

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Academic Program Review Committee

Meeting – Friday, September 15, 2006, 2:00-3:00 pm
LRC, Room 208

PRESENT: Yvonne Bergland (co-chair), Jill Baker, Joi Blake, Gail Conrad, Kristan Clark, Rob Fremland (co-chair), Otto Lee, Susan Mun, Bruce Naschak, Caterina Palestini, Juliette Parker, Teddy Scribner, Leslie Sieger, Chris Sullivan, Cindy Wijma.

ABSENT: Henry Browne (excused), Anne Geller (excused), Bill Grimes, Penny Hedgecoth, Ian Kay (excused), Guillermo Marrujo.

GUEST: None.

The meeting was called to order at 2:08 pm by Dr. Yvonne Bergland, Dean, Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research, Co-chair, in LRC 208. An agenda and handouts were distributed with the circulation of a sign-in sheet.

1. Introduction and Welcome of New Members. Bergland introduced the newest members of the committee: Susan Mun (Campus-Based Researcher), Jill Baker (LRC), Penny Hedgecoth (Reprographics) and Joi Blake (Dean, Student Development and Matriculation).

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

3. Year One Report Format.

a. Draft #1 ().** Bergland noted that this report is based upon committee feedback from meetings held during the spring 2006 semester. The Year One Evaluation Worksheet format was used during the design of this report. She reviewed the sections of the report. All agreed that this report was well done. As was done with previous reports, this document will be sent to the lead writers, etc. for review. This new format replaces the narrative that was formerly included in the Year One report and will facilitate the development and review of the report. The memo to the President's Cabinet part will remain in its current format. Bergland asked the committee for feedback.

b. Draft #2 (*). Bergland reviewed this version of the new format containing a mock report using standardized language. This approach is similar to the one used for the Years Two, Three, Four and Five reports. This standard wording would vary according to the results of the review process. Bergland noted that she developed this wording using language from previous Year One reports. The wording for each program in the report will be developed via roundtable discussion with each liaison during a committee meeting. The standardized wording used will be modified at that time.

It was agreed by consensus to use this form. Bergland indicated it will be used this year and revisions may be made for next year as needed.

4. Recommendations re: Culinary Arts/Culinary Management; Destination and Event Management and Hotel Management.

Bergland noted that the Dean of Health Sciences and Public Service and the faculty in the Culinary Arts/Culinary Management; Destination and Event Management and Hotel Management areas as well as the Vice President of Instruction submitted a recommendation regarding these programs. She indicated that there have been faculty retirements and resignations from this program. Other reasons for this recommendation include: 1. The program names changed; 2. Culinary Arts/Culinary Management is in Year One for 2006-2007; Destination and Event Management and Hotel Management are in Year Five for 2006-2007; 3. The recent hire of a new contract faculty member.

The first part of the recommendation involves merging the three separate program reviews under one umbrella of "Hospitality". The second part of the recommendation concerns the recent hire of a new contract faculty member. As a result, it is requested that the program review be postponed to Year One in 2007-2008. The programs currently in Year One (1) and Year Five (2) would not be reviewed during the 2006-2007 cycle. The entire "Hospitality" cluster would move to the Year One cycle in 2007-2008.

It was suggested that the two programs currently in Year Five be reviewed. Bergland noted that the committee may make this recommendation but these areas will be under one program. She described how the curriculum has been revised and is now set up as one program. It was also suggested that the liaisons meet with the new faculty for this program to familiarize her with the program review process. Furthermore, it was suggested that the Year Five information that would have been provided for the two areas be included with the Year One information as a summary of those two programs. Bergland's office would move the goals for the three areas and carry them forward for the lead writer as a starting point.

After discussion, it was M/S/C by Rob Fremland and Chris Sullivan to accept the recommendation that the Culinary Arts/Culinary Management; Destination and Event Management and Hotel Management programs be combined as the "Hospitality" cluster and be reviewed as Year One in the 2007-2008 cycle.

5. Program Review and SLO Reporting (Gail Conrad) (*). Bergland indicated that this form may be adopted as a mechanism to report the progress of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in each discipline.

Gail Conrad discussed the progress made by Student Services and indicated that she developed a form for the Instructional programs. Information for this report would be pulled directly from the program review documents. She distributed handouts to illustrate how the form would be completed. As an example, Conrad provided information from Student Services and how they incorporated the six SLOs into all their programs. They have shown where they will be starting, where they will go; and, where they are at this time. The blank form is based on what year the program is in the review cycle. Bergland indicated this is the first year that program reviews will be submitted with SLO information. The efficacy of this mechanism will be determined during the first year of implementation. This form would be the repository for SLO information. SLO information would be extracted from the program review and placed into this format. It was suggested that this format be used at this time and that it be revisited and/or revised for the next year in the process. Bergland asked the committee to note information provided on SLOs in Years Two, Three, Four and Five of the cycle so that information may be compiled using this form. If it is found that

several programs include SLO information during the subsequent years in the cycle, it may lead to future reporting of SLOs in those years. Currently, each program may report SLOs in the form of a goal during those years of the cycle but it is not a requirement. The purpose of this form is to centralize the reporting of SLOs. Conrad suggested posting this form online.

Also discussed was use of the term “SLOs” in course outlines to replace “objectives”. This practice will be revisited by the College with a report back to the Curriculum Instructional Council (CIC).

Fremland noted that at this time, SLOs information is reported in a narrative format. By using the grid to report SLOs, it will mark the progress made in each of the courses selected at this time. Eventually, the grid will contain all courses in that area.

Otto Lee noted that if this grid will be used, the lead writers need to be instructed to include certain pieces of information in order for it to be completed on their behalf. Bergland indicated that this document may be sent to lead writers at the appropriate time to assess their progress. Communication is important to include but Bergland suggested waiting until the first year of program reviews are submitted to assess the information included in these documents. At that time, a recommendation may be made to the President’s Cabinet as to the next steps. Conrad indicated that some disciplines are able to move forward while others are experiencing difficulties. Lee indicated that the process should be revisited after this year’s round and noted that there will most likely be gaps in the information submitted by the programs. He expressed his concern as to the programs receiving a recommendation if this information is incomplete. Bergland noted that the intent is to gather the information to assess the progress made by each program and improve the process for the next round of Year One program review.

6. Program Review Materials Online (Bergland/Palestini). Bergland noted that the process has evolved from heavy use of paper copies to use of disks and email. This summer, her office worked with William Craft, Dean, Learning Resources and Information Technology. A website format has been established and her office will be posting the appropriate materials for access by the lead writers, deans, and committee members. Folders will be set up for each program and within those folders, individual electronic files will be posted. This method enables lead writers and other appropriate individuals to use a password to access their materials at any time. At the lead writer training, the password and instructions to access this information will be provided. This new method will be used for Year One in the fall and will continue for program reviews completed during the spring and for future semesters. The program review documents continue to be submitted in hard copy format, with an original and two hard copies, as well as sent electronically to Bergland’s office.

7. Revisions for Handbook.

a. Membership Page (*). Bergland noted there is a vacancy on the committee due to Michael Brown’s resignation. A replacement will be named from the Math department. A revised membership listing will be posted online.

b. Liaisons: Year One (2006/2007) (*). Bergland updated the liaison information on the Year One program listing. The “TBA” will be replaced with the new committee member from the Math department. Also, Mun’s name was added as a liaison for the Computer Business

Technology program. She will participate in the evaluation of this program to become familiar with the process and better understand the research aspect of program review.

Fremland reported that he is no longer the lead writer for Chemistry. Joe Toto will be completing the program review.

Bergland reminded the committee if they have questions about the process, they may contact her or Fremland.

Bruce Naschak reported that he will be on sabbatical in the spring. Bergland's office took this into consideration and did not include his name for the reviews due in the spring.

c. Liaisons: Years Two, Three and Five (2006-2007) (*). Bergland reviewed this document and noted that the Hospitality program information was removed from the list. Also, there are not liaisons assigned to Microsoft due to the approved hiatus and incorporation into the Computer Information Sciences program review in the future. Again, once the committee replacement from the Math department is named, this person's name will be added to this list to replace the "TBAs".

d. 2005-2006 Lead Writers/Liaisons. Bergland noted that these program reviews are due at the end of September 2006. This listing has been also revised due to changes in committee membership.

Once these program reviews are submitted, her office will prepare and send copies and an evaluation worksheet to the committee. The next steps will be for the committee to read their assigned program reviews and make contact with the lead writers as needed for any revisions. According to the Timeline, the committee must finalize the feedback process by the end of October to begin work on the Year One Final Report. If the committee encounters any problems with a program review, these should be brought to the committee meeting for discussion. She noted that one program may experience difficulties due to a change in lead writer. The original lead writer is on sabbatical, leaving the acting chair to also act as the lead writer. As a result of this change, the Timeline was adjusted for this program to allow time for the document to be completed and reviewed by the dean. Bergland reiterated the purpose of program review is to be flexible and assist the programs with putting their best foot forward.

All agreed that Bergland continue sending reminders via email to lead writers as needed.

e. Year One Evaluation Worksheet (*). Bergland noted that as a result of a recommendation made in the Year One report to the President's Cabinet, the Year One Evaluation Worksheet was revised to incorporate the question in part A. Part B was added as a separate question as part of the requirement to attach the curriculum grid.

8. Year One, 2005/06.

a. Reminder Sent to Lead Writers (*). Bergland reviewed the reminder that was sent to the dean, lead writers and liaisons. This email outlined the next steps in the process. From September 1-30, lead writers are to be working with the dean to complete the review and submit it to Bergland's office for forwarding to the committee. Bergland's office will be sending copies of the program reviews along with the Year One Evaluation Worksheet to the committee during the first week in October. Then, no later than October 30, the committee will finalize any dialogue with the lead writers. The focus of the November

committee meeting will be the Year One Final Report. Bergland reminded the committee to inform lead writers to submit changes to the program review document in the form of an addendum.

b. Feedback from Liaisons re: Status of Assigned Programs. Bergland asked the committee for feedback they have received from lead writers. Chris Sullivan reported that he has been in contact with the Accelerated College Program. Naschak reported that he has not been contacted. Bergland indicated that the lead writer for Chicano Studies has contacted her office as well as for Art. She also reported that the lead writer for the Tutoring/Writing Centers worked with her during the summer.

c. Other. No items were added.

9. Other Business. Bergland noted that the SLO workshops were once again a success. A presentation was given on the academic and the student services program review models and their interaction with College planning. Student Services has contacted Bergland to obtain information regarding the academic program review model. They would like to use the academic program review model as a template to revise the student services program review model. On behalf of this committee, she offered assistance and indicated that members of this committee would be available to attend their meetings. Blake reported that the Student Services Program Review Committee would like to move toward a centralized model for both Student Services and Instruction. They would like to include some data elements that are unique to Student Services to create templates and handouts but follow the same timelines and process as Instruction.

10. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:06 pm.

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