

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

Friday, March 22, 2019  
1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m., LRC432

<b>ATTENDEES/ PROXIES</b>	<i>Steering Committee/Liaisons</i>	Jonathan McLeod
	Madeleine Hinkes, Co-Chair	Dina Miyoshi
	Lorenze Legaspi, Co-Chair	Pegah Motaleb
	Bruce Naschak, Co-Chair	Monica Romero (excused)
	Erika Higginbotham Co-Chair (excused)	Charlie Zappia (absent)
	Mark Abajian (absent)	
	Juan U. Bernal (excused)	Administrative Support:
	Kevin Branson (excused)	Mona King
	Andrew Hoffman (excused)	Anda McComb
	Bridget Herrin (excused)	
	Chris Kalck (excused)	Guest:
	Ian Kay (excused)	Nancy Cortes
	Marichu Magana (excused)	
	Larry Maxey	

**Agenda Item A: Call to Order: Approval of May 4, Minutes**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approval of March 1, 2019 Minutes</li> <li>Minutes were M/S by Bruce Naschak and Pegah Motaleb and approved</li> </ul>
-------------------	---

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

**Agenda Item B: Continuing Business:**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p><b>Integrated Planning Survey Results: 2018/2019</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preliminary results with recommendations for the Program Review Committee and resource allocation committees</li> <li>Response Rate 64/142 (45%)</li> <li><b>Lead Writers:</b></li> <li>Overall found module and dashboards easy to use</li> <li>Lower scores for connection between program review and resource allocations</li> <li>Meaningful discussion about program analysis, goals, and</li> </ul>
-------------------	--

outcomes assessment.

- Satisfied with support from liaisons
- **Liaisons:**
- Most feel prepared to support lead writers
- Most valuable aspect of serving as a program review liaison is learning about and connecting with other programs mainly and the support from colleagues
- **Manager Experience**
  - Most felt prepared to support lead writers
- **BARC**
  - Agreed that the new portal was easy to use, rubric was easy to understand, expectations and instructions were clear
  - Less agreement that BARC provided adequate support
- **FHP**
  - Strongest agreement that expectations and instruction were clear
  - Less agreement that FHP committee provided adequate support
- **CHP**
  - Strongest Agreement that new portal was easy to use
  - Less agreement on clarity of rubric and expectations and that CHP committee provided adequate support
  - Only 9 people responded to CHP questions
- **Program Review Training**
  - Most popular venues were open work sessions and individual training
  - Agreement that trainings were well organized, useful, and scheduled often enough
- **Program Review Process**
  - Good communication on timeline, training schedule, and content
- **Most Valuable Aspects:**
- Training, workshops, and support
- The data dashboards and the Request.it portal
- Access to past program reviews
- **Recommendations for future years:**
- The data dashboards are excessively complex and specialized so you have to look at a wide variety of different data dashboards.
- Previously, programs received a standard four or five page packet of information with all data in one place
- Provide faster decisions and communication from resource request committees
- Simplify module content and format
- Simplify Taskstream platform

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide additional examples for resource requests</li> <li>• Provide more training and support</li> <li>• What was the response rate of faculty?</li> <li>• Distinguish between new lead writers and experienced ones (same for liaisons)</li> <li>• Administrators said some questions were unclear or redundant</li> <li>• Please refer to the PowerPoint and report for more details</li> <li>• <a href="#">Power Point</a></li> </ul>
--	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Send final report to committees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Madeleine Hinkes</li> </ul>	

**Agenda Item C: New Business:**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Planning for next year</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The integration of Perkins and Strong Workforce into Program Review and BARC was burdensome</li> <li>• Perkins processes and requirements are changing at the Federal level, so updates will be necessary</li> <li>• The final report will be presented to the Committee before it's presented to PIE and PCab</li> <li>• An Equity Analysis of the Instructional Program Review Template, second look               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are not being intentional or specific enough according to their analysis</li> <li>• Focusing on equity doesn't mean that we're giving up excellence</li> <li>• If we disaggregate the data we see that the level of excellence isn't available to some of our students and we want to figure out who those groups are and what we can do to enable everybody to get up to that level of excellence</li> <li>• Terminology for race and ethnicity: dashboards use terms from applications</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Annual Update 2019-2020               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplify</li> <li>• Updates</li> <li>• Outcomes assessment, work with COA</li> <li>• Program analysis for equity and excellence                   <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Focus on 1-2 metrics</li> <li>2. Guided questions</li> <li>3. Refer to specific dashboards</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Goals update</li> <li>• Closing the loop</li> </ul> </li> <li>• BARC               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation list went to PCab on March 19<sup>th</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results will be posted in Request.it portal</li> <li>• Writers need to make better connection with needs; BARC will revise their questions</li> </ul>
--	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft analysis questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IE Office</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>

**Agenda Item D: Announcements/Adjournment:**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Next meeting, April 19<sup>th</sup></li> <li>2. The meeting was adjourned by Madeleine Hinkes at 2:32 p.m.</li> </ol>
-------------------	---

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

Submitted by: (Mona) Sahar King

Approved on: \_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT