

# **SECTION H**

## **PROGRAM REVIEW**



# **San Diego Mesa College**

**Academic Program Review**

**Committee Report for Year One**

**2005-2006**

**Presented to President's Cabinet**

**March 20, 2007**

DATE: March 20, 2007

TO: President's Cabinet

SUBJECT: ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT FOR YEAR ONE, 2005-2006

The following list contains the names of the programs reviewed for Year One during the 2005-2006 academic year and program review cycle. For information and, more important, to recognize each for the work they have done, the names of the lead writers are included.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Lead Writer(s)</u>
Accelerated College Programs	Laura Creswell/Ed Newton
Accounting	Tracey Tuttle
Animal Health Technology	Peggy Fischer
Anthropology	Diane Barbolla
Architecture	Pamela Chapman
Art-Fine Art (All)	Georgia Laris
Biology	Paul Sykes
Black Studies	Dickson Phiri
Building Construction-Carpentry/Inspection	Larry Horsman
Chicano Studies	Cesar Lopez
Computer Information Sciences	Walter Wesley
Tutoring/Writing Center	William Peters

These program reviews, written by the lead writers with input from discipline faculty and in conjunction with department chairs and school deans, followed the revised San Diego Mesa College program review process found in the Academic Program Review Handbook. Lead writers were assigned Academic Program Review Committee liaisons at the beginning of the process. This assignment continues to encourage earlier interaction with the lead writers and results in a more complete final document. Instead of providing only the research on each program, District Institutional Research and Planning included College data, so the lead writers had comparison information. Data were provided in both quantitative as well as percentage formats. Specially requested data were also provided.

Of the twelve (12) program reviews for 2005-2006, only three (3) were submitted prior to the September 30, 2006 established deadline with the remaining received after this date. One (1) program review was received as late as October 10, 2006. Although all programs were provided with the "Lead Writer/Dean Checklist", only one (1) program attached it to the submitted documents as requested. All programs with the exception of one (1) have submitted the requested electronic copy.

A new lead writer was appointed to complete the Chicano Studies program review and, though given additional time to do so, submitted the document prior to the extended deadline. The Academic Program Review Committee would like to commend this lead writer for producing an excellent report in such a short period of time.

The program review submitted by the Tutoring/Writing Center was found to be exemplary. Following a procedure developed by the Academic Affairs Committee, the faculty in this Student Services program voted to do their program review using the academic model. The lead writer and co-contributors attended a special information

session in the spring of 2005 to prepare them to complete the Year One program review document. In the fall of 2005, the lead writer attended and participated in the Lead Writer training. The Academic Program Review Committee would like to commend the Tutoring/Writing Center for a very complete and well organized document and recommend that it be used a model.

Each program review document was read and evaluated by two program review committee members using the approved "Year One Evaluation Worksheet." After the reviewers met and discussed their findings, the lead writers were contacted and provided feedback. Lead writers were given the choice of meeting with the reviewers, receiving e-mail or using the telephone to discuss these findings. Once given feedback from the reviewers, lead writers had time to revise their program review documents should they wish to do so. Lead writers were given copies of their portion of the committee's final report to review and provide feedback that was incorporated into this report.

The 2005-2006 academic program reviews are the first group to respond to the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) question included in Part B of Form 2, the Program Review Response Sheet in the "Value of the Program to Students" section. This information will be tabulated by the SLOAC Coordinator using a form she developed to collect SLO documentation. Appendix A, page 33 contains an example of the "Instructional Student Learning Outcomes Summary Report for Year One Programs" that will be used for this purpose.

**Following the guidelines developed and approved by the Academic Affairs Committee, the Academic Program Review Committee prepared its final, written report. This report was reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee on February 12, 2007 prior to submission to the President's Cabinet.**

During the Fall, 2006 Flex Days, the Student Services and Instructional Divisions each presented workshops followed by a joint luncheon discussion between the presenters and the participants on the subject of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and College Planning. At the conclusion of the Student Services workshop, the presenters asked for feedback from the audience on how their program review model could be improved. Several suggestions were given, including the need for more recent research, changes to timelines, etc. The Dean of Student Development/ Matriculation became a member of the Academic Program Review Committee at the beginning of the fall semester. The Academic Program Review Committee was asked to provide information about their model. The Administrative Co-Chair provided a copy of the Academic Program Review Handbook to a small group of Student Services personnel who were working on integrating the two existing models. In November, the Acting Vice President of Student Services and the Dean of Student Development/Matriculation requested a meeting with the Administrative Co-Chair of the Academic Program Review Committee to ask questions and obtain information on how the two program review models could be integrated. At their December meeting, after members of the Academic Program Review Committee discussed the review processes, the following recommendations were made. These recommendations have been reviewed by Student Services. Appendix B, page 35, contains a letter of support from Student Services.

### **Recommendation #1**

It is recommended that the Academic Program Review model be adopted and used by all the units in Student Services. If needed, a supplemental document will be developed by representatives of the Mesa College Program Review Committee.

Rationale: In addition to bringing the Instructional and Student Services Divisions closer together, this integrated model will support Educational Master Planning and resource allocation. Mesa's academic program review model received commendation during the Accreditation onsite visit and in the subsequent team report.

### **Recommendation #2**

It is recommended that the Academic Program Review five-year cycle will begin Fall, 2007 for the Student Services units.

Rationale: Beginning in the Fall, 2007 will permit the placement of the Student Services units in the appropriate part of the five-year cycle. The Academic Program Review Committee will work with Student Services in determining what units will be in Year One, Two, Three, Four and Five.

### **Recommendation #3**

It is recommended that the membership of the Academic Program Review Committee be expanded to include appropriate Student Services representation.

Rationale: At the present time, the Academic Program Review Committee has three (3) representatives from Student Services. Increasing the membership will bring additional and necessary expertise to the existing committee. These new members will be assigned as liaisons to both academic and student services program reviews following the established procedure. Program review materials and training will be provided.

### **Recommendation #4**

It is recommended that the Academic Program Review Committee provide lead writer training to faculty and staff selected by their respective Student Services units.

Rationale: The selected lead writers for Year One program reviews will be invited to attend the scheduled Year One Lead Writer Training in the fall of 2007. In addition, the Academic Program Review Committee will provide additional orientations and workshops prior to this training to introduce the process to the student services lead writers.

### **Recommendation #5**

It is recommended that the Dean of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research (Dean) and the Campus-Based Researcher (CBR) work with Student Services units to determine the appropriate research data needed by each to support the program review.

Rationale: The Dean and CBR will assist Student Services with the type and frequency of data required to respond to the program review questions. In some instances, if this data is not available and needs to be collected, goals containing plans of action will be developed.

### **Recommendation #6**

It is recommended that program review findings for Student Services units will be incorporated into the two (2) annual reports presented to the Academic Affairs Committee and President's Cabinet.

Rationale: The content of the Academic Program Review Committee was approved by the Academic Affairs Committee in December 2002. (please see Appendix C, page 37)

### **Recommendation #7**

It is recommended that the new model incorporating Academic Program Review and Student Services Program Review be known as the Mesa College Program Review. The committee name should also be changed to reflect this change.

Rationale: The name of the model and the committee should reflect the new integrated and blended approach to program review.

We commend the efforts of all program lead writers, discipline faculty, department chairs, and deans who worked so diligently to complete their reviews in accordance with the process approved by the Academic Affairs Committee and the President's Cabinet.

The Program Review Committee completed its review of all submitted documents and revisions to these within the established timeline. The following pages contain reports of the Committee's findings resulting from its review and deliberations. The format of this report was revised based upon feedback from committee members, lead writers, and other readers of the Year One report. It was agreed by all that using a chart-format permitted ease of reading and facilitated finding of information when reviewing and discussing the contents of the report. All supporting documentation and worksheets are on file in the Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research.



# **San Diego Mesa College**

## **Academic Program Review**

### **Committee Report for Year One**

**2004-2005**

**Presented to President's Cabinet**

**March 7, 2006**

DATE: March 7, 2005

TO: President's Cabinet

SUBJECT: ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT FOR YEAR ONE, 2004-2005

The following list contains the names of the programs reviewed for Year One during the 2004-2005 academic year and program review cycle. For information and, more important, to recognize each for the work they have done, the names of the lead writers have been included.

<b><u>Program</u></b>	<b><u>Lead Writer(s)</u></b>
American Sign Language/Interpreting	Joseph Halcott
Child Development	Susheela Narayanan/Sandra Luhnnow
Consumer Studies	Lou Ann Gibson
Foreign Languages (All)	Leela Bingham
Geography	Mark Trembley/Kenneth Berger
Physical Education	Henry Browne
• Fitness Specialist	Lisa Williams
• Health Education	Todd Curran
• Dance	Aulani Chun
• Athletics	Manny Bautista
Physics	Michael Crivello
Political Science	John Avorh/Richard Hammes
Psychology	Yosh Kawahara/Dina Miyoshi
Radiologic Technology	Susan Ramirez

These program reviews, written by the lead writers with input from discipline faculty and in conjunction with department chairs and school deans, followed the revised San Diego Mesa College program review process found in the Academic Program Review Handbook. In addition to changes made to the timeline, lead writers were once again assigned Academic Program Review Committee liaisons at the beginning of the process. This change continues to encourage earlier interaction with the lead writers and results in a more complete final document. Instead of providing only the research on each program, District Instructional Research and Planning included College data so the lead writers had comparison information. Data were provided in both quantitative as well as percentage formats. Special requested data were also provided.

For the year 2004-2005, all of the program reviews were submitted within the established timeline. Within these program reviews are two exceptions: Political Science and Geography. Due to a change in lead writer late in the process, Political Science was moved from the 2003-2004 to the 2004-2005 cycle. The 2004-2005 Geography program review was received incomplete due to personal emergencies suffered by the lead writer. The Academic Program Review Committee is recommending that its suggestions and these incomplete portions be included when the program is in Year Two of the cycle (please see page 13 of this document for further information).

Each program review document was read and evaluated by two program review committee members using the approved "Year One Evaluation Worksheet." After the reviewers met and discussed their findings, the lead writers were contacted and provided feedback. Lead writers were given the choice of meeting with the reviewers, receiving an e-mail or using the telephone to discuss these findings. Once given feedback from the reviewers, lead writers had time to revise their program review documents should they wish to do so. Lead writers were given copies of their portion of the committee's final report to review and provide feedback that was incorporated into this report.

Following the guidelines developed and approved by the Academic Affairs Committee, the Academic Program Review Committee prepared its final, written report. This report was reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee on February 13, 2006 prior to submission to the President's Cabinet.

As the Program Review Committee worked its way through the 2004-2005 cycle, members felt that the following findings would strengthen the review process and inform various college processes:

### **Recommendation #1**

It is recommended that the results of the academic program review process be considered as the discipline-level component of the College's overall educational master planning.

Rationale: Mesa's Academic Program Review process received commendation during our recent Accreditation onsite visit and in the subsequent team report. This process was viewed as the heart of the College's educational master planning.

### **Recommendation #2**

As the College develops its educational master plan, it is recommended that the Academic Program Review Committee be given direction from the Strategic Planning Committee as to the:

- A. Types of information that should be reported including any changes to the current content;
- B. Format that the report should take;
- C. Distribution of the entire report as well as its parts (i.e., Student Learning Outcomes, six-year curriculum review);
- D. These same three items for the report written for the programs in Years Two – Five.

Appendix A, page 23, is an example of a report done after the program review cycle is completed. At the present time this report is presented to Deans' Council and used in the development of the IELM requests as well as faculty, staff, and facilities needs.

Rationale: Currently the Committee's report contains three major sections and appendices:

- A. A report of the process itself;
- B. Recommendations to strengthen the program review process;

C. A narrative on each of the programs in the current cycle.

During Year One of the Academic Program Review cycle, a wealth of information is collected that describes and assesses the program as well as enumerates its short and long-term goals.

### **Recommendation #3**

In addition to improving teaching and learning, the results of the development of SLOs and their assessment need to be documented and reported both internally and externally. To support this implementation at the program level, it is recommended that the College:

- A. Continue to provide SLO training for program faculty;
- B. Continue to provide resources to the programs and/or departments;
- C. Identify and catalog existing best practices;
- D. Develop a format for use by the lead writer and/or department when reporting SLO and assessment information;
- E. Develop a distribution list for dissemination of this report;
- F. Post pertinent information to a "Student Learning Outcome and Assessment" website.

Rationale: Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the Associate Degree level were developed by the College's Research Committee and endorsed by the President's Cabinet and the Academic Senate. SLOAC, an implementation plan for student learning outcomes, was also developed by the Research Committee and approved by the same participatory governance bodies. This SLOAC process is being used by the 2005-2006 Year One programs. These twelve (12) programs will be describing how they are addressing or plan to address the six components of the College's SLOs at the Associate degree level and then developing both short and long-term goals for their implementation at the program and course levels with the selection of appropriate assessment methods.

### **Recommendation #4**

During the training, lead writers were given appropriate curriculum materials to respond to this part of the Academic Program Review. One of these documents is a listing of the courses within the program containing information about integration, when the courses were last reviewed and a planning grid for the curriculum review (see Appendix B, page 24). The template for this planning grid was originated by the Languages Program and included as an attachment in support of one of their short-term goals to "begin updating integrated course outlines up for review." The Academic Program Review Committee would like to recognize and commend the Languages Program for this valuable contribution to the College. It is recommended that this completed document become part of the Academic Program Review's final report for Year One and be distributed to Mesa's Curriculum Review Subcommittee and other appropriate areas.

Rationale: The review of curriculum is an ongoing effort by the College and the District. Maintaining currency in the curriculum is essential for articulation with four-year colleges and universities as well as to ensure acceptance of our graduates by business and industry. To meet the needs of the required six-year curriculum review, the Academic Program Review cycle has become the vehicle to report the planned review of course

outlines effective with the 2005-2006 Year One programs. The twelve programs will describe their plans for review and/or integration of its curriculum stating which courses, degrees, and/or certificates will be reviewed in each of the years of the five-year cycle as well include this planning as part of the new goals for the program.

### **Recommendation #5**

To support research functions associated with Academic Program Review, it is recommended that the newly hired research analyst work with the committee in the following ways:

- A. Revisit the data provided to all Year One programs to ensure that it is appropriate and meets the needs of the programs.
- B. Assist the committee with the selection of appropriate research data for Years One through Five.
- C. Assist the lead writers with the selection of specific research requests as described in the Academic Program Review Handbook (see Appendix C, pages 25-26, Form 1, Statistical Analysis for Instructional Programs).
- D. Assist the lead writer and program faculty with the selection of appropriate research relative to SLOs and assessment.

Rationale: The Academic Program Review process continues to incorporate the use of research data to support the questions found on Form 2, the narrative portion of Year One. In addition, Years Two through Five also incorporate the use of research data. With the advent of student learning outcomes (SLOs), the importance of research data will continue to grow.

### **Recommendation #6**

It is recommended that the use of the Survey Select software be revisited when the college-level research analyst is hired.

Rationale: A software package called Survey Select was purchased so faculty could obtain program-specific data from students, graduates and employers. Survey Select software may be used to design, collect and tabulate data for analysis from these groups. Its use was discontinued during the 2003-2004 Academic Program Review cycle due to technical and logistical problems.

### **Recommendation #7**

To assist members of the Academic Program Review Committee with the evaluation of the program reviews and the writing of the Year One Report, it is recommended that the lead writers submit copies of the following documents:

- A. All research used when responding to program review questions
- B. The planning document developed for SLOs
- C. The planning document for six-year curriculum review

It is recommended that this information be added to the existing Lead Writer/Dean Checklist (see Appendix D, page 27).

The suggestions and recommendations given above are a result of an analysis of the findings, problems, issues and concerns discussed with our parent committee, and others during this past program review cycle. We commend the efforts of all program lead writers, discipline faculty, department chairs and deans who worked so diligently to complete their reviews in accordance with the process approved by the Academic Affairs Committee and the President's Cabinet.

The Program Review Committee completed its review of all submitted documents and revisions to these within the established timeline. The following pages contain reports of the Committee's findings resulting from its review and deliberations. All supporting documentation and worksheets are on file in the Office of Instructional Services and Economic Development.

# **San Diego Mesa College**

## **Academic Program Review**

### **Committee Report for Year One**

**2003-2004**

**Presented to President's Cabinet**

**March 1, 2005**

DATE: March 1, 2005  
TO: President's Cabinet  
SUBJECT: ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT FOR YEAR ONE,  
2003-2004

The following list contains the names of the programs reviewed for Year One during the 2003-2004 academic year and program review cycle. For information, the name of the lead writer has been included.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Lead Writer(s)</u>
Geographic Information Systems	John Johnson
Health Information Technology	Teddy Scribner
History	Mary Lou Locke
Mathematics	Laleh Howard, Terrie Teegarden
Medical Assisting	Temma al-Mukhtar
Microsoft	Russell English
Multimedia	Alfonso Saballett, Carlos Toth, Karen
Owen	
Music	Igor Korneitchouk
Physical Therapist Assistant	Christine Kinney
Political Science	John Avorh, Richard Hammes
Real Estate	Shadrick Jefferies, Roger Gee

The above program reviews, written by the lead writers with input from discipline faculty and in conjunction with department chairs and school deans, followed the revised San Diego Mesa College program review process found in the Academic Program Review Handbook, approved by the President's Cabinet on May 6, 2003. In addition to changes made to the timeline, lead writers were assigned Academic Program Review Committee liaisons at the beginning of the process. This revision encouraged earlier interaction with the lead writers and resulted in a more complete final document. Instead of providing only the research on each program, District Instructional Research and Planning included college data so the lead writers had comparison information. The new format of Form 3 as one document that included new goals, needs, plans of action, timeframe, and person(s) assigned was found to be favorable by both the lead writers and liaisons.

For the year 2003-2004, most of the program reviews were submitted within the established timeline. The program review for Political Science was not received due to a change of lead writer late in the process. An extension to December 13, 2004 was given to the new lead writers, however the program review was not submitted. The new Political Science lead writers are working diligently to complete a thorough and effective program review. The Academic Program Review Committee is recommending that the Political Science review be moved to the 2005-2006 Year One cycle.

Each program review document was read and evaluated by two program review committee members using the approved "Year One Evaluation Worksheet". After the reviewers met and discussed their findings, the lead writers were contacted and provided feedback. Lead writers were given the choice of meeting with the reviewers, receiving an e-mail or using the telephone to discuss these findings. Once given feedback from the reviewers, lead writers had time to revise their program review documents should they wish to do so. Lead writers were given copies of their portion of the committee's final report to review and provide feedback that was incorporated into this report.

Following the guidelines developed and approved by the Academic Affairs Committee, the Academic Program Review Committee prepared its final, written report. This report was reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee on February 14, 2005 prior to submission to the President's Cabinet.

As the Program Review Committee worked its way through the 2003-2004 cycle, members felt that the following findings would strengthen the review process:

- The Year One Academic Program Review cycle for 2003-2004 involved a pilot where five (5) programs were to use Survey Select to design, administer, collect, tabulate and analyze student, graduate and/or employer data. Due to unforeseen technical and logistical problems, it is recommended that the original programs continue as pilots into Year Two and that the software not be used until the College has an established research staff to support this activity. (See Appendix A, page 19)
- Institutional Effectiveness Data is also used during the Year One Academic Program Review process to support the questions found on Form 2, the narrative portion. It is recommended that this data continue to be used by all of the Year One programs. (See Appendices B, page 24 and C, page 26).
- To support these research functions associated with the Academic Program Review process, it is strongly recommended that a college-level researcher be hired. This individual would work closely with the committee and the District office of Institutional Research and Planning to provide appropriate data.
- Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the Associate Degree level have been developed by the college's Research Committee and endorsed by the President's Cabinet and the Academic Senate. The next step in the process involves implementation at both the programmatic and course levels. To support the implementation at the program level, it is recommended that the Academic Program Review process be used as the vehicle to achieve this goal during Year One of the cycle. Student Learning Outcomes would be included in Part B of Form 2, the Program Review Response Sheet in the "Value of the Program to Students" section.

The following question would be added:

Describe how the program is addressing or plans to address the six components of the College's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the Associate degree level.

In addition, SLOs would be included in part C, New Goals for the Program as well as added to the appropriate section(s) of the Year One Evaluation Worksheet.

An excellent example of how this recommendation can be incorporated in a program review is presented in Appendix D, page 27. The Committee would like to recognize and commend the History program for its high quality report and especially for the inclusion of Mesa's SLOs in their program review. In addition to describing how their courses fulfill each of the SLOs, the program has developed a long-term goal to "develop a feasible, sustainable, and honest method of assessing student learning outcomes." The Program Review Committee is recommending that these changes be instituted in Year One for the 2005-2006 Academic Program Review cycle. (See Appendix E, pages 31-34)

Although the College's SLOs at the Associate degree level and the Genesis paper (See Appendix F/G) will be provided as a resource to the lead writers, the Academic Program Review Committee is requesting assistance from the Research Committee by having a member or two be available as consultants to the lead writers to help with SLOs at the programmatic level and how to address them in the program review. Also, have a Research Committee member participate in the lead writer training and/or develop a special flex workshop on SLOs and program review.

- The review of curriculum is an ongoing effort by the College and the District. Maintaining currency in the curriculum is essential for articulation with four-year colleges and universities as well as to ensure acceptance of our graduates by business and industry. To meet the needs of this curriculum review, the Program Review Committee is recommending that the Academic Program Review process be used as the vehicle to plan the review of course outlines effective with the Fall, 2005 cycle.

For the Arts and Sciences disciplines, the review must be completed every six (6) years. For the vocational disciplines, a three (3) year cycle is required. During Year One of the Academic Program Review process, the planned curriculum review will be:

- A) identified in Part B of Form 2, the Program Review Response Sheet in the "Value of the Program to Mesa College" section and;
- B) incorporated into Part C, New Goals for the Program.

To achieve this recommendation for Year One, the following question will be added:

Describe the program's plan for review and/or integration of its curriculum stating which courses, degrees, and/or certificates will be reviewed in each of the years of the five-year review cycle. A six-year review is required for Arts and Sciences disciplines. A three-year review is required for Vocational disciplines. Include this plan in Part C, New Goals for the Program. (See Appendix E, pages 31-32, 35)

In order to assist the lead writers with the response to this part of the program review, the Academic Program Review Committee is requesting the assistance of the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) with the preparation of the appropriate curriculum materials to include in the program review packet. In addition, assistance is also requested with the development of training materials for the curriculum review piece.

- To assist with the submission of required documentation, the instructions concerning the attachment of the program pages from the current catalog, it is recommended that this part of the program review response sheet be in bold type and underlined and added to the checklist. It should also be added to the training materials. (See Appendix E, page 30,37)

The suggestions and recommendations given above are a result of an analysis of the findings, problems, issues and concerns discussed with our parent committee, the Year One pilot programs and others during this past program review cycle. We commend the efforts of all program lead writers, department chairs and deans who worked so diligently to complete their reviews in accordance with the process approved by the Academic Affairs Committee and the President's Cabinet.

The Program Review Committee completed its review of all submitted documents and revisions to these within the process timeline. The following pages contain reports of the Committee's findings resulting from its review and deliberations.

All supporting documentation and worksheets are on file in the Office of Instructional Services and Economic Development.