San Diego Miramar College

Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee

Meeting Date and Time: Monday, October 19, 2015 from 3:07 PM to 4:15 PM

Location: L-108

<u>Voting Members Present</u>: Paulette Hopkins (co-chair, instructional admin); Namphol Sinkaset (co-chair, faculty, MBEPS); Fred Garces (instructional admin); John Salinsky (faculty, PS); Alex Sanchez (faculty at-large, MBEPS)

<u>Voting Members Absent:</u>Dan Willkie (faculty, BTCWI)

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

<u>Nonvoting/Resource Members Absent</u>: Julia Gordon (faculty, MBEPS)

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

1. Standing Items
   1.1. Adoption of Agenda

   > Motion to approve October 19th, 2015 agenda carried.
   > Motion made by F. Garces and seconded by A. Sanchez.

   1.2. Adoption of Minutes from Meeting of October 5, 2015

   > Modified the minutes to clarify the usage of the term *disciplinary action* in regard to Student Learning Outcome and added the concept of *ineligibility for resources* for faculty that do not complete SLOs. The subcommittee suggested that deans should not allow incomplete program reviews to be put through; a possibility for enforcing SLO work completion could be through disciplinary action, but this is not yet a recommendation from the IPR/SLOAC Subcommittee.
   > Motion to approve October 5th, 2015 amended minutes carried. Motion made by A. Sanchez and seconded by P. Hopkins.

2. Unfinished Business –None.

3. Information Items –None.

4. Discussion Items
   4.1. New Program Review/SLO Timeline

   L. Murphy presented a chart outlining the full Program Review SLO timeline and updates. The chart outlines everything that the college needs to do for program review including reporting and updating. Deadlines are in place for current year, dates for other years have been adjusted to reflect availability of the workspace in January and a possible due date of April. The

subcommittee brought up the idea that until a cycle has concluded, our evidence for assessment may have to be based on the previous cycle data. Obtaining numbers in the middle of a cycle when people are doing different things at different times may be problematic; therefore for those 3 years, the data would be the same. The college will need to decide if this is the route to take in terms of reporting data and is also dependent on whether ACCJC will accept previous cycle data. Currently, program scan packets are being generated in full program review years, but not in update years. The committee asked how the college's numbers will improve if program scans are generated every 3 years. It was stated that change effects will not be visible in year to year data but may be visible in 3-5 year data. P. Hopkins asked that L. Murphy generate an updated program review and RFF summary report (by school) for the instructional deans and Vice President of Instruction.

4.2. Incentives for Completing SLO Work vs. Meeting Set Standards

In the subcommittee's last discussion it was asked whether the IPR/SLOAC subcommittee should send a list of recommendations to Academic Affairs or if the recommendations should be more open-ended by asking how all of the college's programs will meet a set standard. The subcommittee would like to present Academic Affairs with the second option and ask for their input in setting a set of standards for completing SLO work. If Academic Affairs asks for solutions or recommendations the subcommittee could share their recommendations for incentives in completing SLO work. It was asked by the subcommittee if courses that are currently active but not offered are hurting us, and L. Murphy answered yes. Removal of the courses not offered would help the college's numbers.

4.3. Program Review Survey

X. Zhang created a survey through Survey Monkey. The point of the survey is to be simple and constructive so that it yields useful data. Faculty can make suggestions for program review improvement. The subcommittee suggested that the link for the Program Review survey should be sent to the Chairs or Academic Affairs and the Deans so they are aware and can forward the survey to anyone involved in program review. The subcommittee decided to send the survey to the Chairs and the Program Directors with the thought that the response time may be faster. Two weeks will be given to complete the survey. M. Sanchez will provide L. Murphy with a list of Chairs and Program Directors.

4.4. Customization of Program Achievement Data

The subcommittee would like program data packets to be more customized to the individual programs so that the data may help faculty make decisions regarding program review. The subcommittee noted that it may be better to wait until the survey feedback is received in order to determine the best way to tailor data packets to programs. Programs may need to have different types of data packets produced depending on the individual program's needs. The subcommittee discussed searching for the commonalities of the programs as a starting point and then adding more customized data to their packets as necessary. This topic will return for further discussion at a later subcommittee meeting.

5. Action Items
   5.1. New Program Review/SLO Timeline

Motion:The committee will recommend the modified Program Review/Outcomes Assessment Timeline Table to Academic Affairs to take effect January 2016.

Motion to recommend the modified Program Review/Outcomes Assessment Timeline Table to Academic Affairs carried. Motion made by F. Garces and seconded by A. Sanchez.

5.2. PR/SLO Completion Recommendation

Motion: Recommend that Academic Affairs address the need to promote continual participation and completion of SLOs by all faculty, such that they meet an acceptable standard.

Motion to recommend PR/SLO incentives and standards to Academic Affairs carried. Motion made by P. Hopkins and seconded by A. Sanchez.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.