

San Diego Miramar College
Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee

Minutes

Meeting Date and Time: Monday, November 3, 2014 from 3:26 PM to 4:30 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)

Voting Members Absent: John Salinsky (faculty, PS); Buran Haidar (faculty at-large, MBEPS)

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

Guest: Daniel Miramontez

Meeting called to order at 3:26 PM

1. Standing Items

1.1. Adoption of Agenda

Motion to adopt the agenda with the addition of an information item titled "ISLO Survey Update" was made by N. Sinkaset and seconded by D. Willkie. Hearing no objections, the agenda was adopted.

1.2. Adoption of Minutes from Meeting of October 20, 2014

Motion to accept the minutes was made by D. Willkie and seconded by R. Bennie. Hearing no objections, the minutes were adopted.

2. Unfinished Business

3. Information Items

3.1. Update on Committee Membership

N. Sinkaset reported that nothing had been communicated from the Academic Senate President regarding the issue of the vacant at-large position that exists on the subcommittee. It was noted that the 3-4 week invitation period extended to faculty members of the other areas had passed.

3.2. Update on moving towards 100% completion on Taskstream

L. Murphy reported that the e-mail reminder of due dates to deans and chairs worked well, and she received several responses. However, she was struggling with Public Safety areas. A follow-up e-mail to responsible faculty will be sent in the future.

3.3. ISLO Survey Update

L. Murphy and S. Ballard reported that the random sample of classes had pulled and that there is a primary and secondary list. This list was shared with the subcommittee. Laura will send e-mail invitations and wait 3 work days for a response. If anyone declines, then a class will pulled from the secondary list.

It was noted that the classes that had been randomly selected from Exercise Science were open lab classes, and there may be problems administering the survey in those classes.

4. Discussion Items

A motion to suspend the rules and discuss item 4.3 first was made by N. Sinkaset and seconded by R. Bennie. Motion carried.

4.3. Benchmarking Programs

D. Miramontez addressed the question about what needs to be benchmarked. He indicated that ACCJC has said that the following could be benchmarked: job placement rates, licenses (for CTE programs), success rate, retention rate, and number of degrees/certificates conferred.

Of these, success rate, retention rate, and number of degrees/certificates conferred would be the easiest to benchmark since these data are available to all instructional programs. These are measured by the College because they must be included in a report to ACCJC. Information on degrees/certificates conferred can be found in the annual awards report, and information on success/retention rates can be found in achievement data normally distributed in data packets for program review.

Necessary data can be compiled for any sequence of courses that a program defines.

Five-year averages in the report can be used as a basis for benchmarking, and workshops could be held to instruct faculty on how to benchmark.

4.1. ACCJC response to question about active courses

L. Murphy began discussion by summarizing the content of the response received from ACCJC. In short, all courses need to be offered regularly.

Classes with limited offering should be flagged in the catalog with details about when they are offered. If classes are not offered regularly, they should be deactivated.

A class that is offered once within a 3-year cycle is reasonable. As long as the class is offered once within a program review cycle, it should be fine.

The topic of deactivating courses that are not regularly offered will return as a discussion item at a future meeting.

4.2. Taskstream/Catalog program alignment

A draft of the program list to be presented to Academic Affairs was shared by R. Bennie. The draft program list will be distributed with a document containing definitions and notes. Among them: “program” is the name of the degree(s) and/or certificate(s) that have the same group of broad overarching outcomes; each course will have a “home” program; course outcomes will be mapped to program outcomes in Taskstream, resource requests originate from programs.

Programs will be listed alphabetically in the catalog, and their outcomes will be listed to match the program outcomes in Taskstream.

The application of the concept of program should be practical, along the lines of “When students leave our program, they should be able to...”

It was emphasized that the list was in an early draft form. Input and approval from discipline faculty is important and necessary.

Some programs may be identified by their Course ID whereas others may break up their courses into multiple programs.

4.4. Program Review Template Activity

Due to time constraints, the original activity planned could not be carried out. Instead, N. Sinkaset initiated a discussion revolving around a specific program.

Materials related to the Chemistry Program were distributed. The documents included: list of required courses and electives for the chemistry degree, current list of chemistry program learning outcomes, copy of the last chemistry full program review, and current draft of the Taskstream-based program review template.

Discussion initially revolved around which courses a program review would be written: pre-requisite courses, required courses, and/or elective courses. If the purpose of program review is to evaluate graduates from a program, then it makes sense that they could only be compared based on the required courses since these are common to all.

Programs that have required courses from more than one discipline were then discussed, a specific example being Allied Health which has primarily biology courses as required with a few chemistry courses. In this case, the chemistry discipline is still responsible for the course and its content, but conversations are necessary to ensure that the Allied Health program students are getting the chemistry they need from these courses.

Questions about having all courses belong to a program were then raised. If the program review revolves around only required courses, then a fair number of courses would not find a place in a program.

A point was raised about the purpose of program review. Is the purpose to ensure that every course fits into a program's sequence of courses somewhere or is the purpose to evaluate how well a student has been trained within a program?

The current chemistry program learning outcomes were then discussed. As it stands, it appears that the current list of outcomes will be reduced from 5 to 2 based on the new definition of program and its relation to required courses.

5. Action Items
6. Adjourn