San Diego Miramar College

Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee

Minutes

Meeting Date and Time: Monday, September 21, 2015 from 3:09 PM to 4:18 PM

Location: L-108

Voting Members Present: Paulette Hopkins (co-chair, instructional admin); Namphol Sinkaset (co-chair, faculty, MBEPS); Fred Garces (instructional admin);Dan Willkie (faculty, BTCWI); John Salinsky (faculty, PS); **vacant** (faculty, LA); Alex Sanchez (faculty at-large, MBEPS); **vacant** (faculty at-large)

Voting Members Absent: None

Nonvoting/Resource Members Present: Xi Zhang(Research and Planning Analyst); Laura Murphy (College-wide Outcomes and Assessment Facilitator); Margarita Sánchez (Staff, Instruction)

Nonvoting/Resource Members Absent: Julia Gordon (faculty, MBEPS);

Meeting called to order at 3:09 PM

1. Standing Items
    1.1. Adoption of Agenda
        Motion to adopt the agenda was made by P. Hopkins and seconded by N. Sinkaset. Motion carried.

    1.2. Adoption of Minutes from Meeting of May 4, 2015
        Motion to adopt the minutes from May 4, 2015 was made by P. Hopkins and seconded by D. Willkie. Motion carried.

2. Unfinished Business –None

3. Information Items
    3.1. Introductions/Subcommittee Procedures
        New members P.Hopkins and F. Garces introduced. Subcommittee rules were reviewed and remain the same as last year.

4. Discussion Items
    4.1. Establish Subcommittee Yearly Goals
        6 Goals were created by the committee members (see file: IPR-SLOAC-2015-2016-Goals.docx).

    4.2. Status of SLO Cycle Completion/Program Review Progress
        L. Murphy began the discussion by expressing the importance of addressing the Program Scan data and stated the need for a single page with data relevant to Program Review. It was mentioned that the data could be organized by year instead of

by term in the future. Although some detail would be lost, it was noted that data may be requested by each department individually as the need arises. L. Murphy then updated the subcommittee on TaskStream progress, stating that she will create a report for the Deans. She also noted that there currently are no quality control measures.

4.3. Incentives for Completing SLO Work

N. Sinkaset began the discussion by reviewing what had been suggested at previous meetings, beginning with the idea of creating a SLO Committee where faculty could work to enter data. Some subcommittee members suggested monetary incentives but this could be problematic. Another possibility raised was the use of BRDS funding or Flex credit as an incentive for SLO completion. Another possibility was using funding from SSSP as an incentive. On the negative side, it was suggested that consequences could be put in place for faculty that do not complete SLO data entry. Subcommittee members generally agreed that positive incentives would be more effective, and another idea mentioned was that the department should be rewarded instead of the individual. It was determined that a consensus should be reached before a recommendation for incentives can be passed on to Academic Affairs.

4.4. ISLO Survey Distribution Status and Next Steps

L. Murphy began the discussion by noting the importance of determining where the survey results should go and mentioned that the Task Stream workgroup might be the most appropriate place for them to go. L. Murphy presented the data available from the last administered survey and noted the problem of the data being based on past ISLOs and remarked that a new survey based on the current ISLOs is needed.

L. Murphy stated the next possible step for the ISLO Survey is to work on the survey tool. The end of the academic year was discussed as a possible completion date, but the question of whose purview the task fell into was raised. It was asked whether the PIE Committee should be taking the lead on the survey or if it should continue in the IPR-SLOAC Subcommittee. It was subsequently agreed that PIE was unlikely to work on the survey tool, so it should remain with IPR-SLOAC until further notice. The utility of having an on-line version of the survey available was raised, but it was noted that it could lead to a greatly reduced response rate.

5. Action Items
   5.1. Adoption of Subcommittee Yearly Goals

Motion to adopt the Subcommittee Yearly Goals was made by F. Garces and seconded by J. Salinsky. Motion carried.

6. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:18 PM