

CASL/Program Review Committee Agenda
November 22nd, 2017
 BONH 330 1:30-3:00

Faculty Attendees (Voting members)	Erin Delaney, Cindy Stephens, Jason Burgdorfer, Jeff Baker,
Other Attendees	Daylene Meuschke, Barry Gribbons

Topic	Discussion/Conclusion	Recommendations/Actions/ Follow-up	Status
1. CASL/PR 11.08.17 Minutes		Tabled till next meeting	
2. CASL/PR Updates:	<p>The SLO Coordinators presented information and details on the various ways of mapping of CSLOs, PSLOs to ISLOs. They mentioned benefits of the different approaches to mapping, and the need for further consideration by CASL committee, in Spring 2018, were discussed. Previous work was referenced as well. It was mentioned that the framework with which to proceed would include prior reports language, Accreditation reports.</p> <p>The SLO Coordinators reported that Faculty SLO training will be available several Mondays and Wednesdays in Spring 2018, in both Valencia and Canyon Country campuses.</p> <p>The SLO Coordinators plan to meet with faculty in charge of the ePortfolios project (Brittany Applen, Alexa Dimakos) regarding eportfolios integration on Canvas and eLumen.</p> <p>It was mentioned that the Academic Affairs will communicate the deadline for ISLO mapping.</p> <p>It was announced that Cindy Stephen's tenure as SLO Coordinator would end in Fall 2018</p> <p>It was announced that the application period for a third SLO Coordinator position would close shortly.</p>	Daylene will provide relevant information to the history and previous work on ISLOs	

<p>3. PR Discussion and Action: Finalize and vote on peer review checklist document</p>	<p>Jason Burgdorfer provided a summary and preview of the PR review work on the budget request; updates to the user-interface and the upcoming deadline December 8th 2017.</p> <p>The discussion focused on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether or not to include additional details on the peer review documents when indicating “more work is needed” • Goals on turning the peer review form into a fillable form • Number of peer-reviewers to number of programs reviewed • Terminology choices, such as “Revisit elements” vs. “More work needed” ; “check box” • Formatting of the columns for better readability, spelling • Including historical reflection on comparing sections from year to year • Inclusion of prompts at the end of the document <p>There was discussion on full time and adjunct faculty participation in PR and listing and documenting the faculty’s work and contributions. There was additional discussion on the timing of uploading the peer-review document. Examples were provided to show that in practice no PR is uploaded until the cycle is complete. There was clarification provided on who in administration and at what level (two and three) would have access to the form.</p> <p>There were questions for item number 6th and as it relates to CTE programs and different grants or initiatives connected to CTE programs such as Perkins, Doing What Matters. It was mentioned that forms, such as Perkins forms, are supposed to be embedded.</p>	<p>There would be a follow up with Norris on the PR user interface</p> <p>With the changes suggested, the Committee decided to submit the Peer Review document to the Academic Senate</p>	
<p>4. PR Discussion: Policy for determining which programs do a program review and level one authorship rights</p>	<p>Jason Burgdorfer reported that currently there isn’t a specific policy to determine which programs have a program review; and how to assign, whom to assign. It was mentioned that historically, the mechanism for such assignments has been found in the COCFA contract where the defining factor has been compensation provided for departments. It was also mentioned that historically the PR has been completed by the department chair.</p>		
<p>5. PR Discussion: How do departments do their program review when they are various programs within a department?</p>	<p>The discussion was focused on two parts: Part one considered the variations of program review at College of the Canyons. They included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • select disciplines within programs, • department reviews or • all programs within program reviews. 		

	<p>Members provided examples and reasons for the variations in PR across their departments, disciplines and programs. The following emerged as common factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practicality • Coding • Certificates compiled of same courses • Budgeting priorities for big-ticket items shared by same students • Multiple number one priorities <p>Definitions of what constitutes Awards, Disciplines, Programs, Certificates and a program were discussed in order to provide clarification.</p> <p>Part two of the discussion focused on the role of a department chair in formalizing PR processes. Further discussion examined the processes of conducting a program review separate from budgeting processes. Points were brought regarding the value of program review in capturing the faculty, department members' feedback. Examples from programs such as the Child Center, ECE, PAC, iCUE, Counseling were brought. Points were made in how PR becomes important in documenting the history of the program(s) function.</p> <p>Benefits of a formal vs. flexible PR structure were discussed. Here, points were brought about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program data disaggregation through PR, • Reporting under the different existing PR variations • Process of assigning program/discipline review to faculty • Access to PR module: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who is the editor? Who trains for future How is compensation handled? Can somebody set limits in who reviews the PR Can faculty be excluded from the PR process? <p>Past and existing practices were brought up. Other options were discussed such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict resolution training for faculty • Directly helping the department chairs with PR training • Focusing on being of service and support and the opportunity to mentor • Putting aside funding for each semester toward that training • Creating a CETL PR module online • Tutorials, video tutorials that would support faculty • In planning a policy on PR considering the intention of PR: driving self-improvement; being aware of unintended circumstances <p>Items for next PR meeting were discussed</p>		
--	---	--	--

