

CASL/Program Review Committee Minutes

November 14, 2018

BONH 330 1:30-3:00

Faculty Attendees (Voting members)	Jason Burgdorfer (PR chair), Nicole Faudree (CASL co-chair), Sab Matsumoto (CASL co-chair) Alexa Dimakos (ePortfolio-Faculty Coordinator, Humanities) Brittany Applen (ePortfolio-Faculty Coordinator, Humanities), Erin Delaney-(Humanities), Christine Iskander (Humanities), Anne Marengo (SBS), Gary Quire (SB), Erika Torgeson-(Counseling), Tara Williams (MSHP); Guido Santi
Other Attendees	Omar Torres (Associate Interim VP, Academic Affairs)

Topic	Discussion/Conclusion	Recommendations/Actions/ Follow-up	Status
1. CASL/PR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Consent Item:</u> Minutes for 10.24.18 Meeting 	Feedback on the minutes was provided by Nicole Faudree, Saburo Matsumoto, Jason Burgdorfer, Erin Delaney		Approved
2. CASL: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Discussion:</u> English 103 report out of loop closing of assessment from spring 2018 	Erin Delaney and Alexa Dimakos reported on the process, results, and take-aways for their English 103-Reading Assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of two SLOs (the reading SLO) was assessed separately in Spring 2018 They had informed the faculty of the plans for assessment, and of the new system and process for inputting assessment scores in eLumen, during the English Department faculty orientation session during Flex Week. The faculty received flex credit for attending the orientation. Through numerous emails and discussions, they sought out faculty involvement in creating the assessment. The faculty were able to pick type of evidence that suited their own course when assessing the reading SLO. They had suggested the faculty give value to the assessment by assigning points for its completion, and recommended that the faculty leave space in the syllabus for the assessment as to give students the time to demonstrate their learning. They had developed a scoring guide with eLumen screenshots and they had distributed the guide to all the faculty. 39 out of the 40 sections had reported the results. They had anticipated and addressed the faculty eLumen training and data load issues on an as-needed basis. 		

	<p>Omar Torres confirmed that the Academic Affairs worked to resolve database issues by meeting with the MIS Department to identify issues and concerns, and by provide information and guidance regarding the timing and accuracy of the data-load.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English 103 faculty had reported that scoring the assessment in eLumen was easy. • Involvement of the Curriculum Coordinators with the CASL committee, and prior eLumen training, had been helpful. • Once they had entered the assessment scores, the faculty were asked to answer the default template reflection questions which were created last term by the SLO Coordinators and CASL committee. <p>What happens to the assessment information for students who assess but drop the course before the next data-load? Currently assessments are course at ending, so in reality this might not be an issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Fall 2018, the English 103 assessment reports were reported out. They found that including a vocabulary, and rewording the part of the question, might work better for the students. • The English Department Assessment subcommittee had heard the coordinators' input on the department's 4 assessment related questions. • The loop-closing was done at a subsequent orientation, where everyone, including adjuncts was invited. • A follow up email was sent to the faculty who could not attend. <p>Here, a definition for loop closing was offered: Loop closing means: the last stage of the assessment. Also, it means that after they have the results, they debrief and recap and identify action items for improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication with faculty was constant, changed according to the stages of the assessment and it was well-received. • They have developed a template for the assessment process communication. 	<p>Evis Wilson will follow up with a question to Melissa regarding the assessment data for students who drop the course after they assess.</p>	
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The English 103 orientation was 1 hour and 30 minutes, separate from the department’s retreat during flex week and did not compete with other courses’ orientations. Half of the faculty in attendance was adjunct faculty. • Reminders were not pushed through eLumen, they came through the coordinators with instructions on what to do in every stage of the assessment. This way the instructors had the option to reply immediately to a person they knew. <p>Having a document that summaries the English 103 assessment process could be useful.</p> <p>The Chemistry department had done a flex training for their adjunct faculty and found, as English 103 Coordinators had reported, that piggy backing on department retreat was successful.</p> <p>In departments such as the Sciences, as they are moving away from the test-type assessments, rubrics and best practices information of assessments such as the one to be shared by the English 103 coordinators are useful to the process of implementing changes.</p>	<p>The English 103 Curriculum Coordinators were asked to compile an assessments’ best practices process sheet.</p> <p>The sheet would be made available to other curriculum coordinators to gather their feedback on the assessment process</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>3. CASL: <u>Discussion and action item:</u> Reflection questions for Action Plan. Where do faculty reflection and action items re disaggregation live?</p>	<p>Clarification was provided regarding the questions submitted by one of the English Department Assessment Subcommittee members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The eLumen faculty evaluator reflection prompts can be customized for each department and are accessible to all who plan on adding the Evaluator Reflection prompts to their assessment. The wording to question two could change to include the feedback given to students throughout the semester instead of at the time of assessment. The order of the questions could be changed. <p>The wording at the top of the default reflection template may be changed for clarity as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Plans could be customized as well. This has not been done before, so they would need to sample some departments' Action Plans to see what it looks like. They may work with the English Department curriculum coordinators for the next planned assessment. Courses that are one section and one instructor might make a good sample to test the customized macro loop closing prompts. <p>Course Coordinators may need to be reminded of the resources available for assessment at least once a year.</p> <p>The coordinators cannot go to input the assessment data in eLumen. The faculty need to do it themselves, for issues of confidentiality.</p> <p>In the next meeting Sab will report on the changes to the reflection templates and the committee will try to answer the question: who will push the assessment Action Plans?</p>	<p>Saburo Matsumoto will work on changes to faculty reflection prompt 2 and the reflection template wording at the top of the prompts.</p>	
<p>4. PR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Discussion: Verify questions for chairs to provide feedback on PR.</u> What works well, what needs improvement (be specific); later, this question 	<p>The Budget is in place and all the sections in Program Review are accessible. A training issue has come up with the objectives being populated in the budget module.</p> <p>December 7th would be the deadline now that the system is available</p>		

<p>was modified to add “Consider addressing the following:”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are you doing with your data? • Did you find this process useful? • Do you see a connection between Program Review and Budget allocation, being aware of the different types of funding? • Has an augmentation ever been funded from the general fund? • Did the curriculum prompts on program improvement help in the Program Review? 	<p>Because the budget module and the whole thing became available right now, it may be too late for peer advisors’ activities. However, they could seek feedback through a survey monkey. They would send the survey out during finals week seeking feedback to improve the process. Reminders could be sent before the survey.</p> <p>The questions on the survey should be open ended, engaging and asking specifics toward gathering feedback on what works well and suggestions on improving the process and interface. IAC could be a good place to meet with chairs.</p> <p>Survey Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What did you like about this year’s modified program review? 2. What suggestions do you have to improve the program review process and its online interface for next year? 		
---	--	--	--