

CASL-PR Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: November 19, 2025 -Time: 3:00P.M. – 4:00P.M. -Location: CASL-PR Zoom

Voting Participants: Rana Akiel, Alexa Dimakos, Urvashi Juneja, Mary Powell

Other Participants: Diane Avery, Jennifer Brezina, Lisa Hooper, Daylene Meuschke, Evis Wilson

1.Consent Item: Approval of Minutes – This Item was tabled

2. PR Item: Program Review Committee Update

Daylene Meuschke reported that the October 24 faculty program review training had low attendance. The training recording was distributed and posted on the program review website so faculty can access the material as needed. The committee also noted that the second-year program review process requires less work than the first year, which may explain the reduced attendance at training sessions. An administrative program review training is scheduled for Friday from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. The session will address program review requirements for administrative and support areas, including the library, counseling, business services, grants, development, and facilities. The budget component of the training applies broadly and will be open to anyone interested in attending. Level 1 Program Review submissions deadline is December 12 and the final open lab for the current term is scheduled for December 3.

Erika Torgeson will be stepping away from some of her PR Committee Chair role as she takes on an Interim Administrator position. She contacted department chairs to identify someone who could temporarily serve as a voting member for program viability and participate in the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Project Advancement Team. Kelly Cude volunteered to assume these responsibilities. Erika and Kelly plan to meet to confirm the transition, review expectations and meeting schedules, and address any questions before formally adding her to committee communications and meetings. Kelly will serve for the remainder of the current term, with the committee reassessing the arrangement for spring once more information becomes available. The committee expressed appreciation for Torgeson's significant contributions to program review and welcomed Kelly's participation.

3. CASL Item: Changes to By-Laws/Membership: New School Realignment

Academic Senate President Lisa Hooper joined the meeting to discuss the committee's potential role within the college's revised governance structure. Hooper proposed that

CASL PR consider taking on a recurring, comprehensive review of academic programs that would complement existing program review, curriculum, and program viability processes. She explained that the current program viability process focuses heavily on new program development and provides limited mechanisms for prompting program revitalization, substantial modification, or discontinuance after a program has been established. She proposed a structured presentation process in which academic disciplines would periodically review their programs using data on enrollment trends, student success and retention, persistence, program completion, changes in student pathways, and other indicators of program effectiveness.

The proposed process would provide an opportunity for disciplines to reflect on their programs from a broader, student-centered perspective and receive feedback from faculty peers. Lisa Hooper suggested that presentations could also encourage departments to examine comparable programs at other institutions, consider changes in student needs, and identify opportunities to modernize or improve their programs. The process could incorporate program-level student learning outcome assessment and strengthen connections among curriculum, program review, program viability, institutional outcomes, and other planning processes.

Committee members connected the concept to previous discussions about peer review and data coaching. Daylene Meuschke noted that a peer-based process could make program review more integrated and less intimidating while providing faculty with additional support for interpreting program data. Jennifer Brezina similarly observed that a committee-based peer review process could give departments meaningful feedback and help demonstrate that the work invested in program review has a purpose beyond resource requests.

The group discussed how often programs should participate in the proposed review. Lisa Hooper initially envisioned a five-year cycle, aligned conceptually with curriculum review, but emphasized that programs would need to be distributed across different years rather than reviewed simultaneously. Jennifer Brezina proposed a six-year structure that could coordinate with existing three-year program review cycles while distributing presentations across the academic calendar. The group discussed dividing programs into cohorts so that only a manageable number of disciplines would present during each meeting. Lisa Hooper indicated that she envisioned approximately two or three disciplines presenting during a meeting, with presentations limited in length and guided by standardized prompts.

The committee also discussed the potential workload associated with aligning course revisions and program presentations. Departments with large numbers of courses already experience substantial workloads when curriculum revisions occur simultaneously. The

program presentation process might ultimately need to operate independently of course revision schedules. The committee agreed that additional discussion with department chairs and examination of practices at other colleges would help determine an appropriate structure. Members noted that similar processes exist at other institutions, including Fresno City College, and could provide useful models.

The proposed review process could also strengthen the connection between course-level and program-level outcomes. Mary Powell explained that the college has established a process for mapping new courses to institutional learning outcomes but still has gaps in historical mapping and noncredit course mapping. She suggested that a periodic program review presentation could provide a natural opportunity for departments to revisit program SLO mapping, account for course revisions, and ensure that curriculum continues to align with program and institutional outcomes. Lisa Hooper agreed that the process could provide a mechanism for closing the loop on work completed during curriculum and program viability processes.

The discussion also addressed CASL PR's committee composition. Lisa Hooper recommended that the committee maintain representation from each school and division so that peer feedback reflects the broader academic community. She also connected the proposed role to faculty leadership development, noting that committee participation can provide opportunities for faculty to develop governance and leadership skills. She expressed interest in strengthening the connection between CASL-PR, Curriculum, institutional planning, and student outcomes while also creating opportunities for faculty to examine longer-term program effectiveness, including graduate outcomes and transfer success.

Lisa Hooper emphasized that the proposed expansion is exploratory and does not require immediate action. She indicated that the concept would not be appropriate for spring implementation but could potentially be presented to the Academic Senate in spring for further discussion, with gradual implementation beginning in the 2026–27 academic year if the Senate supports the concept. Any expanded responsibilities would also require consideration of additional reassigned time for committee leadership. Hooper offered to assist Mary Powell with reviewing the committee's composition and ensuring that the college website accurately reflects the committee's structure.

4. CASL Item: Draft of Rubric Language for eLumen Insights

The committee then reviewed the eLumen Insights pilot. Mary Powell reported that the previous training session had limited attendance and that another training session was scheduled for Friday. The pilot team identified discrepancies in the SLO information

associated with some courses, including issues discovered during preparations for assessment in the paralegal program. Mary Powell and Evis Wilson plan to review the SLOs associated with all pilot courses before faculty complete their end-of-semester assessments so that potential problems can be identified and corrected in advance.

The pilot has produced some positive results. Powell reported that assessment data from a short-term paralegal course successfully integrated into eLumen Insights. However, technical and structural issues remain, including problems associated with how outcomes, course objectives, and rating scales transferred into the new system. The existing Canvas outcomes and rating scales can create confusion when they are transferred into Insights, particularly when outdated or unrelated rating scales become available for selection. The team is also continuing to examine how assessment information appears in dashboards and how consistently faculty have configured their Canvas outcomes. Additional work remains on the system's ability to display disaggregated data, which the committee considers an important feature of assessment reporting.

The committee also discussed the transition away from eLumen and the importance of communicating that the existing system will no longer receive meaningful development or support. Faculty who currently use eLumen will need to become familiar with the new assessment environment. The pilot team will continue troubleshooting the technical issues and documenting the changes needed to make Insights function effectively. The contract for extending the pilot remains pending, and Jennifer Brezina reported that she had followed up with the vendor and would review the vendor's latest response.

Mary Powell noted that the committee's leadership group will address several technical questions about Insights before bringing them to the full committee. These questions include whether faculty should have permission to edit or delete rating scales and how faculty should manage outdated outcomes that are automatically populated from Canvas. Because changing these permissions could affect the integrity of assessment data, the leadership group will first clarify the implications before seeking broader committee input in the spring.

5. CASL Item: eLumen Insights Training/Pilot Update

Finally, Mary Powell provided an update on the SLO assessment rubric. The current rubric uses three categories: meets, does not meet, and not assessed. Based on feedback from the committee and the divisions, Powell proposed revising the language for the "meets" category to make it shorter, clearer, and more adaptable to different departmental contexts. The proposed revision would also reduce the amount of text displayed on the grading screen. Powell planned to distribute the revised language by email for committee

feedback rather than use meeting time to review it in detail. The existing language for “does not meet” and “not assessed” would remain unchanged unless further feedback indicated a need for revision.

The meeting concluded with reminders about the upcoming program review deadlines, Friday’s eLumen Insights training, and the forthcoming email regarding the SLO assessment rubric. Committee members were encouraged to continue supporting colleagues involved in program review, assessment, and the Insights pilot during the final weeks of the semester.