

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW AND SLOAC SUBCOMMITTEE

Co-Chairs: Paulette Hopkins and Julia McMenamain

APPROVED 11/07/16

Minutes of October 3, 2016

Voting Members: Paulette Hopkins (Co-Chair, Instructional Admin), Fred Garces (Instructional Admin), Dan Willkie (Faculty, BTCWI), John Salinsky (Faculty, PS), Alex Sanchez (Faculty-at-Large, MBEPS), Laura Murphy (Faculty-at-Large/MBEPS); Julia McMenamain (Co-Chair and Faculty-at-Large/MBEPS)

Non-voting/Resource: Xi Zhang (Research and Planning Analyst); Katinea Todd (Staff, Instruction)

Present: Paulette Hopkins, Alex Sanchez, Julia McMenamain (for herself and with proxy for John Salinsky), Xi Zhang, Laura Murphy, Katinea Todd

Absent: Fred Garces, Dan Willkie, John Salinsky,

The regular bi-monthly meeting of the Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee was held on October 3, 2016. The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by Co-Chair Julia McMenamain, a quorum being present.

Agenda/Minutes. It was moved by Laura Murphy, seconded by Alex Sanchez, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda. It was moved by Murphy, seconded by Sanchez, and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 19, 2016. There being no unfinished business, the Committee proceeded to New Business.

Meeting Calendar. The calendar for 2016-17 Committee meetings that was approved by the committee on September 19, 2016, will be added to the Committee website on October 4, 2016.

Evaluation Tool. McMenamain reminded the committee about the Evaluation Tool for Committees/Subcommittees and that members' attendance at meetings will be recorded, and at the end of the year we'll go through our goals for this year. Murphy volunteered to help Katinea Todd prepare the committee Evaluation Tool for Committees/Subcommittees for the 2015-16 Academic Year.

SLO/Program Review Update.

- Disaggregation. Murphy reminded the committee that the ACCJC requires us to disaggregate, but doesn't define how it should be done. We already disaggregate in several ways: by course, by program, by service area; however, ACCJC wants us to do more and identify subpopulations of students that are not doing well on their SLOs, then figure out how to fix that. She suggested that this committee develop and recommend a plan for ways to investigate disaggregation to determine whether it's feasible or beneficial, possibly by conducting some sort of study or pilot without committing the college as a whole to disaggregating student-by-student.

She suggested some viable options: one is to recommend a study or pilot disaggregating course SLOs by online versus face-to-face and obtain data in that fashion, and the other option is to pilot the Aqua Software Platform as stated in the Student Equity Plan. This would be done in conjunction with the work being done in SEP for disproportionately-impacted populations, and would involve coordination with those who are doing those studies for SEP. The Aqua Software Platform option would also involve purchase of the software, funding for someone to train on it, and inputting information from students. The easiest option would be to do an online versus face-to-face disaggregation. The other option would require funding for the Aqua software, and the coordination and implementation of it, and would be a lot more involved.

She requested other ideas and emphasized that we need to move on this topic. There was discussion about whether online versus face-to-face would be sufficient and whether disaggregating student-by-student would provide information that's useful or any more valuable than just disaggregating achievement data by subpopulations, which we already do. We need to determine whether disaggregation will be beneficial, or we don't want to do it.

Murphy also raised the issue of student rights. The instructor would have to provide the results student-by-student which would have to be done with their grades, and if

we do Aqua the information would have to be put directly into there. Aqua would be a district commitment and we should coordinate that with the other colleges, although the other colleges are at different levels of acceptance and development of SLOs than we are.

Her suggestion would be to come up with an easier plan for doing a pilot or investigation of online versus face-to-face and then, in parallel, pursue trying out Aqua to see whether we can get any other information, and do a comparison between achievement data disaggregated and SLO data disaggregated. In the studies she's seen so far they're pretty well matched, and we should consider whether to pursue something that doesn't give us any more information. She said she has addressed this topic at the Academic Affairs Committee and the Academic Senate, and would be willing to update Academic Affairs if requested.

The committee suggested and discussed various possibilities for disaggregation, some of which were:

- The ability which the new ISLO survey provides to disaggregate by educational objective and part-time/full-time student status.
- Student learning and service unit outcome assessment. We already do this and we can show what we've done so far and where the holes are.
- Disaggregate by student achievement data (grades) or course retention, then we move into SLOs which are done for courses on a cyclical basis.
- Pilot SLOs identified by educational objective then give SLO, take sampling of courses, look at educational objective in a program or sample programs from each school, disaggregate by educational objective without committing to anything else.
- Do basic skills comparison of how basic skills student SLOs data match achievement data in the same course.

- To start, just do a comparison of achievement data to course SLOs. We have those; they will not be disaggregated, but would be interesting to see if they align, and for future work.
- Recommend SLOs and educational plan, instructor would grade/record SLOs and grade achievement, then Research can determine the rate of correlation and whether SLO data is better based on educational goal. This could provide targets for counseling and for incoming students to prepare them for First Year Experience, to identify those who do not have an ed plan or educational goal, and to try to get that subgroup extra help.

Murphy summarized an overview of what is being proposed: establish a more robust review, feedback, and support system for faculty in developing and assessing their SLOs; increase professional development, and investigate potential uses and benefits of SLO disaggregation by additional student subpopulations.

There was discussion about the student subpopulations contained in the SEP and how we could use the individual information to match the demographics to the SLO data and then disaggregate, but the committee preferred not to use protected categories for this purpose.

Murphy stated that she attended the State Academic Senate Accreditation Institute Meeting and saw a study of achievement data disaggregated and SLO data disaggregated, mapped them, and there was no significant difference. She said that if there's no potential use or benefit we're not going to commit to doing it, and that's why we want to investigate it. She thinks it would be more valuable to disaggregate online versus face-to-face because we know there's a difference and probably more meaningful than some other levels of disaggregation. Hopkins stressed that we have to keep the campus aware of this topic.

Murphy presented and discussed the draft Quality Focus Essay which will be considered at the College Executive Committee on October 4th, and requested input from this committee.

It was moved by Murphy, seconded by Sanchez, and carried to recommend to Academic Affairs to support the investigation of potential strategies for additional levels of SLO disaggregation to identify subgroups in need of improvement.

- New SLO Website. Murphy displayed and discussed the SLO website and the changes that she has been working on, including links to provide easy access to program and course SLOs, the catalog, TaskStream, etc.
- BRDS Form. The BRDS Committee has decided to continue using its process in parallel with using the new spreadsheet created by Murphy.
- SLO Academic Senate Statement. Murphy said that most colleges have a position or statement regarding what faculty see as the value of SLOs and the commitment to doing them. We do not, and this is currently on the Senate agenda. Mesa College and City College have such statements, and we should have aligned outcomes. If the Senate drafts a statement, it will come to this committee.

ISLO Survey Update. The committee discussed when and how to implement the updated survey. It was moved by Sanchez, seconded by Murphy, and carried unanimously to move it to Academic Affairs for implementation in Spring 2017. Murphy will present to it AA.

Agenda Items for Next Meeting. Continue review of the new SLO website; more discussion on disaggregation; Program Review deadlines.

Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Katinea A. Todd