

# SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

## Program Review Committee

### Integration Project Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

**Meeting - Wednesday, July 11, 2007, 2:00-3:30 p.m., LRC 208**

**PRESENT:** Jill Baker, Program Review Representative; Yvonne Bergland, Dean (co-chair); Rob Fremland, Program Review Representative (co-chair); Naomi Grisham, Student Services Representative; Adela Jacobson, Student Services Representative; Caterina Palestini, Program Review Representative; Monica Romero, Student Services Representative; Ebony Tyree, Student Services Representative.

**ABSENT:** Joi Blake, Dean, Program Review Representative (excused); Ailene Crakes, Student Services Representative (excused); Susan Mun, Program Review Representative (Campus-Based Researcher) (excused); Chris Sullivan, Program Review Representative (excused).

**GUEST:** Gail Conrad, Interim Vice President, Student Services (unable to attend).

The meeting was called to order at 2:09 p.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. Review and Approval of Minutes of June 18, 2007 (\*).** Clarifications concerning the previous meeting minutes were given. It was M/S/C by Rob Fremland and Monica Romero to approve the Minutes with no changes. Discussion followed as to the distribution of Minutes. Bergland explained that for the Program Review Committee, the Minutes are transcribed, posted on the Web, and a link is included with the notice of meeting so that they may be reviewed prior to the next meeting. She asked if this committee would like to follow the same procedure or continue to list the Minutes as an agenda item. After discussion, it was agreed to post the Minutes online with the Program Review Committee information.

**2. Review and Approval of Agenda (\*).** No items were added. Bergland noted that for the Program Review Committee meetings, the agenda is reviewed by the Co-Chair, Rob Fremland, prior to the meetings. Fremland suggested another co-chair from the Student Services side be considered. This item will be placed on the agenda for the Program Review Committee for discussion at their first meeting in the fall semester. Adela Jacobson will also place this item for discussion at the next Student Services (SSA) Committee meeting. Fremland discussed the role of the Co-Chair. This role includes review of agenda, attendance at the Academic Affairs Committee meetings and President's Cabinet meetings to present the final reports as well as participation at training sessions.

**3. Revisit the Five Year Program Review Cycle - Placement of Student Services Areas (\*).**  
**a. Year One – Fall, 2007.** Bergland explained that the first column on the handout lists the student services areas discussed at the last meeting. Based upon that discussion, some of those programs were placed in Year One.

**b. Year Two – Spring, 2008.** Bergland noted that student services areas have not yet been placed in Year Two.

**c. Year Three – Spring, 2008.** Bergland indicated that “Evaluation and Outreach” was placed in Year Three as these areas are not part of the categorical programs. After discussion, it was noted that “Evaluation” should be separate from “Outreach”.

Discussion followed as to the three-year program review cycle used by student services and the placement of service areas according to that cycle, with the exception of the categorical programs.

Discussion followed as to placement of those student services areas that have not been through the program review process. It was noted that these areas will be placed in Years Two – Five and will be reviewed in spring, 2008. Fremland suggested reversing the order in the three-year cycle to place those student services areas. Bergland indicated that her office requested electronic format for the previous student services program reviews to assist in the movement of goals and/or planning the beginning of the cycle. For those areas that do not have goals, a blank form will be provided. Jacobson added that some of the goals listed may not apply since a new instrument will be used for program review. Bergland indicated that in those cases, goals may be deleted and new ones entered by the service area.

Articulation has been moved to Instruction so this area was not discussed. “Admissions/Records” is listed as one service area while “Veterans” is listed separately. Discussion followed indicating that “Admissions” is part of the Matriculation process. “Records” and “Veterans” are separate service areas. Bergland reported that she is working with Joi Blake as well as using information from discussion at the meetings to finalize the list of programs and their placement. Jacobson indicated that this item will be discussed at the next SSA meeting to determine what areas are to be placed under the Matriculation umbrellas. Fremland indicated the goal is for the placement of the categorical programs in Year One, followed by those areas that have not done a review for a while to be placed in Year Two, and finally, those areas that just finished the review process to be placed in Years Three, Four and Five. Bergland discussed the method used when placing Instructional programs from the three-year cycle into a five-year cycle. Fremland indicated that some programs are under umbrellas while others are on their own. It was an evolutionary process and may be changed as the reviews are done.

Bergland noted, for example, that the Allied Health program undergoes a separate assessment from external accrediting agencies. The program review process answers to most of the questions from those agencies. Bergland asked the student services areas to keep this example in mind when making decisions to configure the services and place them in the cycle. She added that it may be advantageous for “Counseling” to be reviewed on its own. Advantages and disadvantages were discussed. It was noted that if an area is reviewed separately, then a focus is placed on that area and the staff in that area are required to write the program review. If an area is included under an umbrella with another area, then the focus is not just on the one area but more staff are available to assist with the process. Bergland suggested the Tutoring Centers document be studied as an example of a combined program review. Jill Baker discussed the LRC program review as another example where there is one lead writer and a single document but each area contributes information for the document.

Monica Romero suggested inviting Bergland and Fremland to the next meeting of the SSAs. Jacobson indicated that she could share the information from this meeting with the SSAs and additionally agreed that representation from this committee would be beneficial. Bergland indicated that the previous review documents discussed are available for the SSA, should these materials be requested.

**d. Year Four – Spring, 2008.** This item was discussed under 3b.

**e. Year Five – Spring, 2008.** This item was discussed under 3b.

**4. Update on Subcommittee Membership (\*).** Bergland indicated that Ailene Crakes has been appointed to this committee in her new role of Department Chair of Counseling. In the fall semester, all the members of this subgroup will be included as part of the Program Review Committee.

**5. 2006-2007 Institutional Annual Reports.**

**a. Accreditation Annual Report (\*).** Bergland indicated she consulted with individuals and several other sources of information while updating Year One of the Handbook. Also, as per discussion at the previous meeting, she made general revisions to the document to include “student services”, “service units”, etc. She obtained information from individuals involved with the Accreditation Annual Report and provided this report as a handout. This report is included in the meeting packet for reference when reviewing the revised SLO question.

**b. Update on Student Learning Outcomes (\*).** Bergland indicated that information on the status of SLOs, included in the report for WASC, was also used to revise Year One of the Handbook. She included a handout detailing the status of SLOs. She consulted with Gail Conrad, the previous SLOAC Coordinator, as well as Elizabeth Armstrong, Vice President of Instruction. She incorporated information she received from Blake, concerning the categorical programs and SLOs.

**6. Review of Revisions to Academic Program Review Handbook.**

**a. Year One (\*\*).** Bergland indicated the State Chancellor’s document and the one from Armstrong, as discussed under items 5a-b, were used to develop the draft revisions to the Year One part of the Handbook. On the cover and in the Handbook, reference to “Academic” was removed. The name of the committee was changed, since the process incorporates Instruction and Student Services.

Year One of the Handbook was reviewed and discussed. Bergland outlined the changes made as follows:

Page 2 – The section, “what is program review” was re-written to reference AACJC Standard 2 and also discusses Mesa’s model. She made editorial changes such as ensuring that “academic” was removed; where there was “dean” it was replaced with “manager”; where reference was made to “department chair”, she inserted “supervisor”. Also, when there was reference made to “Vice President of Instruction” she pluralized it to “Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services”. Discussion followed. It was noted that changes need to be made to page 4, #5, the third line, and in the same paragraph, line 5: add “staff” to “faculty”. #9, the third line down, after “faculty and staff”, there appears to be a word missing. After further review, it was discovered that the sentence is correct as written.

Page 5 – The major revision was adding Part D, “Integration of ...Models”. Bergland explained she used wording from the recommendation made in the Year One report that was approved by the President’s Cabinet. “History” and “Introduction” will be added. The goal is for the document to report the process in a chronological order. Once the programs from Student Services are determined, they will be placed on the chart found on page 6. Bergland noted that this chart is updated annually.

Page 7 – Most changes made were to remove the word “academic” and adding “service area”, “staff” and “manager”, etc, as applicable.

Page 8 – It was noted that under #1c and #2b, the wording should be changed from “lead faculty” to “lead writer”.

Page 9 – Most changes made were to include “manager”, etc.

Page 10-11 – These pages contain information regarding the research piece and have not been revised. This information will be revised pending completion of revisions to the remaining years in the Handbook. These revisions include placement of Student Services programs as well. It was suggested that developing a “Form A” for Instructional programs and a “Form B” for Student Services may be useful for the research piece. All such documents as well as the revised Handbook will be finalized before discussion takes place on the research piece. Bergland noted that a research request form may be submitted to obtain additional data. She added that data may not be available in some instances and that a goal should be written to obtain this data by a certain date. Bergland’s office is in the process of updating the research provided for program review, based on recommendations made in a previous Year One report.

Bergland added that Blake is reviewing the Handbook to cross-reference information that is relative to the categorical programs. It was noted that the survey previously found on page 12 has been removed and the reference to the survey that is made on page 10 will be deleted. Now that the CBR is available and surveys are being customized as needed, the sample survey is no longer needed.

Page 12 – It was noted that the numbering is incorrect on page 12. Since the survey on page 12 was removed, the numbering will be changed to “2” on that page. Bergland’s office will check the document for overall numbering prior to finalizing the document. Also, Bergland added the wording “or student service area” to sections b, c, d, and e. The “Value of Program or Area...” section included two parts. Discussion followed as to campus-wide SLOs and service area outcomes. Bergland noted that campus-wide SLOs are to be used; however, the method by which they are assessed could be by using service area outcomes.

Page 13 – On Form 2, “or service area” was added to “program“. Under section A, the second bullet, Bergland noted that the question is only for instructional programs and does not apply to student service area programs. Those areas would respond with “does not apply”. Under section B, the student survey, wording will be added to contact Bergland’s office to develop a survey.

Page 14 – Bergland indicated that information was added for the student services areas in the italics portion of the instructions. She asked the committee to review the instructions. Also, #2 concerning SCANS has been included with the revision to the SLOs piece. The

SCANS document will continue to be provided as a resource. The SLO question was expanded. Resource documents will be provided at the training. She asked the committee to provide her with any other source documents for distribution. Bergland reviewed the bulleted items that detail the SLO cycle and provide further direction to the lead writers. There is a note at the bottom of the page to assist the SLOAC Coordinator and the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), to inform them about the location where this information is stored. The term “ALO” will be defined in the Handbook. Vice President Armstrong is the ALO. Bergland asked the committee for feedback on this part since it has changed from the original question. She asked Jill Baker to specifically review this part based on the accreditation report she is currently developing.

Page 15 – Editorial changes were made to this page. Bergland noted that under the first bullet in the “Value to Mesa”, areas not offering courses would respond with “does not apply”. The same answer applies to the six-year review part. The Vice President of Instruction’s office produces a grid outlining the courses in the review process. The Personal Growth courses will be listed on such a grid and will be provided to the lead writer for follow up. A suggestion was made to include workshops that are offered in the student services areas. These workshops can be included in the program review document and the question could include wording such as “student services who offer workshops may respond here”. Naomi Grisham volunteered to provide the wording for this part.

Page 16 – Editorial changes were made to the “new goals” section. Examples, and/or information that would apply to student services and instruction were added. At the bottom of the page, the signature section was reviewed and revised. Bergland noted that the lead writer signs off and she changed the wording to reflect the student services supervisory signatures as they apply. Jacobson indicated she will review this part with the SSA members to ensure that the types of supervisory titles are all included to reflect the student services areas. Bergland added that the committee use box was revised to reflect the pluralization of the Vice President’s and noted that instructional programs will continue to be signed off by the Vice President of Instruction, while the student services areas will be signed off by the Vice President of Student Services.

Page 17-end Bergland noted that editorial changes were made as applicable to these pages.

**b. Year One Report Form (\*).** Bergland included this document and updated it to include student services’ information. She noted that any changes made to the Handbook need to be reflected on this form as well.

**c. Next Steps – Years Two to Five.** Bergland suggested finalizing Year One first before discussing revisions to Years Two to Five. She volunteered to work with Blake to make some revisions to these years while finalizing Year One changes. Then, the entire Handbook will be attached to email for review prior to the next meeting. Information from the SSA meeting will become part of the next meeting agenda for review by the entire subcommittee. Also, if the committee finds any additional changes, they are to send them to her office for incorporation into the document.

Positive comments about this revision were made by Jacobson and Ebony Tyree. Bergland provided an update as the acting Vice President of Instruction. She attended an Executive Staff Meeting and provided a report on the integration process. Bergland reported that the President is very pleased with the committee’s progress and is anticipating review of the final

product. The President added that Mesa has a program review model that can be presented at appropriate conferences to show integration of instruction and student service.

**7. Next Meeting – Date/Time/Location.** After discussion, the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, July 25, 2007, from 2:00 – 3:30 pm. Bergland’s office will send an email to the committee to inform everyone that this meeting to determine their availability and then, a confirmation email will be forwarded. Also, her office will reserve LRC 208.

**8. Roundtable.** No discussion.

**9. Adjournment.** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:39 p.m.

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