

CASL/Program Review Committee
September 27, 2017 Meeting Minutes
 BONH 330 1:00-3:30

Faculty Attendees (Voting members)	Erin Delaney; Diane Solomon, Jason Burgdorfer, Cindy Stephens, Anne Marenco, Kelly Burke, Necia Gelker
Other Attendees	Andy McCutcheon; Daylene Meuschke; Barry Gribbons

Topic	Discussion/Conclusion	Recommendations/Actions/ Follow-up	Status
1. CASL/PR 9.13.17 Minutes	Voting on the minutes of 9.13.17 is postponed since only a few voting members were present for the first part of the meeting;	Approval of minutes is postponed until quorum is reached.	
2. CASL/PR Updates:	<p>SLO Coordinator Erin Delaney shared a brief summary of the SLOs event on September 22nd, 2017. She mentioned that Dr. Natasha Jankowski’s presentations had reached the following groups: Instructional Advisory Council, (IAC) meeting attendees; Student Services Representatives, Department Chairs, Faculty, Instructional Deans. SLO Coordinators Erin Delaney and Cindy Stephens shared presentations’ take-a-ways, which included: being mindful of student learning, providing assessment early so that the SLOs are explained and revisited throughout the semester; the students are able to learn from the experience before completing course/program through feedback based on their assessment.</p> <p>SLO Coordinator Cindy Stephens shared on items that are the currently the focus of the SLO faculty leadership including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • getting ready for eLumen implementation; • Faculty-needs survey results; • contacting Melissa Kibrick regarding the training needs; • eLumen training materials from other colleges • aligning internal assessment terminology with eLumen terms <p>In response to questions regarding participation in the October 20th eLumen training and future eLumen training possibilities, SLO Coordinator Cindy Stephens mentioned</p>		

	<p>that that the department chairs/curriculum coordinators, some faculty would participate in that meeting, and that after that the eLumen training would be ongoing; She added that the faculty members and department chairs or coordinators would bring the rubrics that they are currently using; and that the location and access to computers and related details will be forthcoming pending coordination with Academic Affairs.</p>	<p>Details on the room and equipment for eLumen training will be discussed at CASL- SLO Faculty Leadership meetings prior to the training session.</p>	
<p>3. PR Peer Review Training: Practice run through of a peer review using ECE Year 1 Program Review</p>	<p>PR Committee Chair, Jason Burgdorfer, opened the meeting by inviting the committee members to view the peer review practice run as an exercise to help establish common standards about the PR checklists, and also to see if the document is sufficient.</p> <p>The committee members decided to consider each item on the list one at a time and then come back for a discussion.</p> <p>The following items in the peer review list generated discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer review role in the evaluation on mission statement: checking for accuracy or whether the mission statement is descriptive. There was discussion on whether the peer reviewer would evaluate the mission statement in light of its support of learning or instead check for alignment with the college mission statement. <p>Here clarification was sought regarding peer reviewer assignment. It was mentioned that work across departments on campus would help toward removal of silo-ization and foster inclusion. It was also mentioned that assigning CTE faculty peer reviewers to CTE Program Reviews would be important for the terminology and making connections and finding common standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further discussion centered on Program Goals, and terminology on how to relate to the goals. Emphasis was given to ensuring that the new subtitles match one to one to the rubric goals so that they match up across the different the databases and entry interfaces. There was discussion regarding terms used in program goals and objectives, that would help peer-reviewers evaluate whether or not the program's goals were measurable. It was agreed that connecting goals to SLOs and program objectives would be useful. 	<p>Agenda items 3 and 4 were considered simultaneously.</p> <p>The committee members agreed that the peer reviewer would check the program's mission statement for alignment with the college's mission statement</p> <p>The committee decided that assignment of faculty peer reviewers to programs would be at random, with the exception of CTE programs which were to receive peer - faculty from CTE departments.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition, program descriptors and SLO description language was discussed, as was the use of terms such as “outcomes and descriptors data”. There were suggestions for changes to the rubrics to avoid duplication. <p>Also, the committee members stressed the importance of the need for peer reviewers to keenly look at the program review and identify areas where data would have been missed because it may have been entered in an order other than the one required by prompts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was discussion following on what section 6, articulates in relationship to the connection between the SLOs and program goals. The discussion section 7: internal factors, focused on whether this prompt could be relevant to the evaluators; There was agreement on deleting it from the peer review rubric/checklist The committee members considered the data trends section and the role of the peer reviewer in relation to the data trends table. Some committee members suggested that the reviewer might need to compare instead of evaluate the data table and the description of trends. It was suggested that prompts of checkboxes on data pieces might be of help to peer reviewers when considering the enrollment management analysis part of the PR. Examples of the data prompts/checkboxes were offered as: day offering efficiency; enrollment patterns, that would allow the peer reviewer to say the program review discussed these data. <p>There was discussion regarding how the trend data might or might not affect program budgeting augmentations. The committee members concluded the meeting with a brief discussion on what to call the faculty volunteers for Program Review.</p>	<p>It was decided that the use of data: section may stay as is and that the examples prompt will be merged with the use of data section</p> <p>It was agreed that peer or peer reviewer may be a better term than peer evaluator or peer validator.</p>	
<p>4. PR Discussion: Establishing standards for peer review and adjusting rubric/checklist based on practice run</p>		<p>Agenda items 3 and 4 were considered simultaneously.</p>	

<p>5. PR (If Time) Open discussion - How do departments do their program review when they are various programs within a department.</p>	<p>Another meeting is needed to discuss the items left on the checklist.</p>		
--	--	--	--