San Diego Miramar College

Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee

Minutes

Meeting Date and Time: Monday, March 2, 2015 from 3:02 PM to 4:33 PM

Location: L-108

Voting Members Present: Roanna Bennie (co-chair, instructional admin); Namphol Sinkaset (co-chair, faculty, MBEPS); Paulette Hopkins (instructional admin, MBEPS); Dan Willkie (faculty, BTCWI); John Salinsky (faculty, PS); Pablo Martin (faculty, LA); Julia Gordon (faculty-at-large, MBEPS)

Voting Members Absent: None

Nonvoting/Resource Members Present: Xi Zhang (Research and Planning Analyst); Laura Murphy (College-wide Outcomes and Assessment Facilitator); Alex Sanchez (faculty, MBEPS, nonappointed)

Nonvoting/Resource Members Absent: None

Guest: Margarita Sanchez (Administrative Assistant, Office of Instruction)

Meeting Called to Order at 3:02 PM

R. Bennie introduced Margarita Sanchez as a guest. She recently joined the staff in the Office of Instruction and will help input data into Taskstream, assisting programs as needed.

1. Standing Items
    1.1. Adoption of Agenda
        Motion to adopt the agenda was made by R. Bennie and seconded by J. Salinsky.
        Hearing no objections, the agenda was adopted.

    1.2. Adoption of Minutes from Meeting of February 2, 2015
        Motion to adopt the minutes was made by P. Martin and seconded by R. Bennie.
        Hearing no objections, the minutes were adopted.

2. Unfinished Business

3. Information Items
    3.1. Update on Subcommittee Membership
        N. Sinkaset reported that the Academic Senate President had been contacted via e-mail about the vacant at-large position that has remained unfilled for the past year and a half, but no reply had been received. The subcommittee may consider recommending to the College Governance Committee that the position be removed.

San Diego Miramar College 2013-2019 Strategic Goals
1. Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.
2. Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.
3. Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.
4. Develop, strengthen and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.

4. Discussion Items
   4.1. Status of Previous Recommendations (Strategic Goal #1)
   > N. Sinkaset reported that the program list and the program review template were at Senate and were on the agenda for its next meeting. With regards to the program list, it was noted that Physical Sciences wanted to be consolidated into 1 program and Tutoring, Library Science, Personal Growth, etc. would be eliminated as programs. R. Bennie relayed that removal of these was fine, as it was premature to identify them as programs at this point. Although Physical Sciences can be considered as one program for program review, they still need to assess their two different degrees.

   4.2. Benchmarking Programs in Program Review (Strategic Goal #1)
   > L. Murphy initiated discussion by pointing out that a benchmarking portion is part of the program review template and Academic Senate may have questions about it. Benchmarking was initially placed on the template because it was thought that all programs would be required to do some sort of benchmarking, but different opinions indicate otherwise.
   >
   > R. Bennie stated that ACCJC does not use the term "benchmarking" specifically in any of their documents pertaining to accreditation. A handout of a checklist was distributed, and it was pointed out that the closest phrasing to benchmarking was "expected measures of performance." Thus, there was a question as to whether true benchmarking needs to be done at the department level as opposed to performance indicators.
   >
   > Benchmarking in and of itself would not be difficult for programs if they used a 5-year average plus or minus one standard deviation in any area, and it may be good to get programs exposed to benchmarking and thinking about their programs in this manner. However, it was brought up that some programs may just establish meaningless benchmarks that would be easily achieved.
   >
   > It was suggested that since institutional-level benchmarking is already in place, perhaps these benchmarks could be used for guided discussion in the program review. That is, programs would compare their performance in several areas to institutional-wide set benchmarks. Programs could then see where they are in relation to the college's benchmarks. By consensus, it was agreed that this approach was feasible, and it would be presented to Academic Senate at its next meeting.

   4.3. Program Review Timeline (Strategic Goal #1)
   > N. Sinkaset began discussion be presenting a proposed draft timeline for the 2018-2021 program review cycle. The group worked on changes dynamically, discussing items such as availability dates of the program review template and program scan data. The major issue surrounded the start and end dates of the program scan data. In the end, a timeline that began with the program review template becoming available in January 2018, program scan data for the last 5 available years (Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 would

San Diego Miramar College 2013-2019 Strategic Goals
1. Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.
2. Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.
3. Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.
4. Develop, strengthen and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.

be the most recent data) becoming available in January 2018, followed by the usual due data of October 2018 was generally agreed upon. This proposed timeline would allow programs to begin work anytime during the spring semester.

4.4. Course and Program SLO Cycle Activity (Strategic Goal #1)

L. Murphy began the discussion by reporting that 70% of the necessary outcomes and assessment plans had been entered into Taskstream although the college was supposed to be at 100% by the end of Fall 2014. Findings, Action Plan, and Status Reports are due at the end of Spring 2015.

In mid-March, an annual report is due to ACCJC. The report will indicate the number of active courses and how many of those active courses are undergoing assessment. To answer this, courses with Assessment Plans entered into Taskstream will be counted. However, in the next report, courses with Status Reports entered into Taskstream will be counted. Additionally, the number of program outcomes that have been mapped to ISLOs will be reported.

A check-list will be e-mailed to department chairs and school deans so that they know what they need to do for this report. The Office of Instruction will be available to go into Taskstream and help programs enter some things that are coming directly from SLOJet.

Another concern was raised that GE outcomes are not being addressed. GE courses are supposed to be under the purview of the Academic Standards Committee, so communication with them must take place to check the status of GE courses.

5. Action Items

6. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 PM.

San Diego Miramar College 2013-2019 Strategic Goals
1. Provide educational programs and services that are responsive to change and support student learning and success.
2. Deliver educational programs and services in formats and at locations that meet student needs.
3. Enhance the college experience for students and the community by providing student-centered programs, services and activities that celebrate diversity and sustainable practices.
4. Develop, strengthen and sustain beneficial partnerships with educational institutions, business and industry, and our community.