

San Diego Miramar College
Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee

Minutes

Meeting Date and Time: Monday, October 20, 2014 from 3:06 PM to 4:37 PM

Location: L-108

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

Nonvoting Members Absent: None

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

Nonvoting/Resource Members Absent: None

Meeting called to order at 3:06 PM

1. Standing Items

1.1. Adoption of Agenda

Motion to adopt agenda was made by R. Bennie and seconded by B. Haidar. Hearing no objections, the agenda was adopted.

1.2. Adoption of Minutes from Meeting of October 6, 2014

Motion to accept the minutes was made by B. Haidar and seconded by R. Bennie. A motion to edit the minutes under Item 3.1 was made to clarify the lack of representation from the liberal arts and business areas by B. Haidar and seconded by P. Hopkins. Motion carried.

2. Unfinished Business

None

3. Information Items

3.1. Update on Committee Membership

N. Sinkaset reported that no new information had been received.

B. Haidar indicated that faculty in liberal arts and business had been notified about the vacancies on the subcommittee and 2-3 weeks would be given for a response.

It was mentioned that the subcommittee currently has two regularly-attending nonvoting members that could serve as full voting members.

Co-chairs reminded the subcommittee that information items are reported by and spoken to by one person and are not discussion items.

3.2. Update on administration of ISLO Survey

R. Bennie reported that the Office of Instruction would absorb the \$157 cost to administer the survey since the School of PRIE, Library and Technology has no budget for research costs such as this.

3.3. Potential changes to college catalog regarding programs

R. Bennie reported that program entries in the college catalog vary widely in composition and style. A standard should be set so that there's a more unified presentation in the catalog.

A discussion broke out that touched on how the current entries became the way they are and whether or not the subcommittee has purview over suggesting changes to catalog.

Co-chairs cautioned against continuing discussion of what was originally planned as an information item. The topic will be brought back for full discussion at a later meeting.

4. Discussion Items

4.1. Moving towards 100% course/program assessment in Taskstream

L. Murphy initiated discussion by handing out a report that show the current completion rates for Course Outcomes Assessment and Program Outcomes Assessment.

Currently, approximately 37% compliance in course outcomes, 30% compliance in course assessment plans, 62% compliance in program outcomes, and 56% compliance in program assessment plans.

Several issues were brought up, including: the fall 2014 deadline for outcomes and assessment plans, the spring 2015 deadline for cycle completion, "not offered" courses, how to get remaining courses set up in Taskstream, lack of assessment of work that has been done, and benchmarking of programs.

Possible courses of action to take were then discussed, including: involving the Academic Senate, moving SLOJet data over to Taskstream by classified staff (although SLOJet has been down for 2 weeks), e-mail reminders of varying frequency and to varying people, and regular completion reports to deans.

4.2. Summary of the problem with the definition of "program"

N. Sinkaset began discussion by attempting to articulate an understanding of the problem with finding a definition of a "program." Currently, program reviews are more akin to department reviews and are not centered around outcomes. If the program definition is tied to outcomes, then things like resource allocation will have a clearer justification. A program definition more in line with Title 5 would allow for a more direct tie to outcomes.

Discussion then followed revolving around what the new list of programs would look like. R. Bennie presented a draft of a way that programs could be identified and how some degree outcomes could be grouped into one “program” if they were similar enough.

Art/Visual Studies was used as an example which has three separate A.A. Degrees for Combined Drawing/Painting, Craft Skills, and Studio Arts. If the degrees/certificates were identified as the outcomes around which programs are defined, the Art/Visual Studies faculty would have to complete three program reviews. However, in this case, if outcomes would be identified that were shared by all three degrees, then these three degree programs could be combined into one program centered around those outcomes. To contrast, the A.A. degree in Art History most likely would not share the same outcomes and would have to be a separate program.

Discussion also centered around the idea of specializations within a field of study and how that would impact the organization of programs.

It was generally agreed upon that a Title 5 definition of program would be acceptable, but it would have to be explained to faculty that the key is identifying outcomes around which to center programs around.

4.3. Refinement of Program Review Template

L. Murphy presented a draft of a Taskstream-based program review. Key areas in the template include an area for pre-populated data from the District relevant to the program, links to program and student level learning outcome assessment and results, and area for resource requests.

A few suggestions were made including the use of drop-down boxes for correct categorization of resource requests.

A question was asked about including a benchmarking component to the form. Daniel Miramontez will be invited to the next meeting to give further details about benchmarking requirements.

At the next meeting, a closer look at the program review template would be taken in comparison to previous program reviews, perhaps in small groups.

5. Action Items

5.1. Recommendation on ISLO survey window period to Academic Affairs

A motion was made to recommend to Academic Affairs that the ISLO survey take place between December 1 and December 12, 2014 by R. Bennie and seconded by D. Willkie. Motion carried.

5.2. Recommendation on the definition of “program” to Academic Affairs

A motion was made to recommend to Academic Affairs that programs be defined as written in Title 5, Section 55000(g) which states: “Educational Program” is an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education. It was also recommended that the draft of the proposed programs be reviewed by departments and discipline

faculty. These recommendations were made by D. Willkie and seconded by R. Bennie.
Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 PM