CASL/Program Review Committee Minutes
October 11th 2017
BONH 330 1:00-3:30

Faculty Attendees (Voting members)	Cindy Stevens, Anne Marenco. Dilek Sanver-Wang, Debbie Klein, Rebecca Eikey, Jason Burgdorfer, Howard Fisher; Justin Lundin
Other Attendees	Barry Gribbons; Andy Gribbons; Jesus Gonzales; Omar Torres

Topic	Discussion/Conclusion	Recommendations/Actions/ Follow-up	Status
1. **CASL/PR** Approval of minutes from 9.13.17 and 9.27.17		For 9.13.17 minutes: Kelly Burke motioned Jason Burgdorfer seconded, Justin Lundin, Dilek Sanver-Wang, and Rebecca Eikey abstained.	9.13.17 minutes were approved
		For 9.27.17 minutes Kelly Burke motioned, Cindy Stephens seconded, Dilek Sanver-Wang, Justin Lundin abstained.	9.27.17 minutes were approved

2. **PR** update	PR Committee Chair Jason Burgdorfer provided a summary of the committee's work and discussion in the last meeting.		
3. **CASL** update on eLumen training	SLO Coordinators provided details on the work done regarding the upcoming eLumen training which included - Meetings with Melissa Kibrick regarding the training; - Scheduling Hasley Hall Room 206; from 10 AM to 12 noon - A Training guide prepared by Melissa with eLumen will be made available to faculty who RSVP for the training - Clarification was offered regarding the term "activity" as used in the context of SLO assessments.		
4.**CASL** Discussion of CETL Assessment Strategy Workshop	SLO Coordinator Cindy Stephens invited discussion on the value and details of the process of creating the CETL Assessment Strategy Workshop by listing a few points which included: - it would be offered as a one unit workshop. -a team of faculty with appropriate funding would start developing the course next fall at the earliest. - efforts have already been made toward building a team, and gathering assessment		

	information from faculty who are knowledgeable on assessment. Cindy invited former SLO Coordinator Kelly Burke to share her work and ideas on the CETL Assessment course. A discussion on the value of CETL, and what would make the course successful followed. Main points included: - Include Sciences Faculty for their perspective - Have the Course address building rubrics and mapping - Research assessment courses from other colleges that have this outline to address the assessment. - Approach it with the understanding that we have to go slow in order to go fast. - Build this CETL course as a Basic Course - Addressing summative, formative assessment, as well as outcomes and objectives basics through the course - Consider how many modules would there be in the course as well as course hours - Consider the course format: Online/vs in person in order to increase enrollment of faculty especially part time faculty. - Have the course Capture best practices of assignments	Kelly Burke will be the go to person for resources.	

	- Aligning what one wants to measure to the assessment; - Identifying ways of looking at liability, authenticity; pre/post assessment; - Collect information from faculty through a needs assessment survey for faculty - The course would address Course level SLOs; Here the committee discussed the meaningful use of data; how using resources such as data coaches can help faculty to gain a better understanding in the use of quantitate data and qualitative data in assessment, on how to use assessment data to improve student learning. The committee members made points regarding - the importance of inclusion of all departments' faculty in reviewing assessment results. - changing the way of assessment to include student feedback might entail pedagogical shift, curricular shift, in our practice. - creating a survey to find out what students learn in the course. Anne Marenco with the Sociology Department brought up her Online Education Initiative (OEI) Course Exchange experience. Committee members mentioned that the OEI model of connecting single course assignments to the course objectives, course SLOs, ISLOs, as a		

	way of showing the students what they got out of the assignment and where they got that information, might be useful to use in the FiG assessment. After introducing themselves and their roles on campus, the committee members sought feedback from the ASG representative present, regarding assessments, assignments and student perception of their usefulness.		
5. **CASL** Revisions to SLO Assessment Phase 2 Form	SLO Coordinator Erin Delaney invited the committee members to provide their additions and/or revisions to the SLO Assessment Phase 2 Form and to the accompanying questions designed to focus a portion of the form to getting student feedback on assessment. Various points were offered and feedback was provided, which included: - Include student feedback on assessments, would bring changes for the departments and their way of doing assessments - Formative assessing is not done for lecture SLOs; and so if all along you provide feedback it might lead to the final assessment. - Area of analysis on the form needs to be expanded to invite involvement and also capture discussion, to answer questions such as what surprised you in the SLO involvement; - Area 6 might be a place to record our relationship with the data;		

	how we are thoughtful about how we analyze data. - Include reflection on what surprised the faculty about the SLOs assessment data - Summarize the student feedback findings - Examples of different ways of gaining understanding of the meaning behind student feedback such as through student focus groups. - Having the form questions be not only about who was involved; what is happening in the conversations, what the faculty did discern but also see how SLOs have changed overtime; - Are we still going to keep the action plan? - Should we keep checking boxes; There was discussion on how the list of questions was used in the past to generate ideas regarding the assessments' analysis. Discussion following the Action Plan- items included input as follows: - What if the outcome of assessment is 100% how do we capture the improvement in relationship with what has changed; - It is fair to say that no changes in some cases; - How do we avoid teaching to the assessment?		

	- Looking at the number of assessments and how that might help to look at classes more holistically; Try to relate to larger assessment practices; Here the committee members discussed practices of assessment of SLOs across campus, and provided input, to questions such as: Are all SLOs addressed at one time? If the department has two SLOs how do the assessments fit in with all the classes. Further, input was provided for question number 6: - Involvement of the faculty members; Incorporating that in the discussion for each SLOs; - Systemic place to consider how a course should prepare the students for the next courses. - Supporting students as they move up the pathways. - Maybe a separate question can be added on how does this fit with other SLOS; It was suggested that modifying a prompt in PR to encourage this discussion would be helpful. - Guided pathways could help the students as they intersect to reach that place where we are helping them to build knowledge;		

	- How do we encourage them to build that awareness, perception about what they need to learn. - Valuing building knowledge and recognizing the importance in the lower level courses Examples from the Nursing department were brought to show that a cohort model, helps assess the students' skills progressively through the semesters. There was discussion on challenges that might interfere with such progression in the non-cohort courses, such as personalization availability of courses, differences between disciplines, carrying what you learned to the next level courses. Committee members mentioned that course content in general does overlap. They also mentioned the importance of opportunities for broader discussion on the types of ways to help build knowledge and awareness of that for the students in the classroom.		