I. Call to Order

II. Order of the Agenda
   Motion: To approve the order of the agenda. Motion not recorded

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes
   Approved the minutes from Sept. 29. First: McGinley Second: Mathieson

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.
• Kea and Gutierrez expressed concern that there are still programs that have not completed SLOs or Program Reviews (PR). The concerns are that these programs are conveying the message to other programs that they do not need to complete their SLOs or PR and the college runs the risk of having missing or incomplete program’s SLOs or PR.
• Thus, this needs to be discussed between SLAPEC and Academic Senate to determine how programs will be held accountable for incomplete assessments and the roles of SLAPEC and Academic Senate in regards to the SLOs and PR. (Chair)
• The SLAPEC is looking to the Senate for any recommendations. (Chair)
• It was remind by VPI that the ACCJC will look for the data or discussions and will deduct points for any incomplete assessments. (Hay)

V. Information and Announcements

A. Calendar

• PR theme report will need to be done
• Oct. 23 – draft of PR questions
• Early Nov. – Depts. will start PR
• Feb. 15 – Budget competition
• Mar. 18 – Completed PR and self-study
• Apr. 15 – BRAC makes decisions for dept. budgets (Chair)

B. Reports

1. SLO Assessments
   • Reps need to update the master list for any changes to SLO assessments.

2. Program Review
   • All assessed 14-15 PR should be sent to the Chair to update the master list. The Chair will send all SLAPEC members an updated list.
   • There will be an upcoming PR theme analysis and report which will be forwarded to the college committee.

3. Integrated Planning Committee
   • The Integrated Planning committee met and discussed the data that would be needed for departments to answer institutional benchmarking and student equity questions that will appear in program review for 2015-2016.
The Integrated Planning committee needs to reflect on the old data and future changes that will require SLAPEC’s involvement. (Chair)
  o SLAPEC needs to develop questions to address student equity and institutional benchmarking.

4. BRAC
- The SLAPEC chair is able to sit in the BRAC meetings, can report to SLAPEC, and will be a rep on the BRAC committee.
- All depts. need to be reminded that failure to complete PR could impact the departments’ annual goals and budget. (Kashima)

5. Discovery Call for a Program Review and SLO/A reporting tool.
- SLAPEC and the Integrated Planning Committee have recommended that there is a more integrated and streamlined process for departments to submit, record, and report on their SLO Assessments and Program Reviews instead of using SLOSubmit through e-mail and Angel. Ron Smith of IS has recommended that we look into TrackDat and eLumen as possible solutions. (Chair, Kashima)

C. Anything else?
None

VI. Unfinished Business
None

VII. New Business
A. Tasks for this year
- SLAPEC will need to be involved in the following:
  o Create Flex day activities
  o Create and update SLAPEC handbook and video instructions
  o Create, modify, and review SLO and PR questions

B. Roles within the committee
- The discussion was placed on the agenda for the next meeting.
C. **Enhancing the Learning Conversation**: Adopting the new form to replace the old form.

- New form was provided to all SLAPEC members for review and for discussions at future meetings.
- Dept. SLOs
  - It was asked if the SLOs are going to be used to evaluate the dept. or if it will have any impact on the dept. and what is going to happen to the data. (Louderback)
  - It was assured that SLOs will not be held against the dept. (Hay, Kashima)
  - The administration is only looking for meaningful reflections of SLOs and reaffirms that the raw data and content will not be analyzed. (Kashima)
  - The departments cannot be told how to construct their SLO data or questions and how to analyze it. (Chair)
  - It was suggested the SLOs reflections/dialogue that is done by the dept. should be sent to SLO submit.
  - However, it was recommended that each department should have the ability to keep their SLO data and reflections within house and allow the dept. to show their designated rep or possibly other reps, with the dept. chair’s approval. (Ho)

D. **2014 – 2015 Program Review**

1. Theme report
   - SLAPEC will be conducting a theme report within the next couple of weeks.

2. Student Equity Report
   - There was a lot of confusion on the student equity data. Thus, SLAPEC recommended that there needs to be a revision on the questions.
   - SLAPEC also recommends teaching programs how to analyze the research data.

3. Follow-up
   - All assessed 14-15 PR dates should be sent to the Chair to update the master list.

4. Exporting from ANGEL to Word
   - Not discussed.
E. 2015-2016 Program Review:

1. **Institutional Benchmarking**: Vice President of Instruction Kuni Hay will address the committee on instituting Institutional Benchmarking Questions.
   - On behalf of ACCJC, WV needed to create a benchmarking process.
   - At the last ACCJC visit, WV provided a summary of year 2 in the benchmarking process.
   - Colleges are held accountable for demonstrating student success and institutional effectiveness.
   - Both the ACCJC and State Chancellor’s office requires the College to submit benchmarking results in reports to receive grants. (Hay)

2. Full/Update schedule
   - WV needs to set standards for all programs to report to ACCJC.
   - SLAPEC needs to educate programs so that new questions will be incorporated into the PR. These questions will help construct annual reports go to ACCJC and State Chancellor’s Office. (Johnson)
   - Each dept. will need to answer new reflection questions on the PR. (Hay)

3. Questions
   - For example, one of the 18 IEPI (The Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative) data points for institutional benchmarking is the overall completion rate for a College. For example, if a program has had a completion rate of 72% and the College’s trend line for completion rate shows a projected increase 1% increase for the next year, the department will be asked to increase their student completion rate by 1% to 73% by the next year. In this example, the 1% increase may result in the dept. needing 3 or more students for each class in all sections offered. The amount of students will vary based on dept. student enrollment and sections offered.
   - Concerns the committee had (Chair, McGinley, Mathieson, Ho, and Sandford):
     - If the student population is lower than the projected benchmark, then the dept. will be able to meet well over the projected benchmark. How is this going to be fair between various depts., especially for larger depts.?
     - Faculty may state, “How can one increase the student population? As an instructor, I have no control of the attendance or student population.”
     - I know how to teach, why should I change my teaching methods?
     - How is a dept. going to accurately capture the data?
• It was reinforced by the Dean and VPI that what it being searched is dialogue within the department of how they are going to improve and increase student success. Examples of the dialogue may consists of implementing more stories that can relate to the diverse student population. Thus, the college overall will be able to utilize these stories in explaining the institutional effectiveness. (Kashima, Hay)

4. Data needs
• How are we going to capture the goals, research, and data? (Sandford)
• This will require SLAPEC to work with the Student Success committee.
• When the dept. looks at the data, then the dept. can provide recommendations to the college. (Chair)

5. Handbook
• Some SLAPEC committee members feel that faculty may not have a clear understanding about the PR questions. Thus, it was recommended that there should be an updated handbook that appeals to multiple modes of learning styles. (Johnson, McGinley, Sandford, Mathieson)

• It was recommended that there should be Flex Day events to help work with instructors about the new changes for the PR and SLO assessments.
• Needs to reach out to Michelle Francis, Flex Day committee chair.

VIII. Future Agenda Items
A. SLO Submission Process (Placeholder document)
B. Integrating Program Review and SLO Assessments
C. SLAPEC Ambassadorship

IX. Next Meeting
Tuesday, October 6, 2015 from 2:30 PM – 4:00 PM

X. Adjournment