

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Committee

Integration Project Subcommittee Meeting – Administrative Services - Minutes

Meeting - Wednesday, July 16, 2008, 9:00-11:00 a.m., LRC 208

PRESENT: Yvonne Bergland, Dean (co-chair); Kris Clark, Program Review Representative; Jonathan Fohrman, Program Review Representative; Rob Fremland, Program Review Representative (co-chair); Susan Mun, Program Review Representative (Campus-Based Researcher); Chris Sullivan, Program Review Representative; Kathleen Wells, Administrative Services Representative.

ABSENT: Penny Hedgecoth, Administrative Services Representative (excused); Ian Kay, Program Review Representative (excused).

GUEST: None.

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Dr. Yvonne Bergland, Dean, Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research in LRC 208. An agenda and handouts were distributed with the circulation of a sign-in sheet.

1. Welcome and Introductions. Bergland welcomed the subcommittee to this integration meeting.

2. Review and Discussion of Integration Project.

a. What is Program Review? Bergland stated that program review is a self assessment of a program or service area. It is conducted by members of that area, who have selected a lead writer to report/document the information into the program review instrument. The goal of this subcommittee during the summer is to review the instrument and make any necessary changes to integrate Administrative Services (referred to as "AS").

b. Recommendations Approved by President's Cabinet (*). Bergland reviewed a handout containing the recommendations approved at the President's Cabinet. These recommendations outline the process for integration of AS, including that they will begin the process in fall 2008, participate in the lead writer training, and determine research needs. Discussion continued as to how program review fits into the campus' planning process through the goals established by each program or service area. Bergland noted the individuals involved in the process. Bergland reported that as a follow up to the President's Cabinet retreat, steps have been outlined to link the planning processes together. It was determined that program review forms the basis for all campus planning. A task force of the President's Cabinet is working to link all the College's planning processes. Priorities will be highlighted for a given year.

c. ACCJC Rubric (*). Bergland noted that this document was received a year ago and it was presented at President's Cabinet. It contains three rubrics for evaluating institutional effectiveness. It involves program review, planning, and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). All areas should be above the awareness level. Bergland reported that she met with Ron Perez, Vice President of AS, to discuss the integration of AS into the program review process. As a result, Bergland researched different models for this integration.

Further discussion of the rubric indicated that Mesa is further along than the awareness level in terms of program review. It was noted that administrative services (note this term is not capitalized) is the offices of the President, VPA, and Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services. These overall administrative services will be integrated into the program review process at a later time. Deans' offices will be subsumed under their respective VP office. She referenced a similarity between incorporating program review of general education, for which the Program Review Committee will be collecting all information on general education from each program review document to be used by a future subcommittee who will conduct a program review of general education on a separate review cycle. A similar model may be used for the administrative services piece as referenced above.

3. Five Year Program Review Cycle - Placement of Administrative Services.

a. Year One – Fall, 2008 (*). Bergland provided a handout listing the areas and lead writers/co-writers, provided by Vice President Perez. Kathleen Wells has agreed to serve as one of the lead writers for AS. These areas will all be in Year One, beginning fall 2008. Bergland noted, and Wells confirmed, that the areas listed on this handout accurately represent an agreed upon division of programs that make up AS. Such areas as Facilities, ABSO, and Computing Services were discussed but are not included as part of these programs as they will be handled in the next phase. It was discussed that perhaps Computing Services should be included in the LRC program review or with the LRC dean's area review to be done at a later time under the VPI.

Bergland noted that "Accounting" is part of AS but it is already included under the student services program review of this area. She will provide a copy of this organizational chart to the subcommittee for future reference.

Discussion followed as to a name for the AS areas as one program. Bergland asked Wells to follow up on a name. Also, the cover on the Handbook and any reference to "program/ service areas" has to be revised to include AS. The front matter of the Handbook will list what areas are included. It was noted that Reprographic Center, Mailroom, and Stockroom will be included as one program review document, unless determined that they should be separated out. She referenced page 5 of the Handbook, area D, where a piece will be written regarding AS and its integration process.

Discussion followed as to how the District feeds into Mesa's planning. Currently, the program review year-end reports are not forwarded to the District, however, Bergland indicated that once AS and the accompanying integration of administrative services is in effect, a recommendation to forward this information to the District may be discussed and agreed upon by the Committee.

Wells referenced the findings of the Accreditation team that there is a disconnection between District and Mesa. By forwarding program review information to the District and presenting it to the Board, these actions will provide evidence of our connections.

b. Years Two – Five - Spring, 2009. Bergland noted that no AS programs have been placed in these years at this time. Since Year One is a big document, there is a bye next year during the review process. Rob Fremland explained the five-year cycle and what information goes into each year's document, including setting goals, etc.

Discussion followed as to movement of goals by Bergland's office for each year of the cycle. Caterina Palestini noted that the process to access materials has changed and will involve access to a shared drive rather than downloading materials to a password-protected site.

Discussion followed as to the need to replace the outgoing Student Services Co-chair and the need for an Administrative Services Co-chair. This will be determined by the Committee.

Jonathan Fohrman asked what happens to goals that are sometimes up to ten years old and whether or not the Committee flags such goals for follow up. Bergland noted that recommendations are made by the Program Review Committee in their year-end report and are provided to the lead writers the following year for incorporation into that year's document. Fremland suggested in that case, perhaps the goals should be re-worked. Bergland noted it is ultimately up to the lead writers/deans to keep track of such goals. Kris Clark indicated perhaps highlighting a new part in the document for recurring goals. This item will be discussed with other revisions to the Handbook.

4. Program Review Committee Membership/Lead Writers.

a. How Many from Administrative Services. Bergland explained how Student Services membership was determined. She indicated that not all lead writers from AS need to be on the Committee. She reviewed the process followed by committee members and included their role as liaisons to programs assigned to them for review. All assigned programs are outside their respective areas. She suggested perhaps two or three people from AS to sit on the Committee. Wells will discuss this with Vice President Perez. At this time, Wells believes that two representatives, perhaps herself and Penny Hedgecoth, will serve on the Committee.

b. Who. This item will be carried over to the next meeting once names are determined.

c. Lead Writers for Year One. These names have been determined and are listed on the handout under item 3a.

d. Lead Writer Training – Years One – Five (*). Bergland noted this handout provides the meeting dates for the Program Review Committee as well as the date for the Lead Writer Training for Years One – Five. This document also lists the dates for presentation of the reports to Academic Affairs Committee, of which we are a subcommittee, and the President's Cabinet. Bergland added that the lead writer/Committee liaison charts will also be revised during the summer to include AS.

5. Review of Program Review Handbook.

a. 2007 Program Review Handbook ().** Bergland indicated this part involves overall revisions to the Handbook as well as new input for the integration of AS.

b. Approved Revisions to Year One, Form 2 ().** Bergland noted this document was sent via email with the meeting reminder. It is the latest revision that will be included in the Handbook. Guidelines are included to assist with answering the questions.

c. Next Steps.

- **Administrative Services Revisions (*).** Bergland provided a handout including the results of research she compiled during the spring semester. Under "General", it lists general information as to what AS means for institutions that have integrated it. It appears we already have all these pieces for program review. The "Components" part details what needs to be included in the document itself. Again, it appears our instrument already includes this information with the exception of perhaps bullet #9. It appears the questions may not need to be revised in our instrument but rather changes need to be made to the instructions (the italics) on how to respond.

Bergland included a handout attached to these research results that includes examples regarding “Administrative Unit Outcomes” and assessment methods that relate to SLOs. Bergland invited any other members of the Subcommittee to go online to see if other information exists that might be helpful. Wells indicated she had planned to do so.

Susan Mun asked regarding posting program review materials online as a step toward further transparency. Bergland explained that steps have been taken in the areas of research to post information online. She indicated perhaps the Handbook and year-end reports may be posted online.

Wells indicated that she will follow up to obtain a name for AS, a name for the two components, volunteers for the Committee, and further research online.

- **General Changes to Front Matter (Timeline and Introduction).** Bergland noted that she will make general changes to this part to include wording for AS.

Year One Revisions. Bergland noted that Year One already has two programs coming forward from Student Services (Admissions and Student Health Services) who were in Year Five last year. For fall 2008, Year One will also include AS. She added the bulk of the work will be to revise information in Year One therefore, the main assignment for the next meeting is to review Year One as well as the entire Handbook.

- **Years Two – Five Revisions.** Bergland indicated these years will also be reviewed at the next meeting.
- **Review/Revise for Clarity, etc.** Bergland noted that the overall Handbook will be reviewed at the next meeting for clarity, etc.

6. Next Meeting.

a. Date/Time. Bergland noted the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 30th – from 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. in LRC 208.

b. Assignment. This item was discussed under item 5 above.

c. Research Needs. Bergland noted Mun’s role is to think about the research pieces for AS. A meeting with Mun, Bergland, and Wells will be scheduled to begin work in this area.

d. Other. No items were added.

7. Roundtable.

- Discussion followed as to the incorporation of SLOs in the program review documents. It was noted the assessment piece is still evolving. It was reaffirmed that program review is a reporting mechanism for SLOs only. The newly formed SLO Subcommittee is responsible for all aspects relative to SLOs. A liaison approach is being developed whereby members of the SLO Subcommittee will be sent out to assist programs and service areas. Bergland suggested that AS may want to be represented on the SLO Subcommittee.
- Wells thanked the subcommittee for welcoming AS to the program review process.

8. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:39 a.m.

Submitted by Caterina Palestini, Senior Secretary, Classified Senate Representative
Reviewed and approved by Yvonne Bergland, Co-Chair