San Diego Miramar College

Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee

Minutes

Meeting Date and Time: Monday, September 15, 2014 from 3:04 PM to 4:33 PM

Location: L-108

Voting Members Present: Roanna Bennie (co-chair, instructional admin);NampholSinkaset (co-chair, faculty, MBEPS); Paulette Hopkins (instructional admin);Dan Willkie (faculty, BTCWI); John Salinsky (faculty, PS); Pablo Martin (faculty, LA); Buran Haidar (faculty at-large, MBEPS)

Voting Members Absent: None

Nonvoting/Resource Members Present: Laura Murphy (College-wide Outcomes and Assessment Facilitator); Julia Gordon (faculty, MBEPS, appointed); Alex Sanchez (faculty, MBEPS, nonappointed)

Nonvoting/Resource Members Absent: Sam Ballard (Campus-based Researcher)

Meeting called to order at 3:04 PM

Co-chairs presented a document outlining procedures for meetings taking place this year. Motion to adopt the rules was made by D. Willkie and seconded by R. Bennie. Motion carried 3-0 with 2 abstentions.

1. Standing Items
    1.1. Adoption of Agenda
        Motion to adopt agenda was made and seconded. Hearing no objections, agenda was adopted.

    1.2. Adoption of Minutes from Meeting of May 5, 2014
        Motion to accept the minutes was made and seconded. Motion carried.

2. Unfinished Business
        None

3. Information Items
    3.1. Introductions
        N. Sinkaset introduced everyone present and their role. It was noted that one at-large member position remained vacant, and it was the duty of the co-chairs to request that position be filled.

        Clarification was made that the subcommittee has one appointed nonvoting member and one nonappointed nonvoting member.

4. Discussion Items
    4.1. Establish Subcommittee Yearly Goals
        N. Sinkaset began discussion stating that the College Governance Handbook instructs committees to set yearly goals and opened the floor for suggestions after suggesting that revision of the full program review template was an important item.

        Discussion followed about the timelines associated with program review and the difficulty in completing a quality review in a short period of time.

        The importance of defining "active" courses and "program" was discussed and how these definitions relate to program review.

        Overseeing ISLO assessment was presented as an important matter.

        Discussion concluded by acknowledging that these items were worthwhile goals and could be adopted as an action item later in the meeting if the subcommittee was comfortable with the list. However, if members wanted more time to think about this issue, the action item could be carried over to the next meeting.

    4.2. Outcomes and Assessment Operational Plan, 2014-2015
        L. Murphy began discussion by sharing the updated version of the plan. No further discussion ensued.

    4.3. Campus definition of "active courses" as it pertains to SLO assessment/reporting
        L. Murphy began discussion by detailing the difference between active courses and offered courses during an assessment/reporting cycle. Since not all active courses are offered within a given cycle, preparing reports using active courses results in poor completion rates.

        Discussion then focused on why ACCJC wants reports based on active courses. It was suggested that the motive behind the change is to get schools to deactivate courses that have not been offered in a while. Members discussed the difficulty of reactivating a course once it has been deactivated in our district.

        It was suggested to report using offered courses with an explanation as to why this was being done in some narrative portion of the report. Members agreed that this seemed to be a good solution while further clarification was sought from ACCJC.

    4.4. Campus definition of "program" (Title V for assessment vs. Miramar for program review)
        L. Murphy began discussion by reviewing the Title V definition of a program and the definition Miramar uses for program review. Whereas Title V has wording specifying a degree, certificate, or set outcome after a sequence of courses, Miramar's definition is based on what faculty members decide.

        With movement to Taskstream, a need to more clearly define "program" exists, and it was suggested that the Title V definitions may suit Miramar better now as we transition from a small to mid-size school.

Discussion then moved to certain programs which are not clearly attached to a discipline. R. Bennie will bring more information regarding this situation to the next meeting.

One of the primary concerns moving to the Title V definitions would be the increase in the number of program reviews that would have to be written, increasing the workload on faculty in certain subject areas. It was noted that the subcommittee would try to mitigate this problem by designing the full program review template to be as easy to complete as possible by making use of pre-populated fields.

Discussion on the topic ended with general agreement that the Title V definitions may serve the school better, but more discussion was needed.

4.5. Refinement of Program Review Template

N. Sinkaset began discussion by presenting a previous version of the full program review.

Discussion initially centered on reporting needs on the program review. It was suggested that better justification needed to accompany each need as opposed to a simple list. It was suggested that specific data for each program could be pre-populated into the program review form since it would be hosted by Taskstream.

The timeline in which needs were addressed through program review and the difficulties associated with the length of time were discussed.

Discussion concluded with L. Murphy offering to bring a draft program review integrated with Taskstream to the next meeting.

5. Action Items

5.1. Adoption of Subcommittee Yearly Goals

The following motion was made by D. Willkie and seconded by R. Bennie: Move to adopt the following list of goals for the year: (1) Full program review template; (2) Define "program"; (3) Define "active" courses; (4) Assessment of ISLOs; (5) Look at program review timelines. Motion carried.

5.2. Recommendation on Outcomes and Assessment Operational Plan, 2014-2015

The following motion was made by D. Willkie and seconded by R. Bennie: Move to recommend to Academic Affairs the plan as presented. Motion carried.

5.3. Recommendation of definition of "active courses" to Academic Affairs

The following motion was made by D. Willkie and seconded by P. Hopkins: Move to recommend to Academic Affairs the following definition of "active" courses as it pertains to SLO assessment/reporting: all courses that were offered during the assessment cycle. Motion carried.

6. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 PM.