

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Program Review Committee

Meeting – Friday, April 3, 2009, 2:00-3:00 pm
LRC, Room 435

PRESENT: Jill Baker, Yvonne Bergland (co-chair), Henry Browne, Kristan Clark, Rob Fremland (co-chair), Anne Geller, Ian Kay, Susan Mun, Bruce Naschak, Caterina Palestini, Danielle Short, Ebony Tyree.

ABSENT:, Joi Blake, Ailene Crakes (excused), Jonathan Fohrman (excused) (proxy to Caterina Palestini), Penny Hedgecoth, Laura Mathis (excused), Juliette Parker (excused), Michael Reese (excused), Monica Romero (co-chair) (excused), Chris Sullivan (excused), Joseph Safdie, Kathleen Wells (co-chair) (excused).

GUEST: None.

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 pm by Dr. Yvonne Bergland, Dean, Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research, Co-chair, in LRC 435. An agenda and handouts were distributed with the circulation of a sign-in sheet.

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

2. Feedback.

a. Virtual Meeting. Positive feedback was given regarding the format of the virtual meeting and it was agreed to use this format in the future as needed.

b. Joint Meeting. Rob Fremland reported that all campuses were represented at this joint meeting. The representative from Miramar was unable to attend but information regarding the program review process at that campus was provided to Fremland. Each campus provided information on their program review process. Every campus conducts a program review process on a yearly basis though the processes differ. Discussion focused on the suggestion to present each campus' program review process to the Board as a coordinated effort. As a first step, it was agreed that each campus would present their process to an onsite Board meeting. Then, this group will meet again to plan the combined presentation for a later date. Bergland expressed her support in terms of sharing information among the campuses and keeping the Board informed for Accreditation purposes.

Bergland reported as a member of the Task Stream implementation team that the SLO program review question may be revised to reflect reporting this information via that software. The SLO information generated by the software would be attached to Mesa's program review document.

3. Update on Year One Programs, 2008-2009.

a. Admissions/Records/Veterans. The liaison reported contact was made with the lead writer who is progressing well.

b. Business Operations. The liaison reported contact was made with the lead writers who are progressing well.

c. Hospitality Cluster. The liaisons reported contact was made with the lead writer who had some questions regarding the forms. The lead writer indicated he would contact liaisons for input to a future draft document.

d. Instructional/Staff Services. The liaisons were not present but provided their feedback via email to Bergland.

e. Student Health Services. The liaisons reported contact was made with the lead writer. A first draft was reviewed by Bergland. She provided feedback to the lead writer who also asked for assistance regarding the use of data.

4. Years Two to Five, 2008-2009 Report ().**

a. Review of Recommendations. Bergland reviewed the three recommendations within the memo of this report. The first recommendation is to review the Handbook for clarity. The second recommendation is to review the Handbook for duplication. The third recommendation is to implement any changes that result from recommendations one and two in fall 2009. After discussion, no further recommendations were added to the report.

b. Formation of Subcommittee. Bergland requested the formation of a subcommittee to complete the tasks associated with the recommendations made in the Years Two to Five Report during the summer. These “virtual” meetings would occur via email. She requested the four co-chairs work together along with Susan Mun and other interested members. One of the major revisions will be including information to assist with use of data in all five years of the cycle. In addition, the Handbook will be reviewed for clarity and duplication. All revisions would be sent to the subcommittee for review and feedback. Beginning next fall, five years of data will be provided to all lead writers in Year One. The revisions to the Handbook will lead to changes in the Lead Writer Training. After discussion, Bergland, Fremland, Kathleen Wells, Susan Mun and Monica Romero volunteered to serve on this subcommittee along with Caterina Palestini and Ian Kay.

c. Review of Schedule for Reporting Program/Service Area Findings (*). Bergland reviewed the email sent on March 23rd containing the timeline for liaisons to return their reports on the programs/service areas to which they were assigned. Next steps involve sending the charts containing the reports to the Committee via email. After discussion, it was agreed that submitting either electronic or hard copy of evaluation worksheets are acceptable. Bergland indicated the timeline to email the last part of the report to the Committee will be by April 17th. A list of missing program reviews was provided. The final report will be presented to the Academic Affairs Committee on April 27th followed by the President’s Cabinet on May 12th.

5. Update on Year Two Programs, 2008-2009.

a. Chemistry. Liaisons not present. No report.

b. Computer Business Technology. The liaison reported the review was complete and well done.

c. Economics. The liaisons reported contact was made and feedback given to the lead writer concerning one of the goals.

d. Engineering. The liaisons were not present but provided their feedback via email to Bergland indicating contact was made with the lead writer with no response.

e. Fashion-Consulting, Design, Merchandising. The liaison reported contact was made with the lead writer and assistance was provided.

Discussion followed regarding the Year Four Evaluation Worksheet and the section pertaining to the previous recommendation in the “first year”. It was noted that this information is not consistent with later years in the cycle and their corresponding worksheets. In addition, it was suggested the reference to past program reviews and follow up regarding whether these recommendations were addressed should be revisited by the subcommittee working on the Handbook this summer.

f. Interior Design. The liaison reported the contact was made with the lead writer and assistance was provided.

g. Learning Resources/Instructional Support. The liaison reported the document is well written.

h. Nutrition. The liaison reported the document is well written.

6. Update on Year Three Programs, 2008-2009.

a. Accelerated College Programs. The liaison reported information concerning specific dates is missing. Discussion followed relative to the current budget situation. It was agreed that with the uncertainty of the current budget situation, using such words as “postponed” rather than exact dates was appropriate.

b. Accounting. The liaisons reported the document was well written.

c. Animal Health Technology. The liaison reported the document was well written.

d. Anthropology. The liaisons reported contact was made with the lead writer with feedback given concerning projected completion dates.

e. Architecture. This program review was not submitted electronically to be reviewed by the assigned liaisons. No report.

f. Art-Fine Art (All). The liaisons were not present. No report.

g. Biology. The liaison reported the report was well written. Several goals were deleted due to the budget crisis, however, after discussion, the liaison agreed to contact the lead writer and suggest using such language as “postponed” rather than deleting those goals.

h. Black Studies. This program review was not submitted. No report.

i. Building Construction-Carpentry/Inspection. This program review was not submitted. The liaison reported contact was made with the lead writer with no response.

j. Chicano Studies. This program review was not submitted. No report.

k. Computer Information Sciences. This program review was not submitted. No report.

l. Evaluations. The liaison reported the document was well written.

- m. Radiologic Technology.** The liaison reported the document was well written.
- n. Student Affairs.** The liaisons reported the document was well written.
- o. Tutoring/Writing Center.** The liaisons reported the program review was received and their report is pending.
- a. Update on Year Four Programs, 2008-2009.**
- a. American Sign Language/Interpreting.** The liaisons were not present. No report.
- b. Child Development.** The liaison reported the document was well written.
- c. Consumer Studies.** The liaison reported the document was well written.
- d. Foreign Languages, All.** The liaison reported the document was well written and in place of using date designations, the lead writer noted “postponed” for many goals.
- e. Geography.** The liaisons reported they did not receive the email containing the electronic program review file. This email will be resent.
- f. Geographic Information Systems.** The liaison reported the document was well written.
- g. Physical Education.** The liaison reported she is following up concerning the goals.
- h. Outreach.** The liaison reported the document was well written. She reported the same issue as with the Year Two worksheet concerning follow up on past recommendations made by the Committee. (See item 5e)
- i. Physics.** The liaison reported the document was well written. There was only one issue with “persons assigned” not completed in some cases. It was suggested to note “department” or other such general area assigned as a placeholder in order to meet this goal in the future. The liaison will follow up with the lead writer to submit an addendum indicating the person(s) responsible for these goals.
- j. Political Science.** The liaison reported review of a draft and feedback was given. The lead writer incorporated feedback in the program review document. The liaison reported the document was well written.
- k. Psychology.** The liaison reported the document was well written. This program was commended for use of data comparison to support their goals.
- b. Update on Year Five Programs, 2008-2009.**
- a. Financial Aid.** The liaisons stated their report is pending.
- b. Health Information Technology.** The liaisons will follow up with the lead writer to include additional information relative to the status of the program’s goals.
- c. History.** The liaison reported the document was well written.

d. Mathematics. The liaisons reported a draft was reviewed and feedback was given to the lead writers. This feedback was incorporated into the document by the lead writer. This program review was reported as exemplary.

e. Medical Assisting. The liaisons were not present. No report.

f. Multimedia. The liaisons stated their report is pending.

g. Music. The program review was not submitted. No report.

h. Physical Therapist Assistant. The program review was not submitted. No report.

i. Real Estate. The program review was not submitted. No report.

9. Update on Lead Writer Training Revision.

NOTE: Subcommittee meeting on March 30th. Bergland reported the subcommittee met on March 30th. Kris Clark reported the suggestions that were made concerning revision of the training format. It was recommended to schedule a one-hour general session with the focus on research and the Handbook revisions. It was suggested to schedule break-out sessions for the following combined years: Years Two and Four, Years Three and Five, Year One first-time lead writers (one to two hours) and Year One continuing lead writers (one hour). All sessions will be scheduled in the LRC if possible.

It was also agreed to hold the training in place of the normally scheduled November meeting and it was suggested that all Committee members be present at the training in order to make face-to-face contact with their assigned lead writers. The subcommittee will also be revising the PowerPoint to accommodate this new format. This new format will use a more hands-on approach.

Caterina Palestini added the program review materials will be posted in a new manner. The "general" files such as the timelines, PowerPoint, liaison lists and the Checklist, will be posted on the Program Review website. The program-specific files and the confidential files, such as program data, will be sent via email to the lead writers with copies to the liaisons. This format will allow easier access to the materials from on and off campus. Bergland added there will be an "ice breaker" activity as well as refreshments at the training.

10. Other Business. No items were added.

11. Roundtable. Mun announced that she attended a Student Learning Outcomes/Institutional Research Regional Coordinators meeting and a resource sheet was distributed. This sheet contained a listing of sample program review information. The link to Mesa's Handbook was listed along with a commendation regarding our program review Handbook and process.

8. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:07 pm.

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