

# 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:

<b>Co-Chairs:</b>	Hai Hoang (IE); Jacqueline Collins (Admin); Bruce Naschak (Inst.); <b>Vacant (SS)</b>
<b>Administration:</b>	Hai Hoang (IE); Jaqueline Collins (Admin); Dina Miyoshi (Inst.); Leticia Diaz (SS)
<b>Faculty:</b>	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); <b>Vacant (HS &amp;PS); Vacant (SA); Vacant (SD); Vacant (SSE)</b>
<b>Classified Professionals:</b>	Ayana Woods (CS); Nicole Judd (SS); <b>Vacant (Inst.); Vacant (Admin)</b>
<b>Constituency Group:</b>	Jeremiah Tarvin (AS); Mary Gwin (AS); Ayana Woods (CS)
<b>Committee Representatives</b>	Michael Cox (CRC); Isabel O'Connor/Mary Gwin (FHP); Larry Maxey/Flordaliza Abuyo (CHP); Jaqueline Collins (BARC); Alex Berry (SWC); Liza Rabinovich (COA)
<b>Admin Support</b>	Brenna Bonikowske (IE)

### Table of Contents:

[Meeting Agenda & Minutes – May 1, 2026](#)

[Meeting Agenda & Minutes – April 10, 2026](#)

[Meeting Agenda & Minutes – March 6, 2026](#)

[Meeting Agenda & Minutes – February 6, 2026](#)

[Meeting Agenda & Minutes – December 5, 2025](#)

[Meeting Agenda & Minutes – November 7, 2025](#)

[Meeting Agenda & Minutes – October 3, 2025](#)

[Meeting Agenda & Minutes – September 5, 2025](#)

**Quick Links:** [Meeting Schedule](#) | [Program Review Training Schedule](#) | [Deliverables 2025-2026](#)

## **Minutes and Discussion**

### **Attendees:**

Hai Hoang, Liza Rabinovich, Jeremiah Tarvin, Michael Cox, Mark Abajian, Dina Miyoshi, Jennifer Snyder, Rachel Russell, Leticia Diaz, Celine Ahearn

#### **1. Call to Order**

- a. Hai Hoang called the meeting to order at 12:07 p.m.
- b. Welcome new member – Jennifer Snyder

#### **2. Approval of March 6, 2026 Minutes**

- a. Motioned: Liza Rabinovich - Seconded: Leticia Diaz
- b. Abstained: Rachel Russell and Jennifer Snyder
- c. Outcome: Consensus Approved Minutes

#### **3. Communication Loop**

- a. Update from committee members
  - i. Liza: Met with Nuventive - discussed improving workspaces, adding features, and reducing clicks. More to come later in this meeting.
  - ii. Jeremiah: At the student government meeting, Mesa's tutoring team shared their impact - especially for diverse and ESL students - and noted funding challenges. Additionally, the peer mentoring program, which is vital for student success (especially in STEM), may lose funding as its grant ends, raising concerns about its future.
    1. Hai: Institutional research confirms tutoring and peer mentoring programs are effective, but both face funding challenges due to budget cuts and expiring grants. The committee aims to better allocate limited resources, while student advocacy could help influence funding priorities.
    2. Rachel: Consider a direct appeal to administration or a resolution in support of the funding. Admin cares about student voices.
      - a. Jeremiah: I'll advocate for peer mentoring through student government since it was especially helpful for my STEM success.
- b. Update from co-chairs
  - i. Hai: We're facing many major changes at once, so the focus is on realistic, feasible next steps given limited time and resources.

- ii. Hai: There are ongoing efforts to better represent SPAA staff in governance, with solutions like standardized role categories being explored.
- c. Update from resources committees
  - i. BARC – Not in Attendance
  - ii. CHP – Not in Attendance
  - iii. FHP – Not in Attendance

#### 4. Continuing Business

- a. PR prompts, Rubric Change and Reality Check
  - i. [New vs Old prompt; Draft PR Prompts 2026](#)

*Hai: We reviewed and compared old and new program review prompts across areas (instruction, admin, student services, etc.). Based on that, a draft of a new program review prompts was developed – Draft PR Prompts 2026.*

*Liza: The first program review is a comprehensive one for Instruction. Update cycles are still undecided—while admin and student services use the same prompts each year, we are still discussing whether Instruction will have a comprehensive review.*

1. Rachel: Program review should reflect the president’s priorities - Black-serving status and adult learners - by asking programs to show how they address these goals, aligning efforts with campus equity plans.
2. Celine: Program review should be more reflective and better connect program goals to college goals.
3. Jennifer: I am concerned that requiring strict alignment with institutional goals could limit authentic, data-driven reflection. At the same time, there’s confusion about what defines a “program” especially when courses serve multiple disciplines - so program reviews should better clarify scope and reflect who programs truly serve, including students outside their own degrees.
  - a. Hai: We need to design programs based on who is actually taking the courses, since different student groups (e.g., majors vs. non-majors) have different needs.
  - b. Rachel: I do not think that requiring programs to address institutional equity goals is inauthentic - it aligns with real, data-backed equity gaps, and ensures efforts go beyond just naming equity to actively addressing it.

- c. Dina: Programs should be aware of institutional goals and consider how their work supports them, but not every program goal needs to directly align - flexibility is important since relevance varies.
  - d. Hai: The goal isn't to force compliance but to encourage alignment with college priorities to create greater collective impact. While many departments set their own goals, aligning them can strengthen outcomes, though it's challenging to balance clarity and flexibility in planning.
4. Celine: Questions should be necessary and clear, but inconsistent terminology and training lead to confusion and misaligned responses. Bringing all program review writers together could improve understanding and consistency.
    - a. Hai: There's confusion around technical terms and even the purpose of program review (past vs. future). Clearer definitions and better training - bringing people together - are needed to improve understanding and participation.
  5. Celine: Training should happen annually since people forget over time, and unclear or sensitive terminology (like job titles) can quickly cause confusion. There's confusion about how to categorize roles since titles vary across departments, so clearer, shared definitions are needed to ensure consistency.

## 5. New Business

- a. Roadmap 2 (rough draft)

Timeline: Annual and multi-year; processes for different groups

*Hai: Program review fits into the college's planning cycle as the annual implementation of long-term goals (mission → 10-year plan → 5-year strategic plan → program review → resource allocation).*

*A new approach proposes aligning program goals with divisional plans (by VP, etc.) instead of directly with broad college goals. This helps clarify impact, improve accountability, and make connections between activities and outcomes more meaningful and realistic.*

- i. Celine: I am concerned that 10-year goals may be unrealistic given rapid changes. Additionally, institutional priorities often don't reach frontline staff clearly, making them feel disconnected and less relevant.
  - 1. Hai: Program review should balance alignment with college goals while allowing flexibility for units to set relevant, timely goals - especially as conditions change quickly.
- ii. Celine: 5-year goals are helpful for long-term progress beyond yearly updates, but I'm concerned that longer plans (like 10-year goals) become outdated quickly - so focusing on flexible, relevant 5-year planning may be more effective.
  - 1. Hai: The new approach translates broad goals into clear, measurable outcomes to track progress. Only outcomes with defined metrics are included to ensure accountability and evaluate success over time.

*Hai: The new approach removes rigid "strategic objective" categories from the first roadmap and focuses on outcomes and measures, giving departments flexibility in how they achieve goals while still ensuring progress at the college level.*

- iii. Celine: Removing strategic objectives simplifies the process, but clear training and communication are needed so staff understand goals across divisions and can meaningfully align their work.
  - 1. Hai: Units need to know divisional goals in advance to align their work effectively.
- iv. Celine: Goals should be set upfront to drive real progress, not created after the fact to show success. Program review should allow for unmet goals and focus on identifying and addressing weaknesses, not just highlighting strengths.

*Hai: The current process has everyone working on program review at the same time, causing misalignment. A better approach would be a staggered timeline where leadership sets goals first, allowing departments to align their goals accordingly.*

- v. Rachel: Is there a clear plan for a staggered timeline yet, or if it's still undecided.
  - 1. Hai: Before proposing changes, I am wondering why the current August–February timeline exists and what the original rationale was.
    - a. Celine: The August–February timeline likely reflects the need to capture a full academic cycle, since fall and spring

provide different data and insights, giving a more complete picture for program review.

- i. Hai: Program review is limited by what activities and data are actually available to report on.

*Hai: [Canada College PR timeline](#); uses staggered and overlapping timelines (not one uniform schedule), with earlier starts, phased submissions, and separate processes for personnel vs. non-personnel requests—offering a more flexible approach that could inform improvements.*

- vi. Celine: Programs should clearly understand institutional and divisional goals before starting program review, so they can assess and align their work with those priorities from the outset.
- vii. Liza: Not every program submits every year.
- viii. Jennifer: We should avoid scheduling program review in October due to conflicts with spring scheduling deadlines.

*Hai: They also use flexible guidelines instead of strict rubrics, focusing on alignment with college goals, mission, and equity priorities—suggesting an opportunity to incorporate similar alignment checks into resource requests.*

- ix. Liza: There are too many moving parts and not enough time, so it would be better to delay changes and use next year to refine the process before implementing anything new.
- x. Leticia: If major changes are made, they should be rolled out gradually with clear guidance on how they fit into the cycle, ensuring proper communication and feedback before implementation.

*Hai: What would it would look like to delay changes and continue with a regular program review next year?*

- xi. Leticia: Would delaying changes for a year negatively impact program review cycles or accreditation?
  - 1. Hai: If changes are delayed, the college would continue the regular program review process while using the year to refine details, gather feedback, and build buy-in. This likely won't negatively impact accreditation and allows for a more thoughtful, well-developed approach moving forward.
- xii. Leticia: How is this decision going to be made?

1. Hai: I am just looking for initial feedback, then I can discuss it with leadership and other groups and propose using the next year for regular program review while thoughtfully designing future changes.
  - a. Leticia: If there is no negative impact, I think delaying changes would allow for more intentional planning and organization, we should have broad support from leadership and committees before moving forward.
- xiii. Celine: I would suggest breaking the process into parts and starting with the program review prompts.
  1. Liza: Updating just the questions may be quick, but making the entire process cohesive - integrating data, goals, and systems without duplication- requires more time and coordination.
- xiv. Hai: I plan to move the proposal forward for broader feedback and encourage others to share input via email.
- xv. Leticia: I am offering support to help brainstorm and break down ideas, and are open to meeting to assist further.

**6. Announcements/Adjournment**

- a. Hai Hoang adjourned the meeting at 1:34 p.m.

**7. Minutes Submitted By: Brenna Bonikowske**

**8. Approval – May 1, 2026**

- a. Motioned: Isabel O'Connor - Seconded: Mark Abajian
- b. Abstained: Bruce Naschak
- c. Outcome: Minutes Approved