

San Diego Miramar College

Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee

Meeting Date and Time: Monday, December 7, 2015 from 3:00 PM to 4:30 PM

Location: L-108

Voting Members: Paulette Hopkins (co-chair, instructional admin); Namphol Sinkaset (co-chair, faculty, MBEPS); John Salinsky (faculty, PS); **vacant** (faculty, LA); Alex Sanchez (faculty at-large, MBEPS); **vacant** (faculty at-large)

Voting Members Absent: Fred Garces (instructional admin); Dan Willkie (faculty, BTCWI)

Nonvoting/Resource: Xi Zhang (Research and Planning Analyst); Laura Murphy (College-wide Outcomes and Assessment Facilitator); Julia Gordon (faculty, MBEPS); Margarita Sánchez (Staff, Instruction)

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m.

1. Standing Items

1.1. Adoption of Agenda

Motion to adopt agenda for December 7th 2015 carried.

Motion made by A. Sanchez and seconded by P. Hopkins.

2. Unfinished Business –None.

3. Information Items

3.1. Status of 2 Recommendations Sent to Academic Affairs

P. Hopkins reported that Academic Affairs passed the subcommittee's two recommendations. One recommendation put forth by the IPR/SLOAC subcommittee was that the Instructional Division be able to modify the Program Review Cycle due date to April to allow the division more time to work and to produce a higher quality Program Review. This recommendation must still be taken to the Academic Senate for approval.

The second recommendation was regarding faculty incentives for completing Student Learning Outcomes; Academic Affairs did not have a lot to say on the topic. The IPR/SLOAC subcommittee remarked the needs for a campus-wide cultural change regarding SLOs. P. Hopkins stated that Instructional deans have been instructed to switch their Program Reviews into 'public' mode; this directive is a start to changing the culture on the campus and promotes accountability and quality control within the Program Review process.

4. Discussion Items

4.1. Program Review Template Modification

The committee discussed the new timeline for program review since Academic Affairs approved an earlier due date for Instructional Program Review completion. The modification to the program review timeline will still need to go through Academic

Senate for approval. It will also depend on whether the College Executive Committee determines if Instructional, Administrative, and Student Services all need to be on the same timeline for program review. The Modification to the Program Review Template needs to be forwarded to CEC as soon as possible for immediate voting so that the modification can be implemented in the Spring 2016 semester.

4.2. Restructuring of College Governance

The IPR/SLOAC subcommittee noted that no formal change in the college governance structure has taken place yet. The PIE committee is currently discussing the idea of restructuring and will make any recommendations to the College Governance Committee.

4.3. Program Review FLEX Session

The IPR/SLOAC subcommittee shared that the college does not plan to hold spring convocation this year, instead there will be a FLEX week with 40+ sessions and presentations designed to aid all faculty. Subcommittee member L. Murphy will also be holding several 'open-lab' workshops discussing Taskstream and program Review, as well as Student Learning Outcomes presentations during FLEX week. IPR/SLOAC subcommittee co-chair Namphol Sinkaset will hold a session to address quality control in Program Review, more specifically how to look at data and how to use data. The subcommittee discussed the idea of creating a website with sample program reviews that may be used in the FLEX session and will help facilitate a discussion regarding the value of Program Review. The sub-committee stressed the importance of presenting a workshop that helps faculty to understand why the college faculty goes through the program review process to analyze their programs both internally and to share the information with the public and other interested groups. Sub-committee member N. Sinkaset shared that in his program review, faculty set goals for the chemistry program. Weaknesses and strengths in the chemistry program are measured against those goals. The sub-committee noted that it would be a meaningful experience if different programs shared why and/or how they use program review in their individual programs. This sharing of ideas between programs could also help facilitate a change in the campus culture regarding program review.

4.4. ISLO Assessment, Survey, and other Ideas –Tabled.

L. Murphy shared that a proposal for Taskstream Aqua funding has been submitted to SEP. This would allow for a disaggregated collection of data on outcomes in areas of disproportionate impact.

5. Action Items –None.

6. Adjourn

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