

APPROVED

San Diego Miramar College
Instructional Program Review and SLOAC Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes
Monday, December 3, 2012, 3:00-4:30
L-108

Present: L. Ascione, J. Buckley, D. Figueroa, L. Hahn, M. Hertica, P. Hopkins, L. Murphy, J. Salinsky, S. Schwarz, D. Short, N. Sinkaset, B. Stephens

- 1) Call to order – 3:08pm
- 2) Approval of agenda – approved by consensus.
- 3) Approval of minutes from last meeting – approved by consensus
N. Sinkaset requested to be added to the DL for committee members.
- 4) New Business - none
- 5) Old Business

a) Program review cycle timing

The committee continued the discussion from last meeting about switching the program review process to a three-year cycle with one-year updates. D. Short presented a proposed three-year cycle with each program assigned one of three different designated years to complete the full program review. After discussion, all committee members preferred instead to have one year when every program would conduct a full program review and an annual update for all programs in the two intervening years. Committee members expressed a preference for the annual update to be as brief as possible. The committee voted to recommend this three-year cycle to the Academic Affairs committee. D.Short agreed to prepare a written recommendation that all programs be on the same three-year cycle; annual updates be conducted over the next two years; time be devoted during Convocation each year for faculty to work on SLOs and program review; and a full program review for all programs be conducted in 2015-16. This year was selected because it is immediately before the next accreditation visit and would allow two years of planning time for the next full program review cycle (including preparation of TaskStream if purchased by the college). D. Short agreed to bring the written recommendation to the next committee meeting for approval. The committee also agreed to recommend October 1 as a due date for the annual updates provided time was allocated during Convocation for work on this.

b) PR/SLOAC process management software

L. Murphy described progress since the last PR/SLOAC meeting on the college reviewing TaskStream for possible purchase. Several presentations have been held; the next is scheduled for the Academic Senate meeting tomorrow. L. Murphy presented a handout summarizing the advantages and potential uses of TaskStream at the college.

APPROVED

The main advantages are: enhanced SLO functionality; curriculum mapping capability; program review reporting capability; collection of data for accreditation reporting; committee management functionality; multi-tiered access; and a repository of historical college documents and other materials. She also noted that TaskStream may provide a venue for more adjunct faculty participation and has other capabilities such as a survey tool (some capabilities are only available an additional price). L. Murphy answered questions about TaskStream and reported that a “sandbox” version is being set up for the college to experiment with.

c) 2013-14 program review report form

D. Short reported that he had incorporated the committee’s recommendations from the last meeting. He also reviewed the entire report form and suggested that the “Actions” section be adopted as the single annual update section. After review and discussion the committee agreed with this suggestion. Several committee members recommended changes to the “Actions” section, including the addition of a “status” column to the reporting table and the addition of a section to justify modifications to the goals and objectives based on changes to the program. D. Short agreed to modify the form and bring it to the next committee meeting.

6) Information Items - none

7) Roundtable / Announcements

a) Next meeting Monday, December 3, 3:00-4:30

b) The committee briefly discussed how to better include instructional support services such as the LRC or PLACe in the program review process as well as the possible expansion of the definition of “instructional program” to include instructional areas without an approved certificate of achievement or associate degree. D. Short shared a number of possible criteria for defining instructional support services programs and asked committee members to forward any other ideas for criteria to him. He also agreed to add this topic to the next committee meeting agenda.

8) Adjournment – 4:21pm.