadline for final edit resource committee begins review being Feb 6; (Faculty) Friday after thanksgiving break; (Writers) have things not being due the first or second day of the spring semester. For the next timeline.

6. Discussed the BARC timeline
   a. Tuesday, February 24: BARC rankings presented at PIEC
   b. Tuesday, March 3: BARC rankings presented at PCAB, first reading
   c. Friday, March 6: BARC rankings presented at PRSC
   d. Tuesday, March 17: BARC rankings presented at PCAB, second reading

7. CHP Timeline
   a. Will be meeting on the 1st and 3rd Thursday of the month beginning in December. Timeline is upcoming

8. FHP Timeline and Rubric Reviews
   a. Friday, March 6: FHP rankings presented at PRSC
   b. Tuesday, March 10: FHP rankings presented at PIEC
   c. Tuesday, March 17: FHP rankings presented at PCAB, first reading
   d. Tuesday, April 7: FHP rankings presented at PCAB, second reading

4. Continuing Business

5. New Business

1. COA's decision of 6-year cycle and implication for Program Review: COA recommended moving to a 6-year review cycle. The group discussed implications for Program Review and clarified questions about who has final authority on the decision. Further discussion is needed among COA, PIEC, and PCAB.

1. Rachel: CTE uses a 2-year assessment cycle; a 6-year cycle may be too long to measure impact.
2. Dina: PR has used varying cycle lengths in the past; if aligned to 6 years, the time span needs careful consideration.
3. Bruce: Supports a 6-year cycle to align with CLO review.
4. Isabel**:** Notes alignment with Accreditation at 6 years.
5. Liza: PR prompts and questions could potentially be reduced; Miramar has a simplified process.
6. Hai: Clarifying that Liza is stating because we are simplifying, we can stay at the current timeline/cycle if we choose so.
7. Bruce: No problem aligning CLO and Curriculum review to six years and simplifying the prompts and questions. Benefit of streamlined timeline across major report processes.
8. Liza: ACCJC do not name years; they want the processes integrated.

2. Program Review Process/Prompt Improvement

1. Hai: We have opportunities for continuous improvement and options available that we haven't yet utilized.
2. Mary: Program Review has traditionally been used to request resources, but it should also serve as a tool for continuous improvement.
3. Isabel: Program Review supports continuous improvement and resource allocation by helping close the loop.

Mesa Process – Unified system, common prompts across all groups, and standardized rubric. New request must be submitted each year; Lead writers can duplicate/copy prior request

Miramar Process- Not unified—groups use different prompts and cycles, with no shared rubric. All follow the same annual timeline. SS and AS use the same prompts each year; Instruction uses different prompts with a comprehensive review every three years. Committees make internal recommendations; no classified hiring committee exists yet, and unfunded requests automatically roll over.

4. Mary: How does BARC make decisions without a rubric and whether approved items are funded in the same year.
   a. Liza: BARC pulls requests from Nuventive and schools to set priorities since they best understand their needs.
5. Dina: How much is PRSC involved in deciding these things?
   a. Lorenze- We can recommend
6. Bruce: Long-standing confusion about committee roles led to creating rubrics, which all three committees reviewed to support lead writers' understanding.
7. Isabel: Other colleges use a similar process, and that general budget context is helpful. Clarified that PRSC should support resource committees and does not direct what they evaluate; resource committees propose process changes.

3. FHP Rubric and Process

1. Mary: FHP unanimously agreed that the current rubric does not work.
   a. EX: sustainability component = hard.
2. Isabel: Previously included data elements were removed because they were too detailed. Question raised about whether the current process provides the key data needed for decision-making, as it now relies heavily on narrative.
3. Hai: The problem is that the current rubric does not provide sufficient quality or relevant data for FHP to make informed ranking decisions.
4. Suggested that metrics such as FTEF, load, number of faculty, and upcoming retirements would make the rubric more useful. The timeline often feels rushed, making it hard to

propose improvements. Concern raised about how data-informed decisions can be made without the right data.

6. Action Items/Announcements/Adjournment

Action Items

1. FHP clarify the solutions/approaches to the current issue
2. Revisit the handbook to clarify the decision-making process and the roles and responsibility of the resource committee versus the program delivery committee.
3. Consider Lead Writers – it may add to the confusion – whichever decision resource committee makes.
4. Keep it simple, direct, and smooth!
5. Shift meeting time to accommodate earlier closure on Friday for Classified.

Adjournment

1. Meeting was adjourned at 1:30pm

7. Resources
1. Meeting Schedule 2025-2026
2. Program Review Resources page
3. Membership 2025-2026
4. Program Review Training Schedule 2025-2026
5. Deliverables for 2025-2026

8. Next Meeting
1. 2.6.2026

9. Minutes submitted by:
Minutes Submitted by: Brenna Bonikowske