Faculty Attendees (Voting members):   Dilek Sanver-Wang, Kelly Burke, Lee (George) White, Simon Kern, Debbie Klein, Erin Delaney, Diane Solomon, Nicole Faudree

Other Attendees (Non-voting members): Audrey Green, Daylene Meuschke, Omar Torres

Topic

1. **Approval of CASL/PR Minutes** from March 8, 2017
   SLO Coordinator Kelly Burke started the meeting with the announcement that Miriam Golbert is stepping down from the CASL committee.
   Committee members acknowledged Miriam's contribution to the Committee.
   Committee members listed a few corrections to the 3.8.17 meeting.

   Nicole motioned to approve the minutes.

   Erin Delaney seconded the approval.

2. Quick CASL updates:

• **Bio meeting**

SLO Coordinator Kelly Burke and committee member Dilek Sanver- Wang reported on the Bio-Meeting. In summary:

-The meeting informed and discussed topics of SLOs, curriculum mapping, and authentic assessments.

Take aways:

- Discussion on how to improve Assignments, SLOs

- Discussion on outcomes was a good exercise for the department

-Dilek, Ricardo Rosales, and Kelly Burke now want to meet and discuss ways to mesh together concepts, assignments, and ways to reinforce topics that apply to their related classes.

-More collaboration had been requested regarding curriculum mapping, consideration of assessments, and signature assignments. Biology Department meeting was successful.

• **ISLO Rubrics**   were sent out to the group working on compiling changes for the Days of Assessment. Pending a final review, we will have an instrument that is consistent for everyone to use during future norming sessions. One of the challenges in reviewing has been that the names of the AACU titles of the rubrics are different than our ISLOs, for example, team work vs. collaboration.

- Nicole Faudree reported on the Paralegal dept. retreat.

She shared that at the retreat they had discussed program SLOs and instruments for assessments.

CASL SLO Coordinator Cindy Stephens had attended and offered her experience with Child-Development Department Program Review

- George (Lee) White shared that at Visual and Performing Arts School meeting he had explained and shared regarding securing involvement for the rubrics norming. He reported to have found some support including from the dean.

The committee members clarified that for the Critical Thinking norming session the faculty will be given assignments that students have completed at a variety of success levels and would use the rubric to score them.

SLO Coordinator Kelly Burke clarified that time period in which the work on the norming would take place: TWO days of norming

1) First day would include details on norming procedures

2) Second day would be designated to go over the work done previously.

The process will be organic, if there is a consensus that the rubric is acceptable. Cindy and Kelly will lead the norming session. Identifying people with experience in norming would benefit the process. Once identified, that person, or people, would meet to for a pre-norming training session.

The presenters have decided to facilitate more such discussions for more departments depending and adjusting to the needs of those departments.

3. CASL and PR: By-laws, final approval

The Committee clarified the wording for at large definition and number of adjunct faculty discussed previously. It was decided that : Two adjunct faculty would be part of CASL and PR

Minor corrections were made regarding format and style to both.

Nicole Faudree motioned to approve the CASL By-laws with the mentioned corrections.

Simon Kern seconded.

For PR by laws Nicole Faudree motioned to approve.

Lee(George) White seconded.

CASL By-Laws were approved for submission to Academic Senate

PR By-Laws were approved for submission to Academic Senate

4. Website work:

SLO Coordinator Kelly Burke provided a hand out with external website links which were previously emailed to the committee members.

Input was requested of the CASL members toward making a list for

Essential information need on the website.

Discussion focused on :

• How to organize resources

• updates to by-laws: linking to them or spelling out

• Background; Process;

• Archiving work What to keep

• Tab for assessment schedule

Using Paralegal Department as an example to include vertical links to increase search ability.

• Creating a guide in the new forms and rules.

• Results of institutional assessments

• Content for PR

• eLumen log in button.

Examples were brought from Long Beach City College Assessment website and others:

The Committee discussed on ways the site is currently utilized and making those more accessible.

• Including examples of excellence in assessment

• Redesigning the home page

• Separate tab for Assessment cycle and timeline and forms.

• Uniformity of fonts and colors.

There was further discussion on the website's audience as it relates to accreditation, and resources

There were suggestions in how to approach the website: Process of the idea and introduction

What does the committee do with them: Meeting and events

How to writing SLOs

How to Assess the SLOs

Archives would have to be included within pages and be user friendly.

Access to program reviews via intranet and whether or not that provided enough access or whether or not that should remain in the intranet. A list of headings and sections regarding the website design and content would be brought back to the Committee for discussion.

5. PR: Update from the new program review specifications planning workgroup. Committee members reported to being optimistic after the presentation in Modesto.

Still figuring out which direction to go.

There was a brief summary on budget component discussion recommended to the committee so far:

• Condensing ranking categories drawing from Modesto's implementation of that.

• ELumen budget part looked to be basic.

• Embedding options such as Tableau currently not available in Elumen. Finding out regarding possibilities of retaining, or adding that feature.

Some Committee members remarked that the Elumen Budget part functions are not defined. Others remarked at a simple version could work to our advantage as it could become a base from which to build. Others yet shared that the faculty perspective is having an instrument that functions the same would be helpful. Centralizing still has value. Fitting our process instead of reviewing our process.

Practices at the College of the Canyons were discussed and taking it across the board.

The committee decided to expand participation in the small group working on the PR and ELumen modules.

Next meeting is March 30th 1 to 5pm Join when you can. Check the room schedule.

More discussion centered on the Pros and Cons to basic vs. existing, more refined tools for PR/Budget. There were suggestions on being mindful of the manual work, functionality involved and the demand for staffing that would be placed on different affected offices, as staffing is required and functionality is not there.

Fuse existing PR best practices with eLumen. Planning integrating to budgets to objectives and to SLOs and codifying the different requests. The committee discussed integration as a goal and continuing to look at the list and how to fit those into eLumen. Thinking of ways to make the software work for us.

When considering the integration in the budget aspect of PR, the nature of such integration (artificial vs. organic) integration in connection of budget and goals should be accounted for as well.

6. PR: Finish addressing standing questions about the peer review process

Peer review questions from last year continued from last meeting:

• What is the role of peers in reviewing budget requests (to what format should the peers adhere? – Have you asked for all the things in the lists, training budgeting, creating labs for equipment, move something for the classrooms,

• What happens when you find something in the program review as a peer that doesn't add up:

- You review it and then you have conversation and I am not understanding how this relates to it.

- eLumen –Reviewer role to ask: Would you like to get your review with comments

- Who makes the final decision before forwarding- The Department Chair

- How is the peer assigned- Faculty members of the committee and one would have to be assigned to at least one program a year.

- When are the PRs posted for review; Last year is up on Spring 2017.

- Should the PR be available for cycle 1. ? - Once it is forwarded to the deans the deans may not make changes. Most of the times the approval review is not a planning issue but a budget issue. One drawback on budget augmentation request or forced cost request. Objectives have not been updated, or the wrong objective is posted. Here the Committee discussed the timeline for making the PR available once it is approved by the dean.

The planning has been an internal planning document PR. Website could be a place where the PR could be posted.

What is the PR taskforce?

That is the body that would lead the committee training process for program review. At Committee training and then committee members would then train others through flex workshops to include collegiality and effective feedback. Budget terminology etc.

7. PR: Discuss the peer review rubric/checklist. Committee chair Jason Burgdorfer asked committee members to bring feedback and what modifications are needed to the rubric distributed at the last meeting.

He mentioned that the rubric and checklist were modeled after the curriculum checklist.