



**MINUTES
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE**

DATE: March 25, 2015

TIME: 3:00-4:30 pm

PLACE: Room 507

PRESENT: Nadiyah Taylor, Catherine Suarez, Robin Roy, Christina Lee, Michelle Zapata, Karin Spirn

1. Approve minutes

2. Next year's Program Review Update form

- Changes made, Tina helped with SLO portion
- Questions from "Part One" have not changed
- Three sections in form
- Instruction Section:
 - SLO/SAO Point-Person (SAO added)
- Part One
 - No changes needed
- Part Two: SLO/SAO Assessment Review (SAO added to title)
 - Does Question A need to be an SAO question?
 - Question A edits: "Discuss how assessment results in at least one course in the program indicate success in student learning. (OR) Discuss how assessment results of at least one SAO in the program indicate success in student service." Ask Tina.
 - Questions C and D catered to Instructional and Non-Instructional Programs in this section
- Part Three:
 - SAO information needs to be reflected in section, Karin will talk to Tina about updates/SAO add-ins
 - Change Part Three title: Part Three: SLO/SAO Planning (can we change to "continuous improvements process")?"
 - Question One changed to address SAO
 - Added to Question One, "Examples might include": change service hours, change modes of service delivery
 - Edits in section (changes highlighted)

- “As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program’s plans starting now and continuing through the academic year 2016-17. Focus on how planning (can we change to, “the program’s SLO process”) will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.”
- SLO assessments. How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvements of SLOs? *NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. Each program must assess at least 25% of its courses every semester.* (question added, sentence changed to italics)
- Questions B
 - In order to budget to pay part-time faculty to work on SLOs during the academic year 2015-16, estimate the number of part-time faculty in your program who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

3. Accreditation Report

- Notes to bring to Common Ground Meeting on 3/27
 - History of Program Review issues with data collection of SLOs (faculty complete SLOs but cannot make sense of data; thus, no improvements made)
 - There is documentation of the problems. Problems should be addressed to see what things can be changed in the future?
 - Catherine suggestion: Have a uniform SLO section. Have a survey following SLO completion?
 - Karin: SLOs require data. “Proficiency” standard not reliable data because it varies by academic area/discipline. Standardization is problematic. There needs to be a better way to measure student outcomes.
 - Nadiyah: Everyone completing SLOs could choose from one of the core competencies and see in what area they should focus their SLO approach
 - Karin: Objective disciplines (i.e. biology) are much easier to collect data for in current SLO assessment model. Subjective disciplines (i.e. writing) are harder to evaluate student outcomes for current SLO assessment because students writing styles vary.
 - Small department data is reliable. Large department data is not valid because there is no norm.
 - Feedback: Successes and frustrations with Program Review:
 - Lack of part-time faculty involvement
 - SLO data evaluated within departments/disciplines yet, SLO sections wildly different, data not reliable. How do departments make SLO meaningful?
 - Lack of consistent leadership, shortage of administrators; departments/disciplines trying to make SLOs meaningful but institutionally there is a lack of support for departments/disciplines
 - Such a large administrator turnover = lack of check and balance. Faculty evaluate their own SLO data but there is a need for administration (i.e. Dean) evaluation/feedback.

- Problems have not been dealt with. There needs to be improvements for SLOs to better strategize moving forward
- There should not be any consultants 1) they just show up without faculty approval (college does not ask faculty if a consultant should be hired), 2) consultants are not part of school culture. Karin's point: Not many people have a lot of background with accreditation procedures on campus so consultants helps campus with that.
- There are a lot of people who have been struggling and trying to use SLO data
- Need more constructive meetings about SLO assessment
- Lack of leadership at last week's Combined Division meeting. President, VP Student Services, Dean of Student Services not present. Attendance at meetings of top administrators is important for modeling and facilitating
- Comments of Wiki/feedback: Address administrator turnover
- Staff and faculty cannot evaluate top administrators (i.e. President, Deans)
 - The feedback from evaluating administrators by faculty would be useful in giving information about how administrators need to approach certain things to be more productive. We do not have an assessment tool.

4. New Dean's Summary form

- Accomplishments should be documented in Dean's Summary
- Integrated Planning Committee was pleased about current Dean's Summary form
- English and Math have done a lot of innovations to help students get through basic sequence
- Recommendations section is very helpful. Get Program Review Committee feedback about adding recommendation section
- Chart of "Category and Themes, Accomplishments, Challenges" sums up important key areas of need
- Use this form in structuring Program Review Update

Spring 2014 PR Committee Meetings (2nd and 4th Wednesdays, 3-4:30, Room 507)

April 8

April 22

May 6

May 20