

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:

[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, Eliza Rabinovich, Bruce Naschak, Celine Aheran, Isabel O'Connor, Michael Cox, Mark Abajian, Jeremiah Tarvin, Katie Palacios, Dina Miyoshi, Mary Gwin; Special Guest: Patricia Manley

1. Call to Order

- a. The meeting was called to order by Hai Hoang at 12:08 p.m.
- b. Agenda was approved by consensus

2. Approval of [February 6, 2026, Minutes](#)

- a. Motioned: Bruce Naschak - Seconded: Jeremiah Tarvin
- b. Abstained: Katie Palacios
- c. Outcome: Minutes are approved

3. Special Guest: Patti Manley from Miramar

Hai: This section focuses on knowledge sharing—learning about Miramar’s process and exploring insights that may apply to MESA. Please feel free to ask questions.

Patti Manley: Miramar currently manages all resource requests in Nuventiv, where they remain active until funded or withdrawn. Once a year, active requests are exported and sorted by the VPA into categories such as one-time vs. Ongoing.

Ongoing requests: Sorted by category (e.g., facilities or staffing) and sent to the appropriate committee (facilities requests go to the Facilities Committee, and staffing requests go to the Faculty Hiring Committee).

Hiring: Faculty Prioritization Hiring Committee is made up of Department Chairs and the VPI. They vote once a year on ranking all staffing positions.

Classified Staffing Requests: Follow a similar process as Faculty Hiring committee, it is led by department chairs and the VP of Student Services, with decisions made through discussion and available funding rather than formal ranking.

One-Time Requests (Unrestricted funds, PPIS Funds or Lottery Funds): Requests are sorted by school and prioritized by the deans. The prioritized lists are then submitted to the BRDS Committee (Budget, Resource and Development Subcommittee of PIEC), which reviews and reorders them across all schools. The revised list goes to the Executive Council for approval/revisions and is typically approved by the President and Vice Presidents.

Discretionary Requests or Ongoing Funds: Deans first prioritize ongoing funding requests. These are then reviewed by the Executive Cabinet, which reprioritizes them and allocates available resources.

Patti: There is no formal rubric, and the process is relatively simple—one time requests are typically reviewed over one or two committee meetings, depending on available funding.

Questions:

- a. Mary: Are faculty on the BRDS? Do you have a committee developing an overall campus budget? Is the overall campus budget published so that everyone has access to it? Are faculty in the entire budget process?
 - i. Patti: Yes, there is faculty in BRDS. The VPA creates the campus budget, and presumably it is published. Last year, the VPA allocated \$85,000 to each school for instructional use, with the remaining funds going to BRDS. The source of this one-time funding is unclear, but I will follow up to find out. Yes, faculty are in the entire process.
- b. Hai: Is the Executive Counsel different from your regular Presidents Cabinet?
 - i. Patti: Yes, I will confirm the College Council and the Executive Council information and provide it to you.
 - ii. Isabel: Miramar's college council is like our PCAB.
- c. Liza: Do some committees' rankings get automatically approved, or do all committees submit their prioritized lists to the Executive Council for approval?
 - i. Patti: Requests are prioritized by committees before going to the Executive Council, which usually follows those rankings, though funding restrictions may affect final decisions.
- d. Mary: Are faculty involved in developing the budget?
 - i. Patti: Faculty have expressed concerns about limited involvement in the budget process and unequal funding across schools. The new VPA is forming a group to review the process and address these funding differences.
 - ii. Mary: It's encouraging that faculty are involved in these committees, since Mesa does not currently have that. Do you know if this applies only to the general fund or to all campus funds?
 1. Patti: It mainly includes unrestricted PPIs, and lottery funds. The previous VPA reviewed the full budget with Academic Senate, and the new VPA is open to feedback and potential changes after faculty raised concerns about lack of input.

- e. Dina: Are all requests—such as one-time funds, budget augmentations, and facilities—submitted through Nuventive? Who does the dividing of the requests?
 - i. Patti: All budget requests must be submitted through Nuventive and tied to program goals aligned with the college’s strategic goals. Departments may use their existing budgets independently, but additional funding requests must go through Nuventive. Resource requests are exported into a spreadsheet, sent to the VPA for sorting by division and distribution to deans, and the spreadsheets are kept for historical records.
- f. Hai: Patti mentioned that resource requests can include future-year needs to encourage early planning. This helps the college anticipate large upcoming expenses and avoid unexpected costs.
 - i. Patti: Resource requests include a timeline (e.g., 0–2, 2–4, or 5+ years) to encourage long-term planning. This helps departments anticipate future needs and allows leadership to plan funding for large expenses before they become urgent.
- g. Isabel: Are the shared governance committees informed of the available funding (e.g., lottery or co-curricular funds) and prioritize requests based on that amount?
 - i. Patti: The VPA regularly attends planning and committee meetings, as well as Academic Senate, to share and discuss the budget.
- h. Liza: Could you share the types of prompts or questions applicants respond to when submitting requests, since there isn’t a formal rubric?
 - i. Patti: For one-time funding requests must include the category (e.g., staffing, technology), estimated cost, full description, and priority ranking. They must also indicate if the request is tied to accreditation or licensing, which may give it higher priority. No additional documentation is required. Applicants may attend the BRDS committee to advocate.
 - ii. Patti: Faculty hiring requests go through the Faculty Hiring Committee, composed of department chairs and the instructional VP. Departments submit a form with information such as FTES and justification for the position, and the committee reviews and ranks the requests.
- i. Hai: Is the data you send to the VPA unsorted?
 - i. Patti: Yes, she is the one that sorts the data.
- j. Isabel: Does the campus know ahead of time if faculty positions will be available before submitting an RR, based on the budget?
 - i. Patti: Yes, usually. The number of positions comes from either the budgeting office or the VPI.

- k. Hai: When do you get the information about the budget for hiring on-going staff?
 - i. Patti: Usually in the fall. The list they create stays valid for a year.
- l. Hai: Where does the PRSC fit in? Is the PRSC involved in approval or ranking of the resources at all?
 - i. Patti: They are not involved in the ranking and approval
- m. Isabel: Does a department budget increase request go to the BRDS?
 - i. Patti: No. Resource requests to go to the deans, managers, or directors first. They prioritize them, and then the Executive Cabinet decides how to allocate the resources. We request that people still submit requests because they may not get a budget increase, but submitting the request documents the need so that if funds become available later (e.g., grants or restricted funds), they can be used to address it.
- n. Isabel: Do Facilities Committees meet regularly like ours? If an urgent or new facility needs to arise, do they review and make recommendations throughout the year, or only during the program review request period?
 - i. Patti: They meet monthly, sometimes twice a month, and discuss issues as they arise. If something is urgent, it may be addressed immediately instead of waiting for a meeting.
- o. Hai: Would increasing the department's budget also be considered an ongoing item?
 - i. Patti: It is ongoing, but it comes out separately.
- p. Liza: What is the process for creating different prompts for each area in the program review? For example, were the prompts developed by the Program Review Committee or by the individual departments?
 - i. Patti: A committee of administrators, faculty, classified staff, and a dean created the prompts when Nuventiv first started here. Each area has different prompts based on its needs, though some standard questions (e.g., goals and resource requests) are used campus-wide.
- q. Hai: What is the process to request classified staff?
 - i. Patti: There wasn't a formal process before, but one is being developed based on the faculty hiring prioritization model. Resource requests will go to the appropriate VP, who will consult with deans or directors and create a priority list based on staffing needs and specific criteria.
- r. Hai: Do you have a general idea of how many classified staff you are able to hire? Do you have a process for hiring supervisors, like SPAA members or Admin? What about a non-classroom faculty hiring process?

- i. Patti: I don't; I can ask for estimates. There was no formal process; decisions were made by the dean or VP. Hourly requests go through the discretionary budget process. Non-hourly positions follow their respective processes (faculty, admin, or classified).

Discussion was completed, Patti was thanked, and committee continued onto the next agenda item.

4. Communication Loop

a. Co-Chair Announcement

Hai: Bruce was the sole nominee for faculty co-chair of the Program Review Steering Committee. After no objections were received by the February 23 deadline, the committee confirmed his appointment by acclamation. Bruce has extensive experience with program review, thank you Bruce.

- i. Bruce: I've been on this committee for over 20 years, and I'm reviewing past program review formats (Nuventiv, Taskstream, and earlier versions) to gather ideas that could help improve the next process.
- ii. Hai: No nominations were received for the Classified representative from Student Services, so coordination with Classified Senate will take place to obtain a nomination.

b. Nuventive Discussion

Liza: The system allows different prompts for various campus areas and resource committees, each with their own questions or rubrics. However, any changes should be communicated by the end of spring, so they can be tested and training updated before program review begins in the fall.

- i. Bruce: I plan to develop some ideas and a proposal for the faculty rubric over the next few weeks, drawing on input from those working directly in the area, and bringing it to our next meeting for discussion before the May 1 timeline decision.
 - 1. Liza: Do you mean the questions on the rubrics themselves?
 - a. Bruce: Yes, I plan to review past and recent program reviews to identify useful, consistent elements. My goal is to create something meaningful but also simple and not overly burdensome for faculty.
 - 2. Liza: A link was created comparing the current prompts with the previous one's side-by-side to help start the discussion.

- ii. Isabel: The FHP committee discusses these issues each year and has raised concerns that some uniform elements do not work well. Since they review the requests and data regularly, they already have ideas and ongoing discussions about possible improvements.
 - 1. Mary: The committee discussed revising the rubric by keeping the current questions, reweighting four questions to 25% each, and making sustainability a small bonus (about 5%). They also proposed allowing a data table that does not count toward the word limit while enforcing the existing word count limit.
- iii. Hai: Bruce brings institutional knowledge and long experience with the program review process, while FHP has ideas about possible rubric questions and weighting. Is it suggested that Bruce join the FHP discussion?
 - 1. Bruce: I'm open to joining that discussion, but my focus is on developing the overall structure—such as the analysis and goals—while individual committees create their own rubrics based on their specialized expertise.
- iv. Mary: At the last BARC meeting, there was discussion that they were not satisfied with the rubric. With upcoming changes, that committee may also be interested in revising their rubric.
- v. Liza: Technology may limit exporting tables or charts, so instead specific prompts could ask faculty to include key data (e.g., full-time vs. adjunct faculty) in the narrative. This can be confirmed with Joel.
 - 1. Mary: Ideally, a workaround could allow data presentation without counting toward the word limit. If exporting tables isn't possible, a separate prompt dedicated to data that doesn't count against the word count could be considered.
- vi. Hai: If the tool cannot show data tables, it may not be the best option moving forward, since data is essential for justifying requests. This may require reconsidering the tool.
- vii. Isabel: Having a uniform set of basic data is important to avoid inconsistent comparisons. Standard data helps inform discussions and supports decision-making for leadership.
- viii. Hai: Feedback from Resource Committees suggests the current rubric may not be working. Since program review provides the structure but not the rubric, each Resource Committee could develop its own rubric,
 - 1. Isabel: I support the idea, but tight deadlines often force us to make quick decisions that don't fully address the main issues. I

think having more time would allow us to think more carefully and develop better changes.

- a. Hai: We may not have control over the timeline since the new cycle starts in the fall and faculty are not meeting in the summer, so the work needs to be finished by spring unless we meet over the summer.
2. Mary: I agree with Isabel. Most people were okay with the current rubric except for the data and sustainability pieces, and faculty bandwidth may limit bigger changes before the May 1 deadline.
- ix. Hai: May 1 was set because it is the last Program Review Committee meeting of the semester, and changes may also need to go through governance processes. While there is a timeline, the goal is not to rush since the rubric may remain in place for several years.
- x. Liza: Changes must be finalized by fall when program review writing begins; otherwise, the cycle would need to be postponed. Summer discussion is possible, but we must consider faculty contracts.
- xi. Hai: Postponing the program review cycle was suggested as an option—possibly extending the regular year and pushing the comprehensive review to 2027 to allow more time for development and discussion.
- xii. Isabel: I'm open to moving forward now while continuing deeper discussions for future improvements.

5. Continuing Business

- a. [New vs. Old Prompts](#) (before Nuventive, during Nuventive, future)

Hai: Due to the tight timeline and only two meetings left, a small work group will be formed to develop the new program review prompts. Interested members will be invited by email to participate.

- i. Bruce: If we have the file laid out, can you send it as an email attachment?
 1. Hai: Yes, we can.
- ii. Roadmap 2 [Did not get to]
- iii. Timeline: Final decision May 1
- b. Rubric [Did not get to]
 - i. Roadmap 2

6. Next Meeting/Adjournment

- a. Hai Hoang adjourned the meeting at 1:34 p.m.
- b. Next meeting will be held on 4/10/2026

7. Minutes Submitted by Brenna Bonikowske

8. Approval – 4/10/2026

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

Key Items:

- PR: Program Review
- RR: Resource Request
- VPA: Vice President of Admin Services
- BRDS: Budget, Resource and Development Subcommittee of PIEC
- VPSS: Vice President of Student Services
- Faculty Prioritization Hiring Committee: Made up of Department Chairs and BPI's
- Executive Counsel: Make the final decision on all the Resources Requests

