

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

Friday, May 4, 2018
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m., LRC432

ATTENDEES/ PROXIES	<i>Steering Committee/Liaisons</i>	Jonathan McLeod (excused)
	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 (excused)
		Erika Higginbotham (excused)
	Mark Abajian (absent)	
	Juan U. Bernal (excused)	Administrative Support:
	Kevin Branson (excused)	Mona King
	Paula Gustin	Anda McComb
	Bridget Herrin	Alanna Milner
	Ian Kay	
	Charlie Lieu (excused)	
	Marichu Magana (excused)	
Larry Maxey (excused)		

Agenda Item A: Call to Order: Approval of April 13, Minutes

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of April 13, 2018 Minutes • Minutes were M/S by Dina Miyoshi, Ian Kay 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>1. Integrated Planning Survey : Madeleine</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report with recommendations is complete and will be sent out to the committee. • 6 recommendations in total: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More assistance from BARC and FHP. ○ Simplify and update BARC and CHP request forms. ○ Simplify the Taskstream system. ○ Provide additional resources and examples for resource request forms. ○ Make the PR process more inclusive in terms of the questions we ask.
-------------------	--

○ Keep the processes consistent.

- Data shown to committee.
- How is this translating to the work we need to do for comprehensive? Keeping in mind what the 6 recommendations were.
- In the report, the numbers are mostly compared to previous years.
- CHP form will be integrated into the program review form with FHP and BARC will be an online form.
- The biggest scores were with the timeline being clear.
- This did not track how many people went back to watch the zoom's.
- Report and preliminary PowerPoint will be sent out to the group.
- Resource request forms seemed to be the biggest problems. However, people were pleased with the help they were able to obtain for the CHP form.

- Bruce brought back suggestions for the committee to discuss for clarification.
- Suggestion: the possibility of populating the new form with some material from the previous years.
- Suggestion: Instead of names, in a third element, ask what the ratio is of classes taught by full-time faculty vs. adjunct faculty according to AB1725 directives.
- Program Mission statement feedback: delete "Support the mission of the college" and have a link to the mission statement right there in the box.
- "Strengths, challenges, external influences" – Why is this in program description vs. in the analysis? How about "Program Overview"?
- This was taken to the Strong Workforce group and two CTE faculty went through and started mapping it into the shell from PR.
- Taking the Strong Workforce questions and embeds them into PR then later on we can take the information from Strong Workforce straight to Perkins.
- Are predictable schedules really a curriculum...? It might be going too far out; it is dealing with something that is unpredictable.
- The idea is that we are trying to gather and see where the problems are for each program.
- One concern is that there might be too much to answer in one category.
- Is it more of an overarching question about how their program is engaging or reflecting about Mesa Pathways?
- Maybe it should be a more introductory question.

Privacy concerns about data on the dashboards:

- We protect the data by de-identifying it and data is not available for courses taught with less than 10 students.
- Why is this type of data displayed publicly on the website? We did not want the IR office to be the only people to have access to this data. Also, there is a push in higher education for transparency on student success data.
- "How do the experiences of students in your program impact persistence?"
- "If you are not provided data dashboards, this is the type of data you can be looking at internally." Because some departments are not provided dashboards.
- Maybe this should be worded in a different way so that they do not think numbers but reflect about how their actions have had an effect on persistence.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “How do the experiences of students in your program affect persistence?” • “Are there any special areas of concern for your program that have not yet been addressed?” • Do we define what short term and long term means? If we put a sort of description it might be helpful. • Closing the loop: we want people to talk about all resources (BARC, faculty, staff, Perkins money, mini-grant, ESP, equity money). • This will be due 2 weeks after Thanksgiving (December 7th, 2018). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to Presentation <p>2. 2018-2019 Comprehensive Program Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Program Review: a list of 30+ categories down to about 12. (From 11/3/17 meeting): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
--	--

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

Agenda Item C: New Business:

DISCUSSION	<p>1. Program Review timeline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018-2019 Program Review Timeline • August 20-December 10: Write Program Review in Taskstream space • Monday, December 10 : Must be ready for Review by end of day; closed until January 21 • December 11-January 21: Formal peer and manager reviews entered into Taskstream • January 22-February 4: Final edits in Taskstream; system closes Feb 4
-------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 5: Prepare reports for resource prioritization committees

Agenda Item D: Announcements/Adjournment:

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Next meeting, Summer Work Group 2. The meeting was adjourned by Hinkes at 12:42 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