SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Steering Committee

First Friday of the Month | Zoom Link | 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Mesa Program Review Website

Membership:

Co-Chairs:	Hai Hoang (IE); Jacqueline Collins (Admin); Bruce Naschak (Inst.); *Vacant (SS)*
Administration:	Hai Hoang (IE); Jaqueline Collins (Admin); Dina Miyoshi (Inst.); Leticia Diaz (SS)
Faculty:	Rachel Russell (CTE); Mark Abajian (B&T); Bruce Naschak (HUM); Yuka Brown (A&L); Jake Portugal (ES); Katie Palacios (LRAS); Dina Miyoshi (S&B); Jennifer Snyder (M&NS)*; Vacant (HS &PS); Vacant (SA); Vacant (SD); Vacant (SSE)*
Classified Professionals:	Ayana Woods (CS); Joel Arias (Admin.); Nicole Judd (SS); *Vacant (Inst.)*
Constituency Group:	Jeremiah Tarvin (AS); Mary Gwin (AS); Ayana Woods (CS)
Committee Representatives	Michael Cox (CRC); Isabel O'Connor/Mary Gwin (FHP); Larry Maxey/Flordaliza Abuyo (CHP); Jaqueline Collins (BARC); Alex Berry (SWC); Liza Rabinovich (COA)
Admin Support	Brenna Bonikowske (IE)

Table of Contents:

Quick Links: Meeting Schedule | Program Review Training Schedule | Deliverables 2025-2026

Minutes and Discussion:

1. **Call to Order**
   a. Hai Hoang called the meeting to order at **12:07 p.m**.
   b. Agenda for February 6, 2026, was approved by consensus
2. **Welcome**
   a. Welcomed Brenna Bonikowske as Admin Tech for IE
3. **Approval of December 5, 2025, Minutes**
   a. Motioned: Bruce Naschak; Seconded: Rachel Russell; Abstained: Ayana Woods
   b. Outcome: Minutes for December 5, 2025, was approved
4. **Communication Loop**
   a. Update from Committee Members
      i. Liza: We found incomplete resource requests, followed up with the writer, and met to review them. All were completed by Wednesday, Feb. 4th, sending them to Joel to submit the request on schedule.
   b. Co-Chair Update
      i. Hai: The PR closed Tuesday at noon, with the first FHP meeting today and others to follow. Requested grace due to data limitations from a new platform, as dashboard access is currently limited to full-time faculty and an IT request is in progress for adjunct to get access.
      ii. Hai: Program review surveys will be sent out to collect feedback.
      iii. Hai: Changes in resource committee - FHP states that the rubric should have some changes. I would like to have a conversation sooner so that we are able to implement the changes. Connect offline with FHP, BARC, CHP about rubrics.
         1. Liza: Meeting with Nuventive on the 12th to explore different rubrics. Currently, they cannot be changed.
            a. Mary: Are changes possible? If not, maybe we can think about an alternative to changing the rubric so that they fit the three committees.
            b. Hai: Rubric changes were not previously possible. We currently use workarounds to improve the work.
         2. Isabel: If each resource committee is unable to have different rubrics, then the current rubric should be modified to align with our needs.
         3. Dina: There is a way we can figure something out. We need to brainstorm and get creative. Technology should not drive this. We will figure it out.

        4. Hai: The district does not have the resources for the high end version of Nuventive. We have been using Google forms as support along with Nuventive.

   c. Update from Resource Committee

      i. BARC - Mary: Meeting dates remain unclear.

        1. Hai: How can PR help with this process

           a. Mary: I don't think PR can help but if I think of something, I will let the committee know.

           b. Hai: PRSC could help facilitate the process by asking for dates ahead of time.

           c. Mary: When there is a meeting, I will ask for info to be shared with the committee and program committee. I will also see who is on the BARC committee.

      ii. CHP – Leticia: No updates, but I know that they met.

      iii. FHP – Mary: Met as scheduled and completed the norming session. Attendance was full; the agenda was completed, and progress was made. Members are prepared to begin scoring but are awaiting system access; staff are working with Anabell to request early access. A later meeting will be used to coordinate suggestions for next year, with an emphasis on starting earlier to allow sufficient time for IE and PR review and implementation.

5. Continuing Business

   a. Program review Process improvement: PR and RR

      i. Feedback on current structure

        1. Isabel: Is there a decision on the length of the cycle?

           a. Hai: No decision.

        2. Letica: The sustainability question arises each year. We need to be proactive to address it and develop recommendations in advance.

           a. Hai: It has not been resolved; we will address this in the future.

           b. Leticia: We should provide closure for this cycle and introduce the next cycle (email).

      ii. [Miramar Model](#)

        1. Dina: Do they use Nuventive?

           a. Hai and Liza: Yes, it's simple because they have no rubric; they just map the need.

        2. Mark: Can the goal timeline be extended if issues arise? Can an existing goal have its deadline adjusted—rather than being

rewritten or replaced—particularly if limitations are due to the final year of the cycle.

    a. Liza: Possible solution is to document updates, copy the goal into the next cycle, and note/document barriers encountered; specifics will be confirmed at meeting with Nuventive.

3. Liza: Miramar model - Requests remain active until fulfilled or marked inactive.

4. Hai: Our approach provides annual snapshots, while the Miramar approach shows how long a request has remained unfunded over time.

    a. Mark: A past issue was having to repeatedly rewrite requests; it was frustrating when needs remained unchanged. Keeping requests in the queue allows ongoing needs to persist and be updated or removed only if no longer necessary.

    b. Bruce: Miramar's model- it is good to have the historical structure behind the requests.

5. Liza: Note that Miramar is smaller. Mesa's request list could be large for research committees.

    a. Isabel: There is value in tracking historically submitted requests. Doing so can help prevent discouragement, document ongoing priorities, and support committees in assessing long-term needs.

    b. Hai: Flag new vs old requests which will help with volume.

6. Liza: Within Miramar's form there is not a lot of space for data/narrative.

    a. Isabel: Are we able to get access to all info (someone from Miramar to show the resource request).

7. Hai: Note that there is no rubric; committee decides what gets funded and what does not get funded.

    a. Liza: Will learn more about the process for the scoring.

    b. Dina: Which committee makes the decisions?

        i. Hai: They have a version of BARC. Requests are pulled and sent to the School Dean which will do the initial ranking and send it back then BARC does the final ranking.

  c. Bruce: The rubric was created to address concerns about opaque decision-making by providing clear criteria and rankings, helping departments understand why requests are approved or denied.

  d. Isabel: We need more transparency around available funding and hiring capacity. Who makes final decisions, how priorities align with available resources, and when this information becomes known.

    i. Mary: We should ask for an estimated number of positions or funding levels in the fall (around September–October). This would help programs decide whether to submit requests.

    ii. Members agreed this is a reasonable ask and could come from faculty, FHP, or the resource/research committee.

8. Hai/Liza: Should we have the same prompts or different depending on the department?

  a. Dina: In the past, we had different prompts.

  b. Bruce: Inst. was first, then added Admin and SS. Whether you are from A, B, C you get different prompts. Each part of the college has different needs. Each group should have a calendrical structure. The more consistent the easier it's going to be.

  c. Rachel: Different prompts make sense but then having one overall prompt for equity goals would be good.

  d. Liza: Keep in mind that we should be deciding in Spring so that over the summer we are able to create implementation/training materials then comprehensive in fall.

  e. Hai: Small group offline to bring a proposal for group.

    i. Leticia: I can help.

  f. Hai: Option 2- Send emails on suggestions and review at your own time.

  g. Liza: Bring suggestions for the next meeting; we can have a working meeting.

  h. Hai: We can continue this conversation at the next meeting.

 iii. Roadmap 2

            1. Hai: How do we embed priority (supporting Black and Brown students) into PR structure? Have prompts touching on priorities.
                a. Leticia: Question about Equity, revisit that question; if it is tied to race, consider tying it into the college plan.
                b. Rachel: Smart, Adult learners plan can be tied in just like the equity plan.

6. **New Business**
   a. Co-Chair Election
      i. Hai: Lucio has stepped down (Faculty Co-Chair). Opportunity to rethink the PR structure, revise PR Handbook, and align with AS requirements. Should position be Classified Prof., SS or Faculty from SS?
         1. Mary: The Senate pays attention to the Faculty Co-Chair. It's up to PR whether the classified professional is SS, Faculty, etc.
      ii. Liza – Pulled up Handbook
         1. Hai: Proposes – Have a Classified Co-Chair. Faculty Rep. should come from Inst. and Classified should come from SS.
         2. Mary: Senate and PR Handbook do not match. Faculty Co-Chair is needed in PR. Supports Hai's proposal.
         3. Liza: Did the Senate decide that the faculty of Co-Chair has tenure.
            a. Mary: That is a requirement.
         4. Leticia: Supports Hai's recommendation
            a. Mary: Only Faculty Rep needs tenure.
         5. Bruce: What are the responsibilities of the faculty co-chair?
            a. Hai: Regular meeting; One hour of co-chair meeting time TBD (come in ready with minutes from last time; review; discuss the agenda); Training is optional, not required; training traditionally has been done by IE.
      iii. Leticia: How long do they serve?
         1. Hai: Not specified in handbook, how long do we want it to be?
            a. Mary: Faculty is in constitution, two–year term, elected in even number years.
            b. Liza: Thinks it is two years.
   b. Open nomination and self-nomination included, for Instructional Faculty Co-chair (tenured) and Classified Professional Co-Chair.
      i. Hai: Can start a conversation via email; then vote via email.
      ii. Mary: The faculty on the PR elect/supports the Faculty Co-Chair; Call out to campus is the last resort.

> > iii. If interested - Send email to Hai; he will do voting offline and next meeting introduce the newly appointed Chairs. (Need to be elected by faculty and this committee)

7. **Action Items/Announcements**

8. **Next Meeting/Adjournment**
   a. Next meeting is March 6, 2026.
   b. This meeting was adjourned at 1:33pm by Hai Hoang.

9. **Minutes Submitted by Brenna Bonikowske**

10. **March 6ᵗʰ, 2026 - Approval of February 6, 2026, Minutes**
    a. Motioned: Bruce Naschak - Seconded: Jeremiah Tarvin
    b. Abstained: Katie Palacios
    c. Outcome: Minutes are approved