

Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee

Minutes

Monday, November 04, 2013

In attendance: Nam Sinkaset (V), Laura Murphy (Co-Chair, non-voting), John Salinsky (V), Duane Short (V), Paulette Hopkins (Co-Chair, V), Lynne Ornelas (V), Dan Wilke (V), Julia Gordon, Buran Haidar (V)

Absent: Channing Booth (V)

Guests: Wheeler North, Daniel Miramontez, Denise Kapitzke

Started: 3:02pm

1. Election of Faculty Co-Chair

- a. Laura: 5 votes, Buran: 0

2. Agenda approved

- 3. Ratification/approval of all previous Fall 2013 agendas and minutes:** approved by consensus as a group; the new date will be added with "approved" next to the minutes and agendas already posted

4. Old Business:

- a. **Revised ISLO recommendations:** on agenda for Academic Affairs for 11/7
- b. **3-yr Program Review cycle recommendation:** not added to Academic Senate agenda as the CGC/ AS did not recognize the status as of IR- PR/SLOAC as a functional committee so the committee was not allowed to forward recommendations; waiting to be placed on next Academic Senate agenda
- c. **College-wide PR committee recommendation (CGC version):** in first reading at Academic Senate (11/5)
- d. **Change to IR PR/SLOAC Committee Handbook page:** in second reading at Academic Senate (11/5)

5. New business

- a. **Outcomes discussion:** Discussion on how to approach assessment of programs, degrees/certificates, GE and institutional outcomes. Immediate need to provide some authentic evidence that we are doing assessment at these different levels, to be in compliance with our claimed 2013 Status Report prior to accreditation visit in 2016. Laura M. provided a summary table of immediate areas needing attention. Buran H. stated that prior claims of assessment were based on achievement data and mapping courses to GE tracks or the ISLOs. Laura M. summarized the work being done at the

program (and potentially degree/certificate level) by SLO Liaisons in individual departments. She reported that a meeting with all SLO Liaisons would take place in the next several weeks. Duane S. questioned how we want to assess the GE SLOs. He suggested one method would be to use the current evaluations of Academic Standards in their review of the different GE tracks and the appropriateness of the courses therein. Laura M. suggested that this is an important part of review, but that in relation to outcomes assessment, we need to have some evidence that the GE statements we make are directly being assessed, and that discussions on results and improvement, in relation to those statements are taking place. Buran H. commented that some colleges use the same outcomes for GE and Institution level, and reported that there might be a change at the state level in terminology so that the GE and Institution level outcomes become the same. Currently the GE SLOs are district wide. Committee questioned how we might go about suggesting a change to the district-wide GE SLOs, and Duane S. replied he believed it would be through our Curriculum Committee and then CIC. Laura M. suggested we do a pilot study for GE outcomes assessment and Duane suggested using English or Math. Laura M. agreed to draw up a proposal for this to share at the next meeting. Discussion of ISLOs continued with Denise K. questioning how administrative services fit in to the picture. The committee discussed how we hope to move to the revised ISLOs (based on the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes) that includes language that covers the administrative and student services areas. Methods of ISLO assessment were discussed, including mapping of course SLOs to the ISLOs for aggregated assessment, as well as specific student surveys. Duane S. supported the use of surveys, and Daniel M. cautioned that we need to be strategic in planning our assessment surveys to not inundate students. The group discussed targeting specific populations of graduates and suggested adding an incentive for completion of survey, such as Starbucks cards or seats at graduation. Daniel M. said he will report back on the past percentages of student survey participation. Laura M. suggested an initial pilot study to start the ISLO assessment ahead of Taskstream implementation. Duane S. suggested using one program and mapping its course SLOs to ISLOs and going from there. Laura M. agreed to draw up a proposal for this to be shared and discussed at the next meeting. Laura M. and Denise K. (with the attendance of a representative from Student Services) agreed to meet and discuss how to proceed on the Outcomes/Assessment Handbook so that it includes sections relevant to all areas of campus.

b. Plan for managing review of Program Review self-study reports:

- i. Work on this item has been tabled based on a directive from the President, until we have approval to add this to our committee goals. The group questioned how we will develop a plan without being able to work on it ahead of approval through the governance structure, when the governance groups themselves are asking for details on the plan.

- c. **Taskstream update:** completed college" node structure" for Taskstream; call scheduled for 11/13

- d. **2013-14 PR Update feedback:** Dan W. commented that we need to provide more or better guidance and training on new program review forms/ templates. Group discussed methods for improving training, including workshops and convocation events. Lynne O. and Paulette H. reported that most faculty liked the "update" program review. However, both deans also mentioned that the" updates" were not always complete, again stating the need for some sort of guidance and feedback on program review report production.

6. No announcements

7. Adjournment : 4:31pm