

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

San Diego Mesa College

Program Review

Annual Committee Report

2011-2012

Presented and Approved by President's Cabinet

May 1, 2012

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE REPORT TO PRESIDENT’S CABINET
ANNUAL REPORT
2011-2012
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Committee Membership/Signature Page.....	3
Memo to President’s Cabinet.....	4
Annual Reports, 2011-2012.....	8
• Lead Writers	8
• Liaisons.....	8
• Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee.....	8
• Goals Matrices/Resource Allocation Link.....	8
Addendum	54

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE REPORT TO PRESIDENT'S CABINET
ANNUAL REPORT
2011-2012**

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP/SIGNATURE PAGE:

Jill Baker
Administrative Representative, Co-Chair

Kristan Clark
Academic Senate Representative, Co-Chair

Monica Romero
Student Services Representative, Co-Chair

Kathleen Wells
Administrative Services Representative, Co-Chair

Angela Liewen Romeo
Classified Senate Representative

Danielle Short
Classified Senate Representative

Ebony Tyree
Classified Senate Representative

Robin Watkins
Classified Senate Representative

Manny Bautista
Academic Senate Representative

Brian Cushing
Academic Senate Representative

Anne Geller
Academic Senate Representative

Ian Kay
Academic Senate Representative

Marichu Magana
Academic Senate Representative

Laura Mathis
Academic Senate Representative

Jonathan McLeod
Academic Senate Representative

Dina Miyoshi
Academic Senate Representative

Jill Moreno-Ikari
Academic Senate Representative

Bruce Naschak
Academic Senate Representative

Saloua Saidane
Academic Senate Representative

William Craft
Administrative Representative

Ashanti Hands
Administrative Representative

Chris Sullivan
Administrative Representative

Brianna Hayes
Ex-Officio – Campus Based Researcher

Caterina Palestini
Ex-Officio – Administrative Support

DATE: May 1, 2012
TO: Members of the President's Cabinet
SUBJECT: PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012

Following this memo are the annual reports submitted by the Program Review Committee.

Each report contains the following information:

- the names of the lead writer(s)
- the name of the assigned Program Review Committee liaison
- the committee's findings relative to the program review
- comments/recommendations/commendations from the Program Review Committee and, when provided, feedback from the lead writers

PROCESS

Effective with the academic year 2011-2012, Program Review transitioned from a five year cycle to an annual cycle in order to align with the Integrated Planning Framework adopted by San Diego Mesa College in 2010-2011. This model integrates and aligns planning, evaluation, and resource allocation. Program Review serves to communicate program and service area plans, evaluation, and needs to the college. By positioning Program Review as the vehicle for conveying needs (resource requests), the college clearly integrates resource allocation with program planning and evaluation. The revised process utilizes the Goal Matrix that was successfully piloted during the 2010-2011 academic year.

The program review now consists of six questions and the Goal Matrix:

- Question 1 addresses the program or service area's mission
- Question 2 is specific to Instructional Programs and addresses programs, curriculum, and degrees and certificates
- Question 3 is specific to Student Services and Administrative Services and provides them with the opportunity to describe their program
- Question 4 asks: Describe the current state of the program/service area. However, this question is extensive in terms of addressing the College Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals; Annual Priorities; Key Performance Indicators; and program evaluation, including Student Learning Outcomes and Administrative Unit Outcomes. A SWOT analysis is performed, which lays the groundwork for goals and needs.
- Question 5 asks: What does the program envision for itself in the next five years? This becomes its long and short term goals.
- Question 6 asks: What are the missing program/service area needs necessary to accomplish the five year vision? This is determined by conducting a gap analysis on the current state of the program/service area and where the program/service area wants to be in five years.
- The Goal Matrix is the form where the program/service area articulates each of its needs as SMART goals, and then provides supporting documentation including rationale, plan, needs (both non-budgetary and budgetary), and how the goal aligns with college goals, Institutional Learning Outcomes, Student Learning Outcomes and/or Administrative Unit Outcomes.
- The Resource Allocation Request/Application is completed for any budgetary goal, and accompanies the specific Goal Matrix. Each of the siloed allocation committees has its own criteria and rubric.

All programs/service areas that were due to begin Year Two through Five Program Review in 2011-2012 began the new annual process in fall 2011. All programs and service areas that had just completed their Year One Program Review were given the choice to participate in the new process by either completing a new program review or by completing Goal Matrices that aligned with the goals identified in their Year One report; additionally, they were given the option not to participate this year and to begin the process in fall 2012. Any program or service area completing the new process or the Goal Matrices will have them processed with the current year reports. 2010-2011 Year One programs made the following choices:

- **American Sign Language/Interpreting.** The program opted not to take further action at this time under the revised process.
- **Child Development.** The program opted not to take further action at this time under the revised process.
- **Consumer Studies.** The program opted not to take further action at this time under the revised process.

- **Foreign Languages, All.** The program opted not to take further action at this time under the revised process.
- **Geography.** The program submitted its goals and resource requests via the new Goal Matrices.
- **Geographic Information Systems.** The program submitted its goals and resource requests via the new Goal Matrices.
- **Outreach.** The service area opted not to take further action at this time under the revised process.
- **Physical Education.** The program submitted the entire document using the revised process.
- **Physics.** The program submitted its goals and resource requests via the new Goal Matrices.
- **Political Science.** The program submitted the entire document using the revised process.
- **Psychology.** The program submitted its goals and resource requests via the new Goal Matrices.

Because this was a major revision to Program Review, extensive work was done over the summer to complete the Timeline and the 2011-2012 Program Review Handbook, and to create a variety of training materials. Training sessions were planned for both Liaisons and Lead Writers. Follow up training sessions were provided as well for both groups. The Program Review website was revised to create a Lead Writer support page, and a direct link to this page was placed on the Mesa College homepage. Every effort was made to support the process; however, it was not without challenges. To better understand and assess the process, the committee co-chairs collaborated with the Campus Based Researcher to conduct a thorough evaluation using both quantitative and qualitative data. A formal 90 minute feedback session was held on March 22, 2012 and was video-recorded to assure that all data was captured; in addition, detailed minutes and additional notes were taken. Separate surveys were used to collect both quantitative and qualitative data from Lead Writers and Liaisons. The data were analyzed and triangulated to understand the success and challenges experienced by both groups, and recommendations and next steps were determined based upon this analysis.

On behalf of the Program Review Committee, the Administrative Co-Chair and Administrative Support Staff regularly sent emails to all lead writers, liaisons, chairs/supervisors, and deans/managers reminding them of key due dates and providing Just-in-Time assistance, such as links to support documents and answers to common questions. In addition, the co-chairs and support staff worked with lead writers and liaisons alike to answer questions and provide guidance. The established timelines were well published and were discussed during training. Due to unforeseen circumstances, two programs requested and received an extension to their due dates. Both program reviews were submitted when the lead writers returned to work, consistent with the terms of the extension. Two programs did not submit their program reviews by the established deadline. Black Studies submitted their signed program review after the March 23, 2012 deadline; it is included in the addendum. Building Construction did not submit a program review. The 2011-2012 Program Review Annual Report, along with the individual program reviews and accompanying documentation/applications will be forwarded to the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee for the next step in the Integrated Planning and Resource Allocation process.

One of the challenges this year was the sheer number of programs/service areas that were undergoing in-depth reviews. In the past, with the Five Year Cycle, only 20% of the programs/service areas were conducting this level of analysis at any one time, as the programs were staggered over the five years. This increase in volume stressed the resources of the committee in terms of liaisons to serve them. For the first time, the Program Review Committee had to switch to a single liaison evaluation. In the past there had always been at least two liaisons, and when needed, a co-chair would also review the document as well. Assigning just one liaison lightened the workload by half; however, it placed significant responsibility for the evaluation on the liaison. Co-chairs were available to assist when asked; however, for next year the committee will provide more formal support and training. There was significant feedback on this via the Liaison Survey.

Each program/service area plan was read and evaluated by one Program Review Committee member using the new Liaison Evaluation Guide. The committee's final findings were communicated to the lead writers for review and feedback. The feedback from lead writers was used to prepare the committee's Year-End Report.

The completed Year-End written report was reviewed by the Program Review Committee during the week of April 9 - 13, 2012, prior to submission to the President's Cabinet. After review and approval by the President's Cabinet on May 1, 2012, lead writers will receive final copy of the Annual Report. Public copies will be placed in the Office of Instruction and the Learning Resource Center (LRC).

Evaluation of 2011-2012 Annual Program Review

The Program Review Co-Chairs conducted a formal evaluation of the 2011-2012 Program Review process. The evaluation was two-part. On March 22, 2012, the Co-Chairs held a 90-minute discussion session, which was open to all Program Review stakeholders, including liaisons, lead writers, chairs/supervisors, and deans/managers, as well as the President and Vice Presidents. This session was qualitative in nature and included guided questions pertaining to program review training and process, committee communication, program review resources, timelines, and interactions among lead writers, liaisons, and the committee co-chairs. Feedback from this session was analyzed for recurrent themes.

On March 26, 2012, two surveys were deployed, one targeting liaisons and the other lead writers. The surveys were based upon research questions formulated by the Co-chairs and by information gathered during the feedback session. Survey items addressed lead writer and liaison training, communication, resources, research support, committee support, and the Program Review Response Sheet. In addition, open-ended questions addressing lessons learned and areas for improvement were included in both surveys. The survey was analyzed by the Campus Based Researcher.

Analysis of the discussion session and the surveys were informative in terms of the success and challenges of the current year. The findings of this evaluation were used to formulate the recommendations and next steps for Program Review. The formal evaluation report is available on the Program Review website.

Recommendations

2011-2012 has been a year of transition for Mesa College's planning, evaluation, and resource allocation processes. In 2010-2011, the College's Strategic Planning Committee placed Program Review at the center of its Integrated Planning Framework. In doing so, it recognized the importance of program level planning and evaluation in institutional planning and decision making, and in the allocation of resources. The following actions are recommended for the coming year:

- **Recommendation 1:** The Program Review process should be more fully integrated, simplified, streamlined, and automated by utilizing electronic resources and placing it online.
- **Recommendation 2:** Program Review Liaison and Lead Writer training should be revised so that it is systematic, step by step, timeline-oriented, and supported by web-based materials and training modules.
- **Recommendation 3:** The Program Review Response Sheet should be customized to reflect the division for the program or service area, providing three templates with similar questions that reflect the differences between Instruction, Student Services, and Administrative Services.
- **Recommendation 4:** Student Learning Outcomes and Administrative Unit Outcomes assessment and planning should be explicitly included in the document.
- **Recommendation 5:** The Liaison Evaluation Guide should be revised to better align with the document and provide more effective, targeted feedback and evaluation. There should be consistency in interpretation and evaluation among liaisons. If at all possible the Liaison Evaluation Guide should be integrated with the online version of the Response Sheet.
- **Recommendation 6:** Goal Matrices and resource allocation applications should be clarified and embedded within the Program Review Response Sheet; all resource allocation criteria and rubrics should be in place at the beginning of the process.
- **Recommendation 7:** Training needs to be provided for lead writers, liaisons, chairs/supervisors, and deans/managers in research and the use of data to assess their practices. The training should be targeted according to division, reflecting unique needs of the various stakeholders on campus, and should cover both standard college-provided data and customized authentic assessment.
- **Recommendation 8:** Standardize and centralize official program review committee communications, including regular email communication, revision of the Program Review website, and revision of the timeline to reflect true due dates, and differentiation according to role (who does what and when).
- **Recommendation 9:** Program Review should be extended to be inclusive of all administrative offices, including Deans, Vice Presidents, and the President.

- **Recommendation 10:** Assure that the Program Review process is consistent with the rubrics issued by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges and with requirements of the US Department of Education.

Next Steps:

Upon recommendation by President's Cabinet and approval by the President to accept this report, the Program Review Committee will initiate a summer workgroup to address the ten recommendations. The Committee Co-Chairs will then present all revisions made over the summer to the full Program Review Committee at its first meeting for the Fall 2012-2013 academic year. The Program Review Committee will report back to President's Cabinet for approval of the revisions at the first President's Cabinet Meeting following this vote.

The Program Review Committee completed its review of all submitted plans within the process timelines. The following pages contain reports of the Committee's findings resulting from its review and deliberations. All supporting documentation and worksheets are on file in the Office of Instructional Services, Resource Development and Research.

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
Ron Perez, Vice President of Administrative Services**

Administrative Svcs. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Business Services • Kathleen Wells	Anne Geller	<p>Business Services did a thorough job of completing the program review. The service area description provided the mission statement, which had no recent changes. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The service area used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I approve what is written here. 	<p>The service area completed and submitted five Goal Matrices, four of which were related to online support for the campus, relations with district, development of a new Point of Service Survey, and greater understanding of Contracts and Grants. The fifth goal matrix addressed the need for a new Accounting Technician, Senior position, and included the appropriate Classified Staff Hiring Priorities application.</p>
Employment/Payroll and Administrative Technical Support and Info. Services • Kathleen Wells	Monica Romero	<p>Employment/Payroll and Technical Support did a thorough job of completing the program review. The service area description provided the mission statement, and indicated that it had been updated to reflect a reorganization of Administrative Services. The lead writer included information and a link concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described the changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The service area used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I approve of this summary. 	<p>The service area completed and submitted five Goal Matrices. Three addressed improvements to services and increased participation in shared governance committees. One addressed the purchase of 100 computer printers as replacement reserves for the campus, and included the necessary documentation per Table 1. One addressed the need for a new Administrative Technician position and included the appropriate Classified Staff Hiring Priorities application.</p>

Administrative Svcs. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Reprographic Center/Mailroom <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Penny Hedgecoth 	William Craft	<p>Reprographic Center/Mailroom completed all sections of the program review. The service area description provided the mission statement, and indicated that it had not made changes within the past year. The lead writer included a link to the service area catalog pages. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The service area used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. Reprographics is preparing well for their relocation to the new construction building they will occupy within five years.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The service area completed and submitted five Goal Matrices. One addressed the need for two new administrative technicians and included the appropriate Classified Staff Hiring Priorities application. Four addressed the needs for updated technology, including both hardware and software, to better meet the needs of the campus. The service area did not include individual resource allocation requests for the four technology related goals, but did provide the rationale and plan within the Goal Matrix.</p>
Stockroom <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Penny Hedgecoth 	Ian Kay	<p>The Stockroom completed all sections of the program review. The service area description provided the mission statement, and indicated that it had not made changes within the past year. The lead writer included a link to the service area catalog pages. The assessment described the current services that are provided by the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The service area used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. Service area needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The service area completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. One addressed the need for one new classified staff member and a computer for their use. The lead writer included the appropriate Classified Staff Hiring Priorities application. The second goal addressed equipment necessary to improve effective services. An attachment supporting this request did not include specific information. The lead writer noted that the Matrices did not include all information, such as related AUOs or College Goals.</p>

Administrative Svcs. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Student Accounting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kathleen Wells 	Angela Liewen Romeo	<p>Student Accounting completed all sections of the program review. The service area description provided the mission statement, and indicated that it had not made changes within the past year. The lead writer included a link to the service area catalog pages. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The service area used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. The lead writer analyzed and used data when discussing the impacts on the service area. The lead writer provided challenges faced due to the impact of District limitations. While those may be budgetary in nature, the outdated and antiquated computer system is a major obstacle for this program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I approve this summary. 	<p>The service area completed and submitted seven Goal Matrices. Six of the goals addressed improvements to better meet student needs, to improve service security and effectiveness, to integrate with the grant writing process to include Student Accounting, and to collaborate with Financial Aid to develop a process for handling student deferments. One goal addressed reclassification of two current employees.</p>

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LANGUAGES, 2011-2012
Jonathan Fohrman, Dean, Arts and Languages**

Arts and Languages Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Art-Fine Art (All) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wendell Kling/ Georgia Laris 	Laura Mathis	<p>Art-Fine Art completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a summary of why it was revised this past year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. Two goals addressed the need for contract personnel, including one new faculty member and two new classified technicians. Applications for New Faculty Hiring Priorities and Classified Hiring Priorities were embedded within the matrices. Two goals addressed the need for appropriate technology within their teaching spaces, and a thorough documentation for the need was embedded within the matrices. All costs were presented and supported with quotes.</p>
Dramatic Arts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kristan Clark 	Ashanti Hands	<p>Dramatic Arts completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not changed this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The statements are accurate and thorough. 	<p>The program completed and submitted five Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for contract personnel, including one fulltime faculty member and 1.5 classified positions. Applications for New Faculty Hiring Priorities and Classified Hiring Priorities were attached. One goal addressed administrative status. Another addressed the need for video technology and curriculum. Two goals addressed needs at the facilities and equipment levels. All documentation was provided.</p>

Arts and Languages Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Music</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Romeo/ Jaeryoung Lee 	<p>Ashanti Hands</p>	<p>Music completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had been updated this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted eight Goal Matrices. One goal was for a new contract faculty member, and included a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application. Other goals included smart classrooms, music-specific technology, upgraded computers, keyboards, and an architectural plan, all of which included required documentation. They also requested additional time for their current accompanist.</p>

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, COMPUTER STUDIES AND TECHNOLOGIES, 2011-2012
Jill Baker, Dean, Business, Computer Studies and Technologies**

Business and Computer Studies Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Accounting • Tracy Tuttle</p>	<p>Kathleen Wells</p>	<p>Accounting completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>The liaison noted that this is an excellent program review: clear, concise, comprehensive, and well done.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One goal was for a new contract faculty member; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached. One goal was for upgraded Quickbooks software, which included a quote and documentation. Two goals addressed the program's commitment to continued work on curriculum review and SLOs.</p>

Business and Computer Studies Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Business Admin./Mgmt. • Akunna Winston	Angela Liewen Romeo	<p>Business Administration completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review.</p> <p>The liaison noted that this is an excellent program review that shows the current effectiveness and future challenges of the Business program with supporting documentation and data. Very well written and concise.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. Both were for new contract faculty. A New Faculty Hiring Priorities application accompanied the request.</p>
Computer Business Tech. •Karen Williams	Robin Watkins	<p>Computer Business Technology completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One is for a fulltime faculty member for Web Development; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached. Another goal addressed the need for additional FTEF for Web Development as it grows. One goal addressed the need for training and for site visits to review model programs, both to benefit the program now and to inform the planning of the new Center for Business and Technology. Another goal addressed continued attention to their various articulation agreements with San Diego Unified School District and other organizations, such as the US Navy.</p>

Business and Computer Studies Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Computer Info. Sci. •Walter Wesley	Bruce Naschak	<p>Computer and Information Science completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>The liaison noted that the discussions in the assessment section are excellent, with extensive use of appropriate facts. The liaison noted that the addendums were excellent.</p> <p>Lead Writer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for the positive report regarding the Computer Information Sciences Program Review. • I am especially grateful for the help and guidance that each of you have so generously provided to me. Your help has made this difficult task significantly easier. • Now I await the determination as to whether I will be provided with an additional faculty member to assist me in the many and difficult challenges that lie ahead for my department. 	<p>The program completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One goal is for two fulltime faculty members, and included attached New Faculty Hiring Priorities applications. Another goal was for professional development funds to attend conferences and symposia, which included the documentation within the rationale. The lead writer included his Perkins request as the third goal, and provided his Perkins application.</p>

Business and Computer Studies Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Economics • Mark Abajian	Saloua Saidane	<p>Economics completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	The program completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for subscriptions to two Economics journals, and the other addressed ongoing SLO assessment and refinement.

Business and Computer Studies Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Geographic Information Systems • Karen Owen	Bruce Naschak	<p>Geographic Information Systems completed a thorough Year One Program Review last year, and opted to complete the revised Goal Matrices this year as an addendum to their Year One Report.</p> <p>In combining the Year One Report with the updated Goal Matrix, Geographic Information Systems completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>The liaison noted that the Goal Matrices are extensive and thorough.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have reviewed the report and have no questions or comments. 	<p>The program completed and submitted nineteen Goal Matrices. One goal was a request for a fulltime contract faculty member; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was completed and attached. In addition they requested additional FTEF in the interim. Other goals associated with funding requests included: GIS mapping software, Lynda.com training subscription and other training resources.</p> <p>Several goals directly addressed new programs, new certificates, and course development, and revision of the A.S. to align with industry needs. Other goals addressed articulation agreements with the high schools and San Diego State University.</p> <p>Of note, the lead writer aligned all goals of this career-technical program with the Perkins requirements.</p>

Business and Computer Studies Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Marketing • Mariette Rattner	Marichu Magana	<p>Marketing completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made to the curriculum within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. The lead writer analyzed and used data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. One goal addresses program and curriculum revision with the intent to advance the transfer aspect of Marketing. The other goal is to create an advisory committee.</p>
Multimedia • Alfonso Saballett	Ashanti Hands	<p>Multimedia completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your feedback. 	<p>The program completed and submitted eleven Goal Matrices, which aligned with the Perkins criteria for this career technical program. Goals dealt with annual re-evaluation of the program and curriculum to align with workforce needs, training, software, maintaining the articulation agreements with TechPrep, and sustaining the advisory committee. Other goals included synergy between the programs in the Digital Technology Department. Goals were documented in the Rationale section.</p>

Business and Computer Studies Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Real Estate • Shadrick Jefferies	Laura Mathis	<p>Real Estate completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	The program completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. One addressed the need for more online courses and the other addressed the need for more short term class offerings.
Work Experience • Jill Baker/ John Woodard	Kathleen Wells	<p>Work Experience completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>The liaison noted that the program review was very well done. It describes the program in detail and how it relates to the other campus curriculum.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	The program completed and submitted one Goal Matrix. It addressed the need for continuation of two ESUs for the adjunct faculty member who is providing the administrative and mentoring support for the program.

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
SCHOOL OF HEALTH SCIENCES AND PUBLIC SERVICE, 2011-2012
Margie Fritch, Dean, Health Sciences and Public Service**

Health Sciences Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Animal Health Technology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peggy Fischer 	<p>Jonathan McLeod</p>	<p>Animal Health Technology completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted five Goal Matrices. One addressed regaining AVMA accreditation; two goals were related to equipment necessary for the program –ultrasound machine and CR x-ray system. Other goals included developing a veterinary microbiology course, and additional release time for the program director. Documentation was provided for all goals requiring evaluation by a resource allocation committee.</p>

Health Sciences Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Dental Assisting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Margaret Fickess 	Danielle Short	<p>Dental Assisting completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for all the help. 	<p>The program completed and submitted thirteen Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for one fulltime contract faculty member; a New Faculty Hiring Priority application was attached. One goal addressed increasing the reassigned time for the program director from .20 to .50 FTEF. Other goals to be considered by a resource allocation committee included a 20% increase for instructional supplies, replacement of outdated equipment, purchase of new technology equipment, and a collaboration outreach activity with Southwestern College's Dental Hygiene program to provide a sealant clinic. Goals not requiring resource allocation included curriculum development, accreditation preparation, and providing fee-based instruction for unregistered dental assistants seeking certification.</p>

Health Sciences Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Fashion –Design and Merchandising • Susan Lazear	Anne Geller	<p>Fashion –Consulting, Design, and Merchandising completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>The liaison noted that major obstacles to program needs include budget constraints which relate to limitations in contract hiring and FTEF allocation, among other factors. The liaison also noted that the lead writer did an excellent job of providing a thorough, well written, well documented program review.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: The lead writer indicated that Consulting is no longer part of the name of their program, and it has been removed from this report.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted six Goal Matrices. One addressed the need for two new fulltime contract faculty; two New Faculty Hiring Priorities applications were attached. In addition, they requested additional FTEF and provided documentation within the Rationale section of the matrix. In line with their Perkins application, which was attached, they requested a Camera Art system, Online Fashion and Merchandising Trend Service, and upgrading of their computer hardware and software. Supplies were an additional goal, which was documented in the Rationale section.</p>

Health Sciences Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Health Information Technology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Janet Janus 	Kristan Clark	<p>Health Information Technology completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>The liaison noted that the lead writer is an adjunct instructor who is assigned the Program Review document for HEIT. She is to be commended for her dedication to the program and program review process.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to thank the Program Review Committee for your report of the Health Information Technology 2011-2012 Program Review. • I am very pleased with your comments. 	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One goal is for a fulltime contract faculty member to serve as Program Director; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached. In addition, the need was documented in the Goal Matrix, where the position is cited as a requirement for CAHIIM accreditation. One goal was for conferences and professional development to stay current in the field. Other goals included recruiting more students to the program, and raising the number of graduates who take the national RHIT examination.</p>

Health Sciences Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Hospitality Cluster • Michael Fitzgerald	Bruce Naschak	<p>Hospitality Cluster completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>The liaison noted that this is a very good report, with excellent use of data.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I appreciate all of your time and support. 	<p>The program completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for one new contract faculty member. A New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached. One goal addressed the need for additional FTEF in order to expand the program to offer evening hours and expand their access to a new demographic. Documentation was provided within the Goal Matrix for this need. One goal addressed the need for additional program supplies. The lead writer provided extensive documentation for this need within the Goal Matrix.</p>

Health Sciences Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Medical Assisting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danielle Lauria 	<p>Brian Cushing</p>	<p>Medical Assisting completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One goal was to re-start the bi-yearly entry to the Medical Assisting program, which will require additional FTEF. They requested a total of .40 FTEF and documented the need within the Rationale section of the Goal Matrix. One goal addressed the need for intersession for their program to assist with the sequencing of classes for phlebotomy. One goal addressed the need for a larger supply budget for disposable medical supplies.</p>

Health Sciences Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Nutrition • Christine Dupraw	Jonathan McLeod	<p>Nutrition completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report sounds fine. It summarizes what I wrote in our Nutrition program review. 	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One goal is to offer Dietary Manager Certification, which will require additional support for the program director. They provide documentation for the additional funds in the Rationale section. Other goals include offering more online classes, improving the articulation of Nutrition courses, and exploring relocation of the program within another school.</p>
Physical Therapist Assistant • Tina Recalde/ Chris Kinney	Robin Watkins	<p>Physical Therapist Assistant completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information.</p> <p>The program recently regained its accredited status with the hiring of a new program manager, who is moving the program forward again.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for the report. No comments at this time. 	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One goal addresses the need for each faculty member to attend one conference per year; documentation is included within the Goal Matrix. Other goals, which do not require resource allocation review, address gaining more clinical sites, providing health and wellness fairs, and creating a student governance within the program</p>

Health Sciences Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Radiologic Technology •Lori Covington	Ian Kay	<p>Radiologic Technology completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. All three goals deal with the development of courses that are required either for accreditation or for certification and employment. Due to contract education financing, one goal is cost neutral. One goal will require extension of a maintenance agreement for the CT scanner, and the cost is being assessed by the district. The final goal requires .30 FTEF and consumable venipuncture supplies. The documentation for these resources is included in the rationale section of the Goal Matrix.</p>

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES, 2011-2012
Chris Sullivan, Interim Dean, Humanities**

Humanities Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Communications Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terry Kohlenberg 	<p>Kathleen Wells</p>	<p>Communication Studies completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised within the past year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both.</p> <p>The liaison noted that this was a good program review, and she looks forward to watching its future growth and its positive impact on the students it serves.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One was for two new faculty positions; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached, and the Goal Matrix included a short statement in the Rationale section. One goal was for six iPads for use by the fulltime contract faculty. The documentation was provided within the Rationale section of the Goal Matrix. One goal addressed planning for the new building, to include equipment specifically needed for Communications and the Speech and Debate team.</p>

Humanities Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
English • Donna Duchow for Jennifer Cost	Brian Cushing	<p>English completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to thank our liaison and the Program Review leaders for their assistance. • We approached this year's materials as a work in progress and look forward to the opportunity for revision in the future as the needs of the program evolve and the resources available change. 	<p>The program completed and submitted ten Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for six new faculty members; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached. Other goals were broken down by discipline. Creative Writing requested to reduce their class cap from 32 to 25 students; to fund one visiting author each semester; and to add more texts to the Creative Writing Bookcase. Humanities requested .80 FTEF in order to teach additional sections of Humanities 101, 106, and 201, and to establish one section of a projected new transfer class. They also requested a Bluray disc player for G-106 and running lights to be installed on the wall sideboards so that students can see to navigate the room when lights are turned out to view videos (this is cited as a safety issue, as room lighting is either on or off, but can't be adequately dimmed). English requested a .80 FTEF reassigned time position for Tutoring, as the current .20 FTEF is not sufficient to meet the need. ESOL requested restoration of their Educational Technicians (NANCE) positions, and for restoration of .10 FTEF reassigned time for their Chair, to return it to .20 FTEF.</p>

Humanities Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Teacher Education • Laurie Lorence	Kristan Clark	<p>Teacher Education completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program.</p> <p>The liaison noted that Teacher Ed relies on cross discipline courses. Data for this program is not easily accessible. The lead writer should work closely with the Campus Based Researcher in order to develop data sources that are relevant to the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comments from the Program Review Committee seemed accurate and thorough. 	<p>The program completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. One goal addressed developing curriculum for the Teacher Training Program and coordinating with SDSU to create subject pathways in Math, Science, and Literacy. One goal addressed collecting accurate data about Mesa's prospective teachers and updating the website.</p>
Tutoring Center •Carol Sampaga	Dina Miyoshi	<p>Tutoring completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement regarding its revision in the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. One addressed the need for additional Tutors for the center; the Goal Matrix provided a rationale for the request, and included full description and cost for Classified Hourly Tutors (NANCE positions). One goal addressed the need for outreach to campus and outside community; the Goal Matrix provided a rationale for the request and included full description and cost for 1.6 FTEF Certificated Adjunct Instructors.</p>

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
SCHOOL OF LEARNING RESOURCES AND TECHNOLOGY, 2011-2012
William Craft, Dean, Learning Resources and Technology**

LRC Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Learning Resources/ Instructional Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devin Milner 	<p>Ian Kay</p>	<p>The School of Learning Resources and Technology completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this past year. The lead writer included information concerning the program/service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted nineteen Goal Matrices. Five goals addressed the need for new faculty; four of them are replacements for faculty who have retired within the past five years, while one is for a new position that will serve as Systems Librarian for the district-wide online integrated library system. New Faculty Hiring Priorities applications were attached for each of the five positions. One goal addressed the need for adjunct faculty to cover evening reference hours and library classroom instruction; documentation was attached. One goal addressed the need to maintain the current book budget, and increase it by 5%; documentation was attached. One goal addressed maintaining print periodical and electronic research resources, and increase them by 5%; documentation was attached. One goal addressed conversion of certain texts from print to online format; documentation was attached. One goal addressed establishment of \$100,000 to annually update the computers in the student computer lab; documentation was attached. One goal addressed establishment of \$10,000 to annually update and purchase new software; documentation was attached. One goal addressed a queuing system for course reserves, and another addressed the need for a Student Response System in the library classroom; documentation was attached for both. One goal addressed a tripod for AV production; documentation was attached. One goal addressed installation of an outdoor book drop; documentation was attached. Four other goals addressed advancing services in terms of new technologies and online support.</p>

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND NATURAL SCIENCES, 2011-2012
Saeid Eidgahy, Dean, Mathematics and Natural Sciences**

Math/Natural Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Accelerated College Programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edwin Fields 	<p>Chris Sullivan</p>	<p>Accelerated College Program completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>It is noted that Student Learning Outcomes Assessment and Action Plans were included for all three courses, in some cases for two annual cycles.</p> <p>Lead Writer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you very much for all of the hard work that the committee has done and we are very happy with the comments. 	<p>The program completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One goal was for two new fulltime contract faculty members; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached. One goal addressed the need for equipment; documentation was attached. One goal addressed holding meetings with all ACP faculty to assure consistency with department rules, policies, and procedures.</p>

Math/Natural Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Biology •Paul Sykes	Monica Romero	<p>Biology completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. Two goals addressed the need for Classified personnel, one for a replacement for a part-time ILT, and one for an ILT Supervisor. Documentation was attached for both positions. Two goals addressed equipment and supplies, one for microscope illuminators and one for supplies needed to run the additional course sections that they are offering. Documentation was attached for both goals.</p>
Chemistry •Joe Toto	Dina Miyoshi	<p>Chemistry completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. Both goals addressed contract personnel. One request was for a fulltime contract faculty member, the other was for a laboratory supervisor. A New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached, as was a New Classified Staff Hiring Priorities application.</p>

Math/Natural Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Engineering • Morteza Mohssenzadeh	William Craft	<p>Engineering completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted five Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for an Instructional Lab Technician; a New Classified Hiring Priorities application was attached. Two goals addressed the need for updating the Engineering software and the out of warranty computers in K104; documentation was attached for both goals Two goals addressed the need for curriculum review and for SLO assessment.</p>
Mathematics • Terrie Teegarden	Jill Moreno-Ikari	<p>Mathematics completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>The liaison noted that the use of tables were useful in supporting their rationales for their SMART goals.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted seven Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for five new fulltime contract faculty members; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was completed for each of the five positions. Another goal addressed the need for additional FTEF; documentation was attached. Two goals addressed the need for development of targeted websites; one also included the need for additional Repro funding for Developmental Math courses. Documentation was attached for both goals. One goal addressed the need for increased access to technology in the classroom and included new calculators; documentation was attached. One goal addressed curriculum development for a new lab component for statistics and higher level mathematics courses.</p>

Math/Natural Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Physical Sciences • Donald Barrie	Jonathan McLeod	<p>Physical Sciences completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program. The liaison noted that the lead writer has written an exemplary Program Review for a program that includes three disciplines within a larger department. In addition, the lead writer's conceptualization is clear; his written analysis is concise. The lead writer exhibits a contemplative approach to problem solving that is the mark of a great department chair and committed college professor.</p> <p>Lead Writer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, I felt that the process was clearly outlined, both at the initial training and through the continued support of my liaison, who did an excellent job of making himself available for help and reminding me of important deadlines. • I particularly appreciated being provided with such detailed student demographic data. • The program review document itself was straightforward and provided clear instructions regarding how to address each question. • At every step of the way, I felt confident that if I didn't know how to proceed, I did know who to contact for advice. • My only suggestion might be to include a few more examples of previous program reviews on the program review website to illustrate different ways of responding to the various questions. • Thanks as well for the hard work you, the liaisons, and rest of the committee put into this year's program review process. 	<p>The program completed and submitted seven Goal Matrices. One goal addressed improved physical infrastructure of classroom and lab space; since this will be funded through the new building, the lead writer noted that it is not a budgetary request. One goal addressed the need for an Instructional Lab Assistant; a New Classified Staff Hiring Priorities application was attached. One goal addressed the need for new computers in K-104; documentation was attached. One goal addressed extending course offerings to include a greater emphasis in environmental science. One goal addressed exploring the feasibility of developing an A.S. in Geology. Two goals addressed student learning, one is regarding student success rates in their program, the other is related, with SLO evaluation.</p>

Math/Natural Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Physics	Laura Mathis	<p>Physics was a 2010-2011 Year One program review and opted to complete Goal Matrices and resource allocation applications as part of the new annual process. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writers for an excellent program review and recommended that its Goal Matrices and applications be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer effectively analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the needs of the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lead writer has nothing to add to the report. 	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the replacement of computers in K-104, which is shared by Engineering, Physics, and Physical Science. Each of the three programs have placed the request in their goals; the cost is split three ways. Documentation is provided. One goal addressed the need for a new ILT; a New Classified Hiring Priorities application is attached. The two final goals address SLO collection and analysis and curriculum review.</p>

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
SCHOOL OF P.E., HEALTH EDUCATION AND ATHLETICS, 2011-2012
Dave Evans, Dean, P.E., Health Education and Athletics**

P.E./Health Ed. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Physical Education • Kevin Hazlett	Kristan Clark	<p>Physical Education, Health, Dance and Athletics was a 2010-2011 Year One program review and opted to participate in the new annual process. They submitted a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted twelve Goal Matrices. Two goals addressed specific faculty positions; New Faculty Hiring Priorities applications were attached (one appeared to have followed previous format). One goal addressed multiple faculty members/coaches; this did not include a separate New Faculty Hiring Priorities application. One goal addressed a basketball shooting machine, with attached documentation. One goal addressed a baseball pitching machine, with attached documentation. One goal addressed water polo boards to increase shooting accuracy, with attached documentation. One goal addressed the need for a new aquatics facility; the criteria and rubric for Facilities was listed as TBD, will provide when published. One goal addressed swimmers feedback equipment, with attached documentation. One goal addressed the need for a diving board replacement plan, with documentation. One goal addressed the need for a swimming touchpad replacement plan, with documentation. One goal addressed expansion of training options for swim classes, with equipment and documentation. One goal addressed the need for equipment in support of American Red Cross certification, with documentation.</p>

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL/BEHAVIORALSCIENCES AND MULTICULTURAL STUDIES, 2011-2012
Charles Zappia, Dean, Social/Behavioral Sciences and Multicultural Studies**

Soc./Beh. Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Anthropology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Madeleine Hinkes 	<p>Marichu Magana</p>	<p>Anthropology completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>It was noted that the document was well written, well documented, and well organized.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: the lead writer identified one error in the Goals Matrices/Resource Allocation Link, which was corrected.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for two new fulltime contract faculty members; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was included within the document. One goal addressed the need for additional specimens for the program teaching reference collection; documentation was attached.</p>

Soc./Beh. Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Architecture • Ian Kay	William Craft	<p>Architecture completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>It was noted that the lead writer did an excellent job of detailing plans and providing budget information and required documentation for resource allocation.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted fourteen Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need to establish Landscape Architecture as its own degree program; documentation was provided. One goal addressed the need for two new fulltime contract employees, one for a new faculty position and one for an Instructional Lab Technician; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached, as was a New Classified Staff Hiring Priorities application. Three goals addressed the need for replacing all computers and printers in the Design Center, and upgrading software programs; documentation was embedded within the matrices. Three goals addressed the need for stronger interaction with alumni, professional, and community-based groups (advertising and events costs), grant seeking (.20 FTEF faculty release time), and advancement of articulation agreements (travel and supplies request). Three goals address printing needs, one for training on the Oce printer (cost of consultant), one for implementation of the Pay-to-Print system, and one to purchase a new Xerox copier. Two goals addressed presentation equipment, one for a MacBook Pro in the Conference Room, and one for upgrading all AV equipment in the classrooms, auditorium, and office spaces. One goal addressed the need for a woodworking shop for model building; documentation was included in the matrix.</p>
Black Studies • Thekima Mayasa	Chris Sullivan	<p>The Program Review Committee received the document on April 4, 2012, after the deadline. The evaluation for this program review appears in the addendum at the end of this report.</p>	
Building Construction- Carpentry/Inspect. • Larry Horsman	Laura Mathis	<p>A program review was not submitted as of April 13, 2012. The lead writer contacted the committee on April 23, 2012, to state that he will be proactive with completing the review next year.</p>	

Soc./Beh. Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Chicano Studies (*) • Cesar Lopez	Monica Romero	<p>Chicano Studies completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>It was noted that this was a well researched, well documented, well written program review.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted six Goal Matrices. One goal addressed getting Mesa College designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution. One goal addressed increasing the number students graduating with an A.A. degree in Chicano Studies. One goal addressed curriculum review and development. One goal addressed the need for a new fulltime contract faculty member; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was embedded within the matrix. Two goals addressed the need for upgrading their two classrooms and for upgrading the department workspace; thorough documentation was provided for these requests.</p>
Geography	Kristan Clark	<p>Geography was a 2010-2011 Year One program review and opted to complete Goal Matrices and resource allocation applications as part of the new annual process. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to the goal progress.</p> <p>It was noted that the lead writer provided a thorough analysis in both new faculty requests.</p> <p>Lead Writer Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lead writer reiterated the program's need for additional contract faculty. 	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. Two goals addressed the need for new faculty. One goal was for short term need and the other for long term planning. Both goals included New Faculty Hiring Priorities applications within the Rationale section of the matrices. Another goal addressed the need for a nationwide search to fill these positions. The final goal addressed the need for additional supplies; the request was well documented.</p>

Soc./Beh. Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
History <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Crocitti 	Saloua Saidane	<p>History completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information.</p> <p>The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I reviewed the report and agree with its findings. 	<p>The program completed and submitted five Goal Matrices. All five addressed the need for new fulltime contract faculty. A New Faculty Hiring Priorities application encompassing all five positions was attached to the program review.</p>
Interior Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mimi Moore/ Holly Hodnick 	Marichu Magana	<p>Interior Design completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement. The lead writers included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writers analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lead writers approve the report. 	<p>The program completed and submitted seven Goal Matrices. Two goals addressed the need for new personnel, one for a fulltime contract faculty member and one for a fulltime Instructional Lab Technician. A New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was embedded within the Rationale section of the new faculty goal, and a New Classified Staff Hiring Priorities application was embedded within the Rational section of the new classified staff goal. One goal addressed the need for software purchases and upgrades for their computer lab; documentation was included in the attached Perkins application. One goal addressed the need for a Lighting Lab; again documentation was provided through the attached Perkins application. Two goals addressed NKBA accreditation needs; NKBA dues were documented per Table 1 criteria. One goal addressed the need for released time for the sole remaining fulltime contract faculty member to administer the program; documentation was included in the matrix.</p>

Soc./Beh. Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Philosophy • Dwight Furrow	Anne Geller	<p>Philosophy completed the Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program submitted two Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the plan to deactivate Philosophy 205. One goal addressed the need to for a fulltime contract faculty member; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached; however, the Goal Matrix was incomplete.</p>
Political Science • Michelle Rodriguez	Dina Miyoshi	<p>Political Science was a 2010-2011 Year One program review and opted to participate in the new annual process. They completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information.</p> <p>The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the plan to enhance the online image and visibility of the program through revision of the website. One goal addressed the need to assure the position of Political Science courses within degree requirements, including the A.A. in Liberal Arts and the A.A. in Political Science. One goal addressed the need to ensure continued articulation of courses. Another goal addressed the need to maintain enrollments. None of the goals required resource allocation documentation.</p>

Soc./Beh. Sci. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Psychology • Dina Miyoshi/ Laurie Mackenzie	Chris Sullivan	<p>Psychology was a 2010-2011 Year One program review and opted to complete Goal Matrices and resource allocation applications as part of the new annual process. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writers for an excellent program review and recommended that its Goal Matrices and applications be used as a model. The lead writer effectively analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the needs of the program.</p> <p>It was noted that as with their Year One report, the lead writers have produced an extensive analysis, making excellent use of data to support their resource allocation requests.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: the lead writer identified one error in the Goals Matrices/Resource Allocation Link, which was corrected.</p>	<p>The program completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for three fulltime contract faculty members; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached for each of the three positions. One goal addressed the need for a .50 department administrative assistant; a New Classified Staff Hiring Priorities application was attached. One goal addressed developing new curriculum for a laboratory class in physiological psychology; no resources were requested. One goal addressed developing a new computer lab and physiological psychology enhanced classroom to be housed in the new Social and Behavioral Sciences Building; the classroom will be equipped through Prop S and N funding, but licenses for SPSS will not. This request is for three individual licenses; documentation is provided within the Goal Matrix and in an attachment.</p>
Sociology • Tanya Kravatz	Jill Moreno- Ikari	<p>Sociology completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you very much for taking the time to read and comment on our department's review. I agree with your assessment. 	<p>The program completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for a fulltime contract faculty member; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached. One goal addressed assessing their critical thinking SLOs.</p>

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
SCHOOL OF STUDENT DEVELOPMENT AND MATRICULATION, 2011-2012
Ashanti Hands, Acting Dean, Student Development and Matriculation**

Student Dev./Matric. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Admissions/Records/ Veterans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ivonne Alvarez 	<p>Chris Sullivan</p>	<p>Admissions & Records completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Service area needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the service area.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: the lead writer identified one error in the Goals Matrices/Resource Allocation Link, which was corrected.</p>	<p>The service area completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One goal was to reinstate two classified positions lost due to budget cuts; a New Classified Hiring Priorities application was attached. One goal was to reclassify two classified positions in order to provide support to the director and supervisor; a justification was provided for this goal. One goal addressed the creation of an International Student Program Budget to meet the needs of training and support; the request was documented within the matrix. The final goal addressed the need for a supplies budget for ID cards; the documentation was included in the matrix.</p>

Student Dev./Matric. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Counseling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ailene Crakes 	<p>Jill Moreno-Ikari</p>	<p>Counseling completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Service area needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the service area.</p> <p>The liaison noted that the article and political cartoon from the Mesa Press show the perceived need for increased counseling access to students (good use of qualitative data). Excellent analysis on multiple levels.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for recognizing the Counseling Program Review. I appreciate the feedback. 	<p>The service area completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. All three goals address the need for fulltime counseling faculty members to replace those positions which have been vacated. The positions include Transfer Center, Puente Program, and two positions in General Counseling, for a total of four positions. A detailed New Faculty Hiring Priorities application addressing all four positions is attached.</p>

Student Dev./Matric. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Employment/Career Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monica Romero 	<p>Robin Watkins</p>	<p>Employment/Career Center completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Service area needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the service area.</p> <p>The Program Review was very well presented and documented.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you. The Career Center appreciates critique of the program review and looks forward to using this document to meet its goals in the upcoming years. 	<p>The service area completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for one fulltime contract career center coordinator, one fulltime senior student services assistant, and adjunct career counseling. A New Faculty Hiring Priorities application and a New Classified Staff Hiring Priorities application were attached; and the budget was clearly documented within the matrix. One goal addressed the need for additional funds for expanding the type and volume of career assessments; supporting documentation was attached. The final goal was to address Career Center SLOs.</p>

Student Dev./Matric. Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Orientation/ Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Wales 	Kristan Clark	<p>Orientation and Assessment completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been updated this year. The lead writer included information concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The service area completed and submitted two Goal Matrices. One goal was to hire a fulltime Student Services Assistant for the Testing Center; this position has been vacant since the previous incumbent retired. A New Classified Hiring Priorities application for this position is embedded in the matrix. The second goal is for a part-time seasonal Student Services Assistant (45%) during peak periods. A New Classified Hiring Priorities application is embedded in the matrix.</p>
Transfer Center <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris Kalck 	Angela Liewen Romeo	<p>Transfer Center completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Service area needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the service area.</p> <p>The liaison noted that this is an excellent program review that is well written and well supported by data.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The service area completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for a fulltime Transfer Center Director; a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached. One goal addressed the need for adjunct counseling support; documentation was provided within the matrix. One goal addressed the need to secure funding so that Transfer Center counselors and staff can attend professional development conferences; documentation was provided within the matrix. One goal addressed the need to collect accurate data on the use of the Transfer Center and its related activities; no funding is associated with this goal.</p>

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
STUDENT AFFAIRS, 2011-2012
Larry Maxey, Acting Dean, Student Affairs**

Student Affairs Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Student Health Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suzanne Khambata 	<p>Dina Miyoshi</p>	<p>Student Health Services completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review.</p> <p>It was noted that this was a very well researched and documented program review.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lead writer approved the report. 	<p>The service area completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One goal addressed moving to the new building; no budget costs were associated with this goal. One goal addressed implementation of Electronic Medical Records by Summer 2012; documentation was provided for a service fee by the EMR provider. Two goals addressed new personnel. A fulltime contract Psychotherapist was requested, and a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached. A Senior Student Services Assistant was also requested, and a New Contract Hiring Priorities application was attached.</p>

**SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
STUDENT SERVICES, 2011-2012
Dave Evans, Acting Vice President, Student Services**

Student Services Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
<p>Disability Support Programs & Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dawn Stoll 	<p>Danielle Short</p>	<p>Disability Support Programs and Services completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Service area needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the service area.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for the final report. 	<p>The service area completed and submitted five Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the move into the new building with necessary equipment and office and classroom space, and assuring accessibility for students. One goal addressed the need for added personnel, including: one Program Activity Manager, two fulltime contract faculty members, and two fulltime classified positions. A detailed New Classified Hiring Priorities application is attached, and a New Faculty Hiring Priorities application is attached, which also refers the reader to Item 4 under challenges. Another goal addresses the need for funding High Tech Center computers and a fulltime contract staff position. The documentation for this position is included in the New Classified Hiring Priorities application for SMART goal 2. Another goal addresses the move of the High Tech Center to the first floor of the LRC, no costs are associated with the move. The final goal addresses the need for career counseling resources for DSPS students; no costs are associated with the goal.</p>

Student Services Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
EOPS • Nellie Dougherty	Bruce Naschak	<p>EOPS completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Service area needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both.</p> <p>The liaison commended the lead writer on her dedication and hard work in creating an effective program review document to explain her program and its needs – excellent work.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The service area completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need to research alternative funding sources. One goal addressed the need to reinstate two classified positions that were lost due to budget cuts; a New Contract Hiring Priorities application was completed and attached. One goal addressed the need to reinstate a fulltime counselor. A New Faculty Hiring Priorities application was attached.</p>

Student Services Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Financial Aid • Cathy Springs	Ashanti Hands	<p>Financial Aid completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Service area needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the service area.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for the kind words on the completion of this project. 	<p>The service area completed and submitted four Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need to provide a series of financial aid workshops; associated costs were for classified staff time and printing. One goal addressed the need to coordinate with Counseling to develop forms and processes to assure accountability in developing Education Plans for the Appeal process; costs for printing were documented. One goal addressed updating the webpage. One goal addressed need to fill Senior Clerical position; a New Classified Hiring Priorities application was attached.</p>

Student Services Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
STAR TRIO • Marichu Magana	Brian Cushing	<p>STAR TRIO completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Service area needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the service area.</p> <p>The liaison expressed appreciation for the lead writer's hard work.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback: No comment was provided.</p>	<p>The service area completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One goal addressed creating a Program Procedure Manual. One goal addressed hiring a .50 Student Services Assistant; a New Classified Hiring Priorities application was attached. The final goal addressed creation of motivational posters highlighting individual student achievement; documentation was embedded within the Goal Matrix.</p>

Student Services Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Student Affairs • Ashanti Hands	Danielle Short	<p>Student Affairs completed a thorough Program Review. The service area description provided its mission statement, including a statement that it had not been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the service area catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the service area, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the service area and contained all required information. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The Program Review Committee commended the lead writer for an excellent program review and recommended that it be used as a model. The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. Service area needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the service area.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks for sharing the feedback. This process has been a wonderful growth experience. • I appreciate the work of my liaison and the committee. 	<p>The service area completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for the creation of an Associate Dean, Student Life position. A detailed application for the position was embedded within the Rationale section of the matrix. One goal addressed the need for purchase of student conduct case management software; documentation was embedded within the matrix, and associated costs were provided. A third goal addressed the need for purchase of Academic Works Scholarship Management software to more effectively and efficiently manage the scholarship application process. Documentation was provided.</p>

**ADDENDUM FOR PROGRAM REVIEWS RECEIVED AFTER THE MARCH 23, 2012 DEADLINE
 SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE
 PROGRAM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT, 2011-2012
 SCHOOL OF SOCIAL/BEHAVIORALSCIENCES AND MULTICULTURAL STUDIES, 2011-2012
 Charles Zappia, Dean, Social/Behavioral Sciences and Multicultural Studies**

Soc./Beh. Sciences Lead Writers 2011-2012	Program Review Committee Liaisons	Comments/Recommendations from Program Review Committee	Goals Matrices/ Resource Allocation Link
Black Studies • Thekima Mayasa	Chris Sullivan	<p>Black Studies completed a thorough Program Review. The program description provided its mission statement, including a statement as to why it had been revised this year. The lead writer included information concerning the program catalog changes as well as described changes made within the past year. The assessment described the current state of the program, where it wants to be, and the challenges that need to be addressed in order to reach its desired state. The Goal Matrices addressed the gaps identified by the program. The program used data and provided required information to support resource allocation requests.</p> <p>The budget is cited as the major obstacle to goal progress. The lead writer has used data appropriately throughout the responses and also described what and how specific items should be addressed in the next program review. The liaison noted a recurring theme of budget constraints and their impact on the program. Program needs and challenges are identified with budget cited as the reason for both. The lead writer analyzed and used the provided data when discussing the impacts on the program.</p> <p>Lead Writer Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After careful review of the final report for Black Studies, I agree with the majority of the analysis outlined. However, there are several points worth noting particularly as it relates to the New Hiring Priorities Application a.k.a. Table 1. • I do wish to acknowledge the guidance provided to me by my faculty liaison who was a perfect match, as he has taught courses within Black Studies and was acutely aware of my Department needs, while providing insightful suggestions and support. • First it should be noted that there was significant redundancy in many of the questions asked, each requiring substantial data and analysis to support the programs' position and/or requests. More specifically, as lead writer of a small, multi-disciplinary department, all analysis required more extensive time and attention to fully capture the program's needs and achievements with supporting data. • Table 1 was not clearly identified as the New Hiring Application. This should have been more clearly described. • Lastly, the demands this type of process imposes upon smaller departments with limited human capital must be reviewed, discussed and appropriately streamlined to address and minimize excessive externalities that take valuable time, energy and resources away from our primary obligation of serving students. 	<p>The program completed and submitted three Goal Matrices. One goal addressed the need for two new faculty members; the Goal Matrix included budget documentation. In the attachment section for Table 1, the lead writer indicated that all of the answers to the New Faculty Hiring Priorities application were answered in questions 4, 5, and 6 of the program review, and that they could be accessed there, in context. A separate application specific to New Faculty Hiring Priorities was not attached. The second goal addressed curriculum review and integration for the program. The final goal addressed expansion of the Black Studies Pathway to four-year institutions, including strategies for additional Memorandums of Understanding and institutional partnerships.</p>