

## INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW AND SLOAC SUBCOMMITTEE

Co-Chairs: Paulette Hopkins and Julia McMenamin

## APPROVED 11/07/16

## Minutes of October 17, 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 McMenamin (Co-Chair and Faculty-at-Large/MBEPS)

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

**<u>Present</u>**: Paulette Hopkins, Alex Sanchez, Julia McMenamin, John Salinsky), Xi Zhang, Laura Murphy, Katinea Todd

Absent: Fred Garces, Dan Willkie

\_\_\_\_\_

The regular bi-monthly meeting of the Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee was held on October 17, 2016. The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by Co-Chair Julia McMenamin, a quorum being present.

<u>Agenda/Minutes</u>. It was moved by Alex Sanchez, seconded by Julia McMenamin, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 3, and October 17, 2016, was postponed.

Deadlines for Program Review Cycle. October 1<sup>st</sup> is the college deadline for Program Review (PR); however, the Instructional Program Review was completed in Spring 2016 and will again be due in Spring 2017. This change to Spring was done to allow the instructional deans time to review the PRs over the summer and construct their individual school PRs. The committee discussed deadlines for 2017 and selected Monday, April 24, 2017, as the due date for faculty/chairs for entering Program Review in TaskStream; and Friday, September 15, 2017, as the recommended due date for Deans for School Program Review. <u>SLO Academic Senate statement</u>. Murphy advised that the Academic Senate has convened a task force to deal with any time-sensitive accreditation items that could benefit us for the upcoming accreditation visit. She felt that it could be beneficial for faculty to create a statement which identifies what the faculty sees as the benefits, as well as the limitations, of doing SLO work. The Senate task force met and created a draft statement for the Senate to review at its October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. Murphy shared the draft statement with this committee, and discussion of the pros and cons followed. It was moved by Murphy, seconded by Sanchez, and unanimously carried to support the concept of an academic statement on SLOs.

Internal Viewing of Program Reviews Update. Murphy demonstrated and discussed the new internal viewing of instructional program reviews on Taskstream. Instructional program review links are now available in the Training Area of Taskstream..

The links are live and will update automatically whenever new data or text is entered into a Taskstream Workspace.

<u>SLO Website Review</u>. McMenamin reminded the committee that it will be conducting program review workshops for the first 45 minutes of its meetings. She will email the chairs and deans that the IPRs are now available in the training area. Murphy presented and discussed the website and requested that the committee members individually review it and bring their observations to the next meeting to help with ongoing development. The committee will work with the website during the next meeting which will be in a computer room so everyone can access and view it appropriately.

<u>Quality Focus Essay/Self Evaluation Report</u>. Murphy asked the committee members to review the section on SLO assessment for discussion at the next meeting. This document is still in draft format and will be submitted to the ACCJC in January.

<u>Disaggregation Plan</u>. This is going to the Academic Senate on October 18<sup>th</sup> and to the Academic Affairs Committee for discussion on October 20th.

<u>Agenda Items for Next Meeting</u>. The committee will continue review of the new SLO website, and will continue discussion on disaggregation and the Program Review deadlines.

<u>Summary of Action Items.</u> We approved our agenda and approved our support for the Academic Senate statement.

<u>Suggested Items for Next Meeting</u>. Discussion on the Quality Focus essay and the website will continue. Murphy said that we're trying to develop a PR web page, and the PIE Committee would like to have a figure on it that demonstrates the PR process on campus. This committee requested that she create something for the committee to review and discuss at the next meeting on October 31<sup>st</sup>.

Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Katinea A. Todd