I. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order at 2:30 pm.

II. Order of the Agenda

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes
No minutes were presented for approval.

IV. Oral Communication from the Public (3 Minutes/Person)
Note: This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Senate on any matter not on the agenda. No action will be taken.

There were no members of the public in attendance.

V. Information and Announcements
A. Calendar – See New Business Item A.
B. SLO Assessments Report – See New Business Item A.
C. Program Review report – See New Business Item A
D. Integrated Planning Committee Report

The IPC’s first meeting will be at the end of September. The Chair will report back to the committee after their first meeting.
VI. Unfinished Business –
No specific items were discussed. See items in section VI below.

VII. New Business
A. Review of Last Year:
   1. SLO Submissions – What can we do better?

Stephanie Kashima reported the following:

- A list of Spring 2015 courses still needing assessment was sent to the Division Chairs.
- Ideas for improving submission rate coming from the Office of Instruction, Division Chairs, and this committee include:
  - Changing the submission deadline to the following semester to allow more time for faculty/departments to reflect on and discuss the outcomes. Also, faculty are already occupied at the end of the semester with finals and computing semester grades. The challenge with this is handling assessments from part-time faculty who are not teaching during the next semester.
  - Improving the reporting system by automating it and moving away from the email system.
  - A staff person in Office of Instruction will be identified to handle submission tracking.
  - Friendly reminders of SLO reporting and deadlines should be made.
  - More professional development training should be provided for doing assessments for both service programs and academic programs.
  - Committee members could be charged with reviewing SLO’s and giving program owners feedback towards creating more reflective SLO’s.
  - It was noted that the only punitive measures for those who do not do SLO assessments is contained in rather vague language in the faculty evaluation form.
  - On the issue of institutional benchmarking when compiling SLO data, LeAnn pointed out that it is difficult to impossible to disaggregate data such as ethnicity in the SLO assessment process.

   2. Program Review – What can we do better?

Changes to Submission Calendar
Making changes to the calendar for submission of Program Review and SLO Assessments was discussed. During the last academic year, submission of the budget portion of PR was in
February while everything else was submitted in April. The budget portion needs to be submitted when BRAC needs to review them. The entire PR should be submitted early enough to give the Committee more time to review and communicate back to the submitters. The possibility of beginning the process in October was discussed but no decisions were made. The committee will continue to address this issue in future meetings.

Process for Submitting, Review, and Maintenance of Program Reviews

- The use of the cloud-based Drop Box has caused a problem – all items posted were accidentally deleted sometime at the end of spring or during the summer. The Chair had a back-up of the materials on his computer but needs an accounting from all committee members as to what they reviewed and when. All members should confirm with the Chair whose PRs they read and the status of the PR (whether it was satisfactory or not).
- Angel will now be used for uploading of submissions of PRs by program owners and PR reviews by Committee members.
- Using another method to collect and review PRs was discussed. Alternatives included Curricunet, Angel and its future replacement, OrgSync, or another software vendor. Jennifer Ho discussed the problems had by Mission when they attempted to use Curricunet for PR. She stated that between the two systems under consideration by the College, Canvas was must better designed than Blackboard for handling PR submissions.

Institutional Benchmarking

- Stephanie Kashima informed the committee of the increasing importance of providing information regarding institutional benchmarking in reports which must be made by the College to the accrediting body and the State Chancellor’s Office. Examples include what standards the College has set for student success and completion rates, especially with reference to ethnic groups. The College may set its own benchmarks but they must be reasonable and the College must act to assure that progress is being made to attain them.
- She suggested that Program Review needs to be revamped to cover benchmarking expressly.
- It was pointed out that many PR owners will need more guidance in analyzing statistical data relating to reporting benchmark information.
- Stephanie stated that Kuni Hay, VP of Instruction, wants to meet with the committee to discuss the institutional benchmarking requirements. The discussion with Kuni will be agendize for a future meeting.
B. **Tasks for this year** – no separate discussion was had under this item. Please refer to the other items above.

C. **Roles within the committee** – no separate discussion was had under this item. Please refer to the other items above.

**VIII. Future Agenda Items**

A. Enhancing the Learning Conversation Adoption  
B. SLO Submission Process (Placeholder document)  
C. Integrating Program Review and SLO Assessments  
D. SLAPEC Ambassadorship

**IX. Next Meeting**

Tuesday, September 29, 2015 from 2:30 PM – 4:00 PM

**X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm.