

CASL/Program Review Committee Agenda

April 12, 2017

BONH 330 1:30-3:00

Faculty Attendees (Voting members): Debbie Klein, Kelly Burke, Dilek Sanger-Wang, Lee (George) White, Cindy Stephens, Erin Delaney, Howard Fisher, Jason Burgdorfer

Other Attendees (Non-voting members): Barry Gribbons, Daylene Meuschke

Topic

1. Approval of CASL/PR Minutes from March 22, 2017 SLO Coordinator Kelly Burke and SLO Coordinator Cindy Stephens opened the meeting with the comment that there might not be enough voting members to reach quorum for minute's approval.

Erin Delaney suggested that we use a landscape format for the minutes aiming at reducing the number of pages.

3 voting members were present No quorum.

Landscape format for the minutes. Tabled approval for next meeting

2. Quick CASL updates:

- ISLO Rubrics Cindy-SLO/Curriculum SLO Coordinator Kelly Burke reported that most ISLO Rubrics have been submitted with feedback. She mentioned that questions will be addressed as a group next time.
- Website work: SLO Coordinator Kelly Burke reported that she has a list of items needed for the website and ideas for the look from COC Counseling and TLC website. She reported that she plans to provide that information and direction to SLO Tech Evis Wilson who will be implementing the changes to the website.
- Natasha Jankowski meeting and event: SLO Coordinators Kelly Burke and Cindy Stephens reported that they had a phone conversation with Natasha Jankowski and confirmed plans for Natasha's presentation on Thursday August 17th on Convocation day. The presentation will focus on moving from compliance to engagement. The SLO Coordinators reported that they plan to set up time for her to meet with Student Services Departments so that she has an opportunity to share her knowledge broadly.

The SLO Coordinators reported that attending the presentation and event, will not be mandatory. Dr. Jankowski is an excellent speaker with expertise and an engaging style. She might be able to help reduce the reticence towards assessment and SLOs and increase faculty engagement. Attendees will enjoy her presentation regardless.

The SLO Coordinators reported that the event might be broken into the sessions for faculty to participate for as long as they need to participate. Funding needs for lunch, etc., are being addressed.

Reminders will be sent out about the presenter and event.

The Committee discussed the potential for changes in ISLO assessment based on the requirements (or lack of) in this year's annual ACCJC reporting requirements.

The Committee members focused their SLOs discussion on the culture of inquiry, changing the practice, making it easy to assess as well as providing the faculty with autonomy in creation and selection of SLOs. There was discussion on what happens when one creates SLOs, inherits them, and valuing SLOs.

There was consensus among committee members that the assessment data should be useful and measurable.

Questions were brought up regarding how assessment measurability related to pathways for transfer and how that could be worked in the SLOs. The Committee identified the need to provide more clarity to faculty regarding SLOs vs. course objectives and how to relate that information to measurability.

The SLO Coordinators provided clarification regarding upcoming work with ISLOs. Faculty are needed to participate and submit their work toward norming the rubrics.

Faculty without assignments can still participate. The SLO Coordinators encouraged committee members to talk the presentation and presenter up, emphasizing that it will be an interactive engaging experience.

The Committee recommends that Curriculum informs faculty of any changes or new requirements for the Course Outline of Record as soon as these are made, and at the start of each semester.

Clarification regarding who may participate will be sent out to Faculty.

3. CASL: What to tackle next in a working meeting? ISLOS and eLumen-It was recommended that CASL Co-Chairs meet with course coordinators and chairs (in the absence of course coordinators) regarding assessment cycles, status of assessment and what type of assistance might be needed.

Co-Chairs will request the new Coordinator list from Audrey and reach out to them this spring in prep for Fall.

4. PR: eLumen workgroup update Jason Burgdorfer opened the PR discussion with a report on the video conference with Modesto College and the information they had provided in piloting their PR in eLumen. Modesto representatives had reported that eLumen is working on updates to the budget module and they are continuing to use it.

In contrast, at Southwestern College, of the 10 departments piloting the program, three departments completed their PR in eLumen, however seven dept. had abandoned it. Southwestern departments who

abandoned the program reported that the program was not intuitive, that eLumen customer service is reachable, but when tutorials were updated the changes were not constructive.

Some context was provided regarding the need for integrative planning that might drive the efforts at colleges mentioned and that eLumen might represent a limited but available tool to show effort in meeting the integrative planning between the different modules (budget request and objectives) in Program Review.

Here the committee focused discussion on how the information gathered from other colleges, discoveries on functions (or lack of) of eLumen budget planning module and work on PR, has been shaping the committee's vision in how to revise the Program Review Module at College of the Canyons.

It was reported that the PR Committee's resolve is to finish what it has started in the analysis and identification of changes that would be needed.

Taking a look at the structure so that it serves function was deemed an important step.

A Community of Practice might be needed to look at the connective pieces between PR and Budgeting. It was reported that there are a few colleges that would join such community.

Here the Committee discussed possible options, and their benefits and drawbacks in achieving integrative planning.

5. PR: Discuss/edit the rubric for the peer review process Jason Burgdorfer reported that the PR Committee developed the form/rubric in the Fall 2015 and asked Committee members to consider whether or not and how to incorporate this into the new or revised program review.

Committee members discussed embedding options. Others thought that keeping the form separate would be easier as it relates to revision and changes that might be needed.

There were comments regarding changing subjective terms to words that provide better understanding through inquiry and clarity.

The committee discussed the summary report page and who might find it useful.

Committee members offered different opinions but decided that the checklist would be used as a self-assessment rubric.

Erin Delaney will review and provide recommendation toward improving the language of the rubric.

6. PR: Discuss the implementation of the peer review process *This item was tabled*