

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Committee

Integration Project Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Meeting - Wednesday, July 25, 2007, 2:00-3:30 p.m., LRC 208

PRESENT: Yvonne Bergland, Dean (co-chair); Joi Blake, Dean, Student Services; Ailene Crakes, Student Services Representative; Rob Fremland, Program Review Representative (co-chair); Naomi Grisham, Student Services Representative; Adela Jacobson, Student Services Representative; Susan Mun, Program Review Representative (Campus-Based Researcher); Caterina Palestini, Program Review Representative; Monica Romero, Student Services Representative; Ebony Tyree, Student Services Representative; Chris Sullivan, Program Review Representative.

ABSENT: Jill Baker, Program Review Representative (excused).

GUEST: None.

The meeting was called to order at 2:06 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. Posting of Minutes to the Website. Bergland noted that the minutes will be posted and the link will be sent to the subcommittee members.

2. Review and Approval of Agenda. No items were added.

3. Review of Revisions to Program Review Handbook.

a. Years Two to Five ().** Bergland noted that the Years Two to Five revisions were attached to the notice of meeting. She indicated the revisions made to those years were not as extensive as Year One and noted that most of the changes were editorial. The major change made to each of these years was in the signature block. It has been revised to read "department chair or supervisor" and the "Vice President of Student Services" was added. No other revisions were made during the meeting. The Year One Checklist was not included with the notice of meeting and will be emailed separately to the members.

After discussion, it was M/S/C by Joi Blake and Rob Fremland to accept the revisions to Years Two to Five as noted.

b. Year One ().** Bergland noted that the Year One electronic file was attached to the notice of meeting. She indicated that the major revisions were made on page 15, where "service area workshop" in the appropriate places was added under "Value of Program to Mesa".

Discussion followed as Naomi Grisham suggested adding "activities" on page 15. The difference between "Value of Program to Mesa" and "Value of Program to Students" was clarified. It was suggested that "activities" could be addressed in more than one area and that this should be clarified during the lead writer training. Other revisions to Year One were relative to the signature component, where "supervisor" was added on page 16. A bullet was added to the Evaluation Worksheet on page 23 to address where SLO information is being filed.

Page 3 – The wording was revised to include the student services component: “lead writers/department chairs/student services supervisors” to item 6.

Page 4 – The wording “service area supervisor” was added to the first sentence. Item 5, the third sentence, the word “staff” was added. “Staff” was also added in the third line from the bottom of the page. Item 10, the fourth line down, the words “or service areas” were added.

Pages 5 and 6 – These pages will be revised to include the placement of student service areas under item D.

Page 7 – The following revision will be made to the third paragraph, second sentence: “during the process, ...programs or services areas can describe their needs.” In the next paragraph, the word “phase” was added. In the last sentence, a revision was made to include the words “additional information....” Item B, the second paragraph, the word “evaluate” had replaced “reviewed”; however, after discussion, it was agreed to change it back to “reviewed”.

Page 8 – In items 1.c. and 2.b., wording was revised to reflect lead “writer”.

Page 9 – In the first box of the schematic, the wording was revised to include the word “staff”.

Pages 10-11 – These pages will be revised once the research piece is finalized.

Page 12 – In the third paragraph from the bottom, the part that includes the wording “when responding” will be revised once the revision on the research piece is complete. At this time, the word “dean” has been changed to “manager”.

Page 13 – There were not revisions made to this page.

Page 14 – The definition of “Accreditation Liaison Officer” (ALO) was added.

Page 15 – Under “Value of Program or Service Area to the Community”, the second bullet in the italicized print, the wording was revised to read “plans to develop....” This wording was also added to the end of the third bullet. Also, the section discussing “course” now includes wording to reflect “or service area workshops”.

Page 16 – The word “supervisor” was added to the signature piece.

Pages 17-19 – No revisions were made to these pages.

Page 20 – In the third paragraph, the words “or service area” were added. Also, after discussion, the word “evaluate” will be changed to “reviewed”. Another change that will be made is: “assigned to evaluate program reviews outside their department, school or service area”.

After discussion, it was M/S/C by Joi Blake and Chris Sullivan to approve Year One pending the completion of the information to be determined on page 5, 6, 10, 11, and 12.

4. Revisit the Five Year Program Review Cycle – Finalize Placement of Student Services Areas (*). Bergland reviewed this document that was developed following discussion at the meeting of the Student Services Administrators (SSA). Bergland was invited to attend that meeting where discussion took place to determine placement of

programs. A next step is for the student services areas to provide names of the lead writers for the student services areas to Bergland's office.

a. Year One – Fall, 2007. After extensive discussion, the following student service units were placed in the Year One program review cycle: Admissions (Matriculation component); Orientation/Assessment; Counseling (including Athletic advisory, Puente, Mesa Academy, International Student component, Personal Growth classes); Transfer Center; Career Services; DSPS; and EOPS/CARE/STAR.

b. Year Two – Spring, 2008. Bergland noted that Evaluations and Student Affairs (noting the areas included with Student Affairs) will be evaluated in Year Two during spring 2008.

c. Year Three – Spring, 2008. Bergland noted that Outreach will be evaluated in Year Three during spring 2008.

d. Year Four – Spring, 2008. Bergland noted that Financial Aid will be evaluated in Year Four during spring 2008.

e. Year Five – Spring, 2008. Bergland noted that Student Health Services, and Admissions with Records and Veterans (including the International Student component) will be evaluated in Year Five during spring 2008.

Bergland's office will revise these documents based upon discussion during this meeting and will distributed revised electronic copies to the subcommittee.

Jacobson reminded the group that discussions had taken place regarding International Students and that each area affected by International Students would address it in their program review document. It was agreed that the lead writers assigned to coordinate the program reviews for student services would need to be well versed in knowing what areas are to be included in the program review.

After discussion, it was M/S/C by Blake and Sullivan to approve the placement of the programs in the review cycle as discussed above and to add them in the program review handbook.

Fremland suggested revisiting the current list of Year One academic programs to accommodate the addition of the seven student services areas added to Year One. Bergland noted that along with the student services areas, the committee membership has increased with additional student service area representatives who would be assigned as liaisons. The Committee may need to further increase its membership in the future to accommodate the increased workload.

5. Next Steps – Research Needs. Bergland noted that determining the research needs is part of the next steps in the integration process. As discussed in the past, this part of the process will not require the entire subcommittee's participation.

The first piece will be completed by Susan Mun, the Campus-Based Researcher, along with Bergland and a representative from the District Research office. The goal is to develop a template. Student Services representatives from this subcommittee will be asked to provide their feedback. Those subcommittee members from the academic side may assist as consultants.

Bergland suggested that a meeting of the entire subcommittee is not needed until mid to late August. Mun is currently responding to recommendations made by the then Academic Program Review Committee prior to the hiring of the CBR. These recommendations refer to revisiting the research component for the academic programs. The current research instrument is being reviewed to determine the baseline information to all of the student services programs. Once the research piece is revised, this information will be sent to the subcommittee, and at that time, a meeting of the entire subcommittee will be discussed to finalize this part.

Bergland noted that after the baseline data is determined for the appropriate service areas, the research request form may be used to obtain additional research. Blake indicated that several student services areas may be requesting similar data. She will be working with them to submit one request for research.

Bergland requested the student services areas representatives to provide her with feedback as to the type of baseline data that may be needed by those areas. She suggested reviewing the baseline data provided to the academic programs.

For example, Bergland noted that the data needs for the “services” part of Counseling need to be determined. She indicated that a curriculum grid would be provided for the Personal Growth classes. Bergland suggested that if there is consistent data that is needed, her office needs to be given this information. If there is no source of data, then the need for it would be noted in the service area’s goals so that it may be collected for future use. Discussion followed as to the coinciding site visit for Matriculation.

6. Next Meeting – Date/Time/Location/Who. No meeting was set for the subcommittee at this time as members will be participating in separate meetings to discuss the research component.

7. Roundtable.

- Crakes received clarification that all programs and service areas will undergo program review every year. Bergland noted that the one program that has not gone through the program review process is Student Health Services and that this program was placed in Year Five in spring 2008 to assist them with preparation for Year One the following year.
- Jacobson noted that each student services area was instructed to provide their previous program review documents to Bergland’s office. Bergland indicated that not all student services program reviews (electronic and/or hard copy) have been received.
- Jacobson also expressed concern as to possible “conflict of interest” on the part of student services committee representatives if they are assigned to read program reviews from their respective areas. Bergland clarified that this will not occur. She explained the process of assigning liaisons and noted that the new members will be paired with seasoned members to assist them with the review process.
- Bergland will provide a revised list of student service areas based upon discussion at this meeting.

8. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:22 p.m.

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