

## APPROVED

San Diego Miramar College  
Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, March 4, 2013, 3:00-4:30  
L-108

Present: J. Buckley, P. Hopkins, D. Miramontez, L. Murphy, L. Ornelas, S. Schwarz, D. Short, N. Sinkaset

1) Call to order – 3:14pm

D. Short noted that quorum was attained via proxies of voting members.

2) Approval of agenda – approved by consensus

3) Approval of minutes from last meeting – approved by consensus

4) New Business

a) Definition of “program” and program-level SLOs

L. Murphy briefly summarized the results of the program-level SLO activity from fall Convocation. One outcome of the activity was that it became clear that the college's current program-level SLOs do not easily lend themselves to assessment because they are too broad and cover multiple certificates and degrees. Instead, it might be more useful to create program-level SLOs for each individual degree and certificate of achievement. Doing so would not necessarily change the level of analysis used in the program review process for the overall program; just the level of detail for the program-level SLOs. After discussion, the committee agreed with this concept.

J. Buckley reported that the latest ACCJC annual report asked colleges to publicly post program-level SLO outcomes. R. Miramontez confirmed that we are already using student achievement data at the degree and certificate level. He also briefly summarized the RP Group's work on “Completion by Design.”

D. Short asked how this kind of change would be implemented. L. Murphy suggested coordinating the drafting of the program-level SLOs through the SLO Liaisons currently being identified for each department. The work could be overseen by the Instructional PR/SLOAC committee or the SLO Task Force currently being formed. The committee also discussed a target date for completion and identified March 1, 2014 as a good date since it would allow for changes to the program-level SLOs to be incorporated into the 2014-15 catalog.

D. Short agreed to put this topic on the agenda for the next meeting for a “second reading” and further discussion if needed.

b) Evaluative component to program review process

J. Buckley reiterated a concern expressed at the last meeting that our program review process does not have an evaluative component, yet this is typically a major function of

## APPROVED

program review. He reported ACCJC rules now require an evaluative and accountability component to the planning process. D. Short summarized the history of evaluation in program review at Miramar over the past eight years. The committee discussed the difference between evaluating/assisting in the quality of the program review reports and evaluating the programs themselves, which is what ACCJC is most concerned with. Committee members emphasized that the purpose of the evaluative component would be to assess the overall health and viability of the program in order to determine how to allocate resources appropriately; not as a way to make judgments or “rank” programs against each other. The committee also discussed how the program reviews are currently used to feed the planning process, the levels at which evaluation might occur, and processes for deciding on creating, maintaining, or retiring programs.

After discussion, the committee agreed to continue investigating the idea of a broad evaluative component further. D. Miramontez agreed to search for recommendations from the RP Group. D. Short agreed to search for recommendations and best practices from the ASCCC.

### 5) Old Business

#### a) SLO Operational Plan

L. Murphy reported that after the SLO Operational Plan was approved and sent forward, a request was made to provide an executive summary to include the college’s own assessment of its progress to the “proficiency” level. The committee briefly discussed some methods that might be used to determine if the college is at “proficiency.”

After discussion, the committee approved adding an executive summary to the document. L. Murphy agreed to draft the executive summary and share it with the committee at the next meeting.

### 6) Information Items

#### a) Program review recommendation status

D. Short reported that the recommendation on changing to a three-year cycle and the draft annual report form was approved by Academic Affairs and is to be reviewed by the Academic Senate at its next meeting.

#### b) Committee co-chair election

D. Short reminded the committee that he is completing his fourth year as faculty co-chair and that he would not run for re-election after this semester. He asked any interested faculty members to contact him if they would like information about the duties of the faculty co-chair.

### 7) Roundtable / Announcements

a) P. Hopkins asked about the status of the recommendation to purchase Taskstream. J. Buckley reported that the Classified Senate is in support of the purchase, that he has determined the initial cost and the likely contract renewal cost, and that now the recommendation is waiting for approval from CEC and possibly BRDS if needed for funding. Committee members suggested that L. Murphy attend the CEC meeting in case members had questions about Taskstream.

b) Next meeting Monday, March 18, 3:00-4:30

### 8) Adjournment – 4:36pm.