

CASL/Program Review Committee Minutes

April 26, 2017

BONH 330 1:30-3:00

Faculty Attendees (Voting members) Nicole Faudree; Erin Delaney; Simon Ker, George Lee White, Cindy Stephens, Kelly Burke, Dilek Sanver-Wang

Other Attendees (Non voting members): Audrey Green, Daylene Meuschke, Barry Gibbons

Topic

1. Approval of CASL/PR Minutes from March 22 and April 12, 2017 SLO Coordinator Cindy Stephens informed the committee that Mr. Gary Quire, Adjunct Faculty from the school of business is now a member of the CASL-PR.

For the March 22nd Minutes George (Lee) White motioned to approve the minutes, Erin Delaney seconded the motion, Nicole Faudree abstained.

For the April 12th minutes Nicole Faudree motioned to approve the minutes Dilek Sanver-Wang seconded the motion, Erin Delaney abstained.

Both motions carried.

2. Quick CASL updates:

- Natasha Jankowski meeting and event
- eLumen
- Future meetings
 - 5/10-eLumen 5/24-Goal setting for Fall and celebration
 - The meeting and event with presenter Natasha Jankowski are now confirmed and that they will be included in Fall PD Week.
- Audrey Green listed a few eLumen implementation items for committee members' consideration. The Committee must make a few decisions in order for eLumen implementation to go further. Some of the listed items for committee's approval were
 - SLO name naming conventions
 - Type of assessment needed
 - Ways of training for use the data – Here the committee members briefly discussed the value of data disaggregation, as well as the need to be mindful based on the data available from college forms such as application etc.

SLO Coordinators will meet with Audrey Green to plan on details for the event's budget.

5/10 would be a 2 hour session/training with Melissa from eLumen.

The committee asked the SLO Tech Evis Wilson to provide a list of items for Committee's considerations with eLumen screenshots as well as links to show implementation examples from other colleges.

In addition, they recommended a desktop equipped room for the eLumen decision-making, training session.

The training will be on 5/10 from 1pm to 3pm, 30 minutes earlier than the normal meeting time.

3. CASL: ISLO Rubrics review and discussion SLO Coordinator Kelly Burke reported that input and comments on the ISLOs have been compiled.

The committee members had a discussion on whether or not the critical thinking rubric fits across assignments and whether or not the rubric serves across disciplines. It was mentioned that while any-course would involve critical thinking, it would have to be something measurable. Here the committee discussed the importance of norming across disciplines, and that the rubric might not be useful in every situation where critical thinking occurs.

The committee discussed the importance of keeping two separate ISLOs for effective communications; it was argued that they measure different things depending on the courses faculty could be applying one or the other.

A review of the rubric using objects from a variety of disciplines should be done, then within a discipline norming can occur with specific assignments.

Collect the assignments and have a repository. Possibly delay norming, have review sessions first with a variety of assignments from diverse disciplines.

4. PR: Documents for the peer review process Jason Burgdorfer opened the PR session.

The PR checklist was developed in Committee last year.

The committee was asked whether or not to keep the document as a Self-Assessment List.

The draft of the summary document was distributed to CASL members and discussed. It was decided that the language should be positive, affirming.

Some committee members offered suggestions as follows:

- The questions "What did you really like about..." should read Program Review vs. the Program.
- It should list Strength and Weaknesses
- Question 3 should be split in 2A. and 2B.

Initial discussion focused on whether the summary document should be used by reviewer.

The Committee discussed aspects of training the reviewer and designing a summary document to aid in providing quality, timely feedback.

Experiences from the Early Childhood Education rating skills for the teaching environments were brought by Cindy Stephens.

The committee decided to create two documents for the review process based on the checklist document. The first list will be a self-review checklist and the second document to be used by the peer reviewer will be essentially the same but with two questions added at the end of the document. What were the strength of the program review? What about the program review could be improved? There was discussion on whether Yes, No, and comments columns on the checklist would be sufficient. There was consensus amongst the group on this. The revised checklists will be voted on at one of the remaining meetings this spring semester. Action: Vote on the peer review checklists at a May meeting.

5. PR: Discuss the implementation of the peer review process

The committee discussed regarding the possibility of piloting peer review implementation in the fall if a corresponding pilot Year One PR is identified. The goal would be to find out what do we need to include in the training for peer review process.

6. Update: PR planning group

eLumen has no structure for budget integration to PR. Also, the pool of schools using eLumen for PR is small. While there will be one system for curriculum and SLOs; on the Program Review there is some struggle with the idea on whether or not we should make upgrades to the old system or keep exploring eLumen because it is a shared solution. The planning group has had a good amount of dialog on strengths and challenges.

The group's last originally scheduled meeting would be on April 29th 2017. Additional workgroup meetings are scheduled for May.

The agenda for the workgroup's next meeting will be on committee recommendations and then a vote on what path to take and vote on modifications to the Program Review (modifications to our in-house system.)