

**CASL-PR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**May 13, 2020 1:30 pm – 2:50 pm Via ZOOM**

**CASL-PR COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**April 1, 2020**

**1:30 pm – 2:50 pm**

**via Zoom**

**Voting members:**

<b>Voting Members</b>					
CASL Chair SLO Coordinator	Jeff Baker	X	Learning Resources	Ron Karlin	X
CASL Chair SLO Coordinator	Nicole Faudree	X	Counseling	Tony Law	X
PR Chair	Jason Burgdorfer	X	K&PE	Justin Lundin	A
ePortfolio Coordinator	Brittany Applen	A	SBS	Anne Marengo	X
ePortfolio Coordinator	Alexa Dimakos	X	SB	Gary Quire	X
MSHP	Kelly Burke	X	MSHP	Dilek Sanver-Wang	A
Senate, MSHP	Rebecca Eikey	X	SBS	Cindy Stephens	X
K&PE	Howard Fisher	X	MSHP	Tara Williams	A

<b>Non-voting members</b>		
AVP of Academic Affairs	Omar Torres	X
AVP of IE and IPE	Daylene Meuschke	A
Dean of Humanities/SBS	Andy McCutcheon	A
Dean of VAPA	Jennifer Smolos	A
<b>Guests</b>		
Senior Analysis IE and IPE	Vida Manzo	X

X=Present A=Absent

**Topics:**

**1. CASL/PR- Consent Item: Minutes from April 22<sup>nd</sup> , 2020**

Gary Quire motioned to approve the minutes. Kelly Burke seconded the motion. The committee unanimously approved the minutes.

**2. CASL & PR – Accreditation Overview**

Omar Torres, AVP of academic Affairs, summarized the timeline and work to be done on the report for the visiting accreditation team from ACCJC.

Fall 2020- Spring 2021 - Evidence collection will occur this coming Fall 2020 and Spring 2021.

Early Fall 2020 - The writing teams for addressing the prompts would be finalized; they would be meeting at least one additional time for training.

Spring 2021 - The drafts would be submitted to the PIO in Spring 2021

Summer 2021 - The drafts would be submitted to an editor in Summer they would be ready for the various governance groups in the Fall 2021.

Even though accreditation standards have changed, the college would be bound by the previous standards.

CASL's focus is typically focused on Standard IA and Standard II.

Standard I.B.6 This Standard was the driving force in the college acquiring eLumen. SLO Coordinators and CASL leadership have made a recommendation to continue to work with eLumen in the forthcoming year the 2020-2021 academic school year to bring on some consultants from eLumen that will customize training for how to disaggregate learning outcomes assessment data, to make it user or user friendly and viable for the college.

In general, the following standards apply to the work of CASL:

- Standard 1B - The Standard language outlines the requirements for defining and assessing student learning outcomes for all programs and student support services. We certainly comply with this, but now we're working on not only the mapping the various outcomes, but also the assessment related to the various learning outcomes.

"The institution assesses the accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes and student achievement". This prompt is related to what we do and working in partnering with IR with respect to the mission of the college with respect to our program review prompts, which a lot of this relates to the work that Jason leads us in in the PR side of the house here.

- Standard 1B.6 The disaggregation of learning outcomes and achievement data for subpopulations of students.
- Standard 2A Has language regarding instruction and looking at how we regularly are we looking at the learning outcomes assessment data with regards to courses that we offer in a distance education mode. How does learning outcomes assessment vary when offered in a distance education mode.

Continuing assessing outcomes is important; looking at learning outcomes assessment data in the Fall 2020 semester, is important especially because we are operating in a different mode it would be great to be able to see how differently students perform.

Faculty discussed accreditation topics including:

- Teaching and assessing in distance education on assessment because of the Covid-19 crisis;
- Providing opportunities for faculty to continue to learn about assessment best practices;

- Recommending to the Senate that departments continue with their ongoing assessment; and
- Crafting SLOs that could be evaluated even in an emergency.

### **3. PR – action item to recommend to add a forced cost category "I" "Institutionalization" to program review.**

There are currently four forced cost categories:

- critical,
- external,
- program viability
- enrollment management.

Another forced cost is being considered when the college is paying for something out of grant money for years and then that grant runs out. We need a category for this in the program review, and it would be "I" for institutionalization.

And this is our recommendation to the PAC-B committee which will formally adopt it as part of their budgeting process, but we need it to originate with us in this committee.

Because past attempts in defying forced costs in the institutionalization category were rejected in PAC B, bringing this proposal through the Academic Senate, puts some weight behind it, because it helps make a change in the process.

This is the first year where not only did department chairs identify the area of forced costs, but that the force costs were verified by the independent committees.

Nicole Faudree motioned that the committee approves a recommendation to create a new forced cost category of "I" institutionalization in the program review process.

Anne Marengo seconded the motion.

The committee recommended the item unanimously.

### **4. PR – Review language for communication re status of budget items:**

With Sharlene Coleeal and Jason Hinkle and James Temple, there has been discussion on a three level communication regarding budget items.

Feedback will be given to the chair before something goes from Level 2 o Level 3 (from the dean to the executive cabinet member). This practice will be incorporated in a pre-determined selection of categories, and some personalized feedback.

From Level 3 (VP of Instruction) to the Budget Committee there will be feedback there.

The third set of feedback would be things have been approved, by levels 2 and 3 and PAC B committee as forced costs, at the end of the process, customarily in September.

We were working on trying to incorporate that so that that communication can happen through canyons email either automated or not. And it can be recorded in the Program review Module.

Committee would like to see what the language will be for the feedback.

Standardized language would provide uniform understanding and information for the deans of why something was or was not funded.

### **For Agenda items 4. 5 and 6**

#### **Tabled.5. PR –Peer review or committee presentation update**

The prompts for the Q&A for the Academic Program Review Peer Review Process have been edited to reflect:

- The committee presentation added to the process, and what changes needed to be made to the existing procedures.
- Timeline, duration of the peer review process relative to the timeline for Program Review, and the number of programs
- Correction from CTE to CE

The committee will provide verbal feedback at the end of the presentation. What was said would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting and there would be no written feedback required from the committee.

Issues with length of time allotted to feedback, or cancellations of presentation need to be addressed.

Development of data-coaches was specific to assist with program review, so the current class of data coaches is trained to be able to look at the Program Review topics.

Peer training would be offered at the beginning of the semester and assignment of the mentor or peer to help with the training will be added to the Q&A. Professional Development will be offered for training the peer mentors.

A form is available to the peer reviewer as they work with the chair. It can be useful to help the faculty but to look for themes and developments in areas where the Academic Senate, or the district, or this committee, can support faculty and departments and programs, be more efficient, more effective. This is look at as n appreciative inquiry.

#### **6. PR –budget module training including screen shots with explanation update:**

We are working in not only creating screen shots but also short little videos for the tab to provide an overview.

#### **7. PR – PAC-B summary – We do not have one.**

A verbal summary includes:

In the last few meetings, the committee reviewed all of the force costs requests from student services, and instruction and then the ones that related to program by ability to enrollment management, etc. were all discussed in brought in, but and approved as force costs. But we are just an advisory council. There are 7.5 million dollars in forced costs.

Local shortfall numbers are not given, but at a minimum, next year, for the state there is \$18 billion deficit for K14 education.

We are 10% of that as the community college system. That's 1.8 billion and for College of the Canyons that is \$23 million out of a \$110 million dollar budget excluding categoricals

The CAREs funds from the federal government we have heard from the Budget office is instruction related where \$3 million is for instruction and \$3 million is directly to students.

At the state level, the rainy-day fund is spent.

The retirement package, SERP, if they replace everybody the savings would be in the millions. And will depend upon when and if they replace everybody who retires. It could result in \$330,000 in savings per year.

**Agenda items 8 and 9 are also tabled.**

Vida Manzo and Daylene Meuschke have reached out to the data coaches and tentatively have two of them confirmed for the assessments. They will need to know what day the sessions will take place.

The Professional Development Committee has asked that discussion and training on assessment happens throughout flex week.

They are looking on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday as the best days to offer the trainings. They don't have to be at the same day or concurrent, but they have to get approval from the committee.

Daylene and Vida would be available to facilitate training regardless of the data coaches.

- For the first session CETL could facilitate the discussion on what happened, how it affected the assessment. Overall, what we learned from it, and what can we then apply from what happened this semester to fall semester because this is in the fall semester right before fall starts. Cindy Stephens would lead this session, facilitating discussion, giving people a chance to talk about it as it relates to their assessment as it affected your ability to assess your students and kind of keep that at focus.
- 
- Session two is much heavier into what does our data show beyond which students did well, it will be driven from what Vida and Daylene to provide success and retention data from Tableau. They would be available for questions from the faculty.
- For session three we are going to take volunteers from those particular areas, to talk about their disaggregation of their data.

Another update will be provided in the last CASL-PR meeting.