

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Academic Program Review Committee

Meeting – Friday, May 5, 2006, 2:00-3:00 pm
LRC, Room 208

PRESENT: Yvonne Bergland (co-chair), Michael Brown, Henry Browne, Joyce Carrigan, Kristan Clark, Rob Fremland (co-chair), Anne Geller, Bill Grimes, Ian Kay, Devin Milner, Bruce Naschak, Caterina Palestini, Juliette Parker, Teddy Scribner, Leslie Sieger, Chris Sullivan, Cindy Wijma.

ABSENT: Gail Conrad, Otto Lee, Guillermo Marrujo, Robin Martindill.

GUEST: Susan Mun, Campus-Based Researcher.

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 pm by Dr. Yvonne Bergland, Dean, Instructional Services and Economic Development, Co-chair, in LRC 208. An agenda and handouts were distributed with the circulation of a sign-in sheet.

1. Review and Approval of Agenda. No items were added to the Agenda. Bergland introduced Susan Mun, Campus-Based Researcher, and a new member of the Committee.

2. Year-End Report, 2005/06.

a. Review and Discussion of Final Version ().** Bergland indicated that this revised document was sent via email to Committee members. She thanked the Committee for their affirmative responses for the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Microsoft programs.

b. Feedback from Liaisons. Bergland asked the Committee for any final feedback. She noted the information was incorporated regarding the GIS and Microsoft programs. Also, the listing of programs was revised to include this information for GIS and Microsoft. Appendix A contains the actual documentation from the Vice President of Instruction that contains the full rationale for GIS and Microsoft recommendations.

The liaisons indicated that they received little or no feedback from the lead writers.

c. Next Steps.

- **May 8 Academic Affairs Committee Meeting.** Bergland indicated that the Year-End report will be presented to Academic Affairs on May 8 and it will be sent to them for review prior to this meeting. Fremland and Seiger volunteered to attend. This report will be listed first on their agenda.
- **May 23 Presentation at President's Cabinet.** Bergland indicated that the report will be presented for review and approval at the President's Cabinet meeting on May 23 and will be distributed for review prior to the meeting. Bergland, Fremland, Sullivan and Palestini volunteered to attend.

Bergland thanked the Committee for their work in the development of this report.

3. Continued Discussion re: SLOs, Curriculum and Program Review (Fremland).

Fremland indicated that based on feedback from faculty, the notion of a separate SLOs

report as well as reporting it through academic program review, should be revisited. It might be less work to have it as one report. Since it is unknown at this time as to what type of report will be submitted for SLOs, faculty workload should be considered. This topic has been discussed by the Academic Affairs Committee and at the Academic Senate. He added that the questions asked concern the format for reporting SLOs. The other issue is that SLOs are only addressed in Year One. He questions if the program will be required to develop a SLOAC report every year or is the continued work on SLOs reported through the program goals during these years. The role of this Committee needs to be discussed.

Bergland reported that Gail Conrad, SLOAC Coordinator, presented a grid to Deans' Council and this grid contains information for each course in each of the programs. This grid could be sent to the department chair, lead writer or the person "in charge" of SLOs. Also, Norena Badway will be returning in both the fall and spring of 2006-2007 to update the College on current information regarding SLOs. Bergland suggested asking Dr. Badway these types of questions. Also, Bergland reminded the Committee that these questions were asked in the Year One report.

Kris Clark indicated that Conrad attended her department meeting and indicated that even though the programs in Year One are required to report on SLOs, every program should be working on them. A reporting mechanism should be developed. Academic program review should be the reporting mechanism but an additional method should be used for follow up. Perhaps the department chair should provide follow-up as different faculty in multiple departments under the chair are developing SLOs. The grid should be used and updated yearly to assist the lead writer with reporting progress.

Discussion continued with a suggestion made to ask each department to name a specific person to do SLOs but doing so means this person becomes "responsible" for continuing the follow-up.

Anne Geller indicated that it may be easier for larger departments to report on SLOs but it is a much bigger issue for smaller departments. She suggested attaching the report to the program review document. Fremland agreed that for those departments that are having difficulty with SLOs could write a paragraph describing their difficulty. The global problem is Mesa faculty are proactive but the down-side is that by being proactive creates a lot of extra work for faculty. The real problem exists for small departments.

As discussion followed relative to reducing the number of required reports and replace them with a statement about what is taking place in the department relative to SLOs. Bergland suggested that departments write that SLOs are a "goal that it is being explored". If they have a report, then attach it. A suggestion was made to place the SLOs requirement in a subsequent year rather than in Year One to reduce the size of that report. Bergland noted that there is a five-year SLOAC Implementation Cycle. It is irrelevant when the cycle is started during the academic program review cycle. If SLOs are added as a goal, then follow-up can occur.

Bergland suggested including Conrad on the Agenda for the first meeting in the fall semester to review the progress. Fremland indicated that once it is known what the Committee is asking for relative to SLOs, then it will become clear how to incorporate it

into the program review document. Bergland noted that Conrad has worked with the lead writers and she could report this feedback at the first meeting in the fall.

It was clarified Conrad has provided materials for the lead writers in Year One that contain information about how to develop SLOs, etc. She would be able to give the Committee an idea of what to look for in the reports. Also, Bergland reminded the Committee that the SLOAC Coordinator and the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) chair are available as consultants to assist the Committee.

Fremland suggested reassigned time for faculty to do program review. Bergland noted that reassigned time and workload questions could be answered by the Vice President of Instruction, Elizabeth Armstrong. She suggested inviting Armstrong to the first meeting in the fall. This focus of that Agenda will be on information provided by Conrad and Armstrong.

Devin Milner asked about the grid and if it includes information about when courses are to go through the review process. Work should begin with core classes. A suggestion was made to have some of the focus be on small departments at the Dr. Badway workshop to offer those faculty some direction. Milner indicated there are many courses to look at in some disciplines that the review process will take a long time.

Bill Grimes indicated there are several variables but core courses should be the higher targets. He liked the "liaison group" idea consisting of not only members of this committee but Conrad and the CRC Chair as well. Conrad is a central support system.

Bergland noted that there will be workshops during Flex Days that have been developed to discuss SLOs. One will take place in the fall and a follow-up will be held in the spring. The International Education Committee has put together a workshop to discuss the levels of assessment for global awareness. This workshop is designed to give faculty tools to develop that aspect of SLOs in their curriculum. There are five different levels of assessment. On September 1, they have scheduled a follow-up session for those faculty who attended the first workshop. This session will be used to actually implement the global awareness SLO. Another workshop is being developed by the LRC regarding the SLO on information competency.

4. Year One, 2005/06.

a. Reminder Sent to Lead Writers (*). Bergland reviewed the email she sent on behalf of the Committee to the lead writers. She noted that email lists dates according to the Timeline that is found in the Handbook for Year One. The drafts of Form One and Two should be reviewed at this time with the goal of completing the document by September 1 and forwarding it to their dean.

b. Feedback from Committee Members re: Status of Assigned Programs. Bergland reported that the Art Department invited Conrad to attend a meeting to discuss SLOs, Bergland to discuss research, and Paula Hjorth-Gustin, chair of the CRC, to discuss curriculum. Palestini reported that the lead writer for Anthropology informed her that she had completed her program review document. Palestini advised the lead writer to submit the completed program review to her dean for review and feedback and then her dean will submit the document to Bergland's office in September, according to the Timeline.

c. Other. No items were added.

5. Joint Meeting with Research Committee. Bergland reported that at the last meeting of the Research Committee, they reviewed their progress with developing the Research Agenda and it was decided to postpone the joint meeting until the fall semester. The Research Committee proposes a joint meeting be scheduled for both the fall and the spring.

6. Other Business. No items were added.

7. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.

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