

**INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW AND SLOAC SUBCOMMITTEE**

Co-Chairs: Paulette Hopkins and Julia McMenamain

Voting Members: Paulette Hopkins (Co-Chair, Instructional Admin), Fred Garces (Instructional Admin), Dan Willkie (Faculty/BTCWI), Patricia Manley (Faculty/LA), 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), (Classified Staff, Instruction, Vacant)  
Staff/Resource: Xi Zhang (Research and Planning Analyst); Katinea Todd (Staff, Instruction)

**APPROVED 05/15/17**

**Minutes of May 1, 2017**

**Present:** Paulette Hopkins, Fred Garces, Julia McMenamain, Patricia Manley, Alex Sanchez, John Salinsky, Laura Murphy, Katinea Todd

**Guests:** Brett Bell, Wai-Ling Rubic, Cheryl Vallejo

**Absent:** Dan Willkie, Xi Zhang

---

The regular bi-monthly meeting of the Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee was held on May 1, 2017. The meeting was called to order at 3:01 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 meeting agenda. It was moved by Sanchez, seconded by Patricia Manley, and carried to approve the meeting minutes of April 17, 2017, with Murphy abstaining.

Integrating BRDS with TaskStream. Murphy reminded the subcommittee that it wants to move forward with the generation of spreadsheets that we provide to the Budget and Resource Development Subcommittee (BRDS). Our program review system contains the template that provides some of the fields necessary for BRDS to do the ranking and which was put into place last semester as a pilot. Brett Bell said that BRDS used that pilot and would like to adopt the MBEPS method which is extremely organized and probably the easiest one to follow. He demonstrated and discussed the drop-box folder on the website that collects annual

data, its contents, and the workbook format that BRDS would like to see used, including the MBEPS method, which he also demonstrated and explained. Murphy said this committee needs to generate the spreadsheet and can insert additional columns to make it more optimal for the BRDS committee. Bell added that the due date to BRDS will be either October 6<sup>th</sup> or October 9<sup>th</sup> and the calendar is making its way through the constituencies now. Murphy suggested that this committee generate a guidebook for program review which would house information.

Meeting Calendar for 2017-2018. McMenamin presented the meeting calendar for next year. It includes the regular meetings on the first and third Mondays of each month, and the committee added a few extra meetings because of the amount of work this committee must address. The revised calendar was approved by general consensus.

ACCJC Recommendations.

Recommendation #3.c: “Identify department priorities for types of research data to be included in full Program Review for the 2018-2021 Cycle.” Murphy said we need to customize the data reports from Research to have them be more meaningful, and she discussed perceived issues with those reports. The committee discussed possible alternatives to content and format and discussion will continue.

Recommendation #3.a: It was moved by Murphy, seconded by Manley, and unanimously approved to re-order the agenda to discuss ACCJC Recommendation 3.a: “Provide feedback to program reviews.”

Sanchez reported on his April 20<sup>th</sup> presentation of this subcommittee’s recommendation to the Academic Affairs Committee. He said that the Academic Affairs Committee revised the recommendation to make it optional and approved the revised recommendation. This subcommittee discussed whether the revised recommendation met the intent of this committee.

Murphy said that the only way to evaluate the program review process is to review the end product, which is program reviews, and to look at different areas to see if they’re working or need to be revised, such as cycle time and due dates. Questions to consider are: is it working? Are we giving enough support for instructors to have productive program reviews? Is

TaskStream working? Is the data correct or should it be tweaked in such a way to make it more useful? All of that is evaluation of the process, but if we never see the end results, it's moot.

Salinsky pointed out that the data is public information and anyone can look at it in TaskStream. This subcommittee can review information and make sure it's being done correctly and can look at program reviews to see where they are deficit. It can then report generally that certain areas need improvement and it can make school-wide general suggestions. It will also provide individual or program feedback to anyone who requests it.

Murphy added that this subcommittee is charged with looking at program reviews as part of its recommended task and will provide school-wide general recommendations, as well as individual feedback. It can provide that feedback specifically to a department to help improve the quality of its program review; otherwise, it will go into the general pot of recommendations that come from the subcommittee

Murphy and Cheryl Vallejo will discuss this topic at the May 2<sup>nd</sup> Academic Senate meeting and advise that this subcommittee is going to be looking at program reviews so the college can meet this accreditation standard, which it's required to do, but if anyone would like individual feedback, that is optional.

Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

*Katinea A. Todd*