Advancement of Student Learning Council
Minutes
October 14, 2019
12:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Page Conference Room, TAC 316 and Zoom Meeting

Members present:

Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio
Katie Dodds, School of Law
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
Lee Kats, Vice Provost, ex officio
Seta Khajarian, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
Heather Thomson-Bunn, Seaver College
Jeremy Whitt, University Libraries
Ildiko Hazak, Recorder

Members Abset: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio Business School
Michael Shires, School of Public Policy

I.   Welcome and Call to Order
    A. Lisa Bortman opened the meeting at 12:05 p.m. in the Page Conference Room.
II.   Business
    A. Approval of the Minutes

        1. The Advancement of Student Learning Council approved the September 17, 2019 minutes.
III. WSCUC Projects

    A. Lisa reviewed the WASC Projects PowerPoint slide. Lisa worked on the list of WSCUC projects with the ASLC members. Lisa noted that the annual assessments should be linked to the program review. Currently each program establishes its own rubrics. They should be using the same rubric. It would be more consistent. OIE would not have to set up 42 assignments every year. Lisa commented that OIE is developing general rubrics, critical thinking rubrics and research rubrics. Lisa noted that if ASLC can get some consistency across the board, then ASLC will be able to establish benchmarks and assessment would be more efficient. It would also provide better support for faculty.

Lisa asked: What does ASLC want to do for this essay for program review? ASLC is going to revise the guidebook. Lisa noted that ASLC is going to try to find a way to share information better about the results of the program review. Lisa commented that the deans don't understand program review enough to do the presentation. Lisa suggested that ASLC should do the presentation to UPC and UAC. The ASLC group worked together on the list of WSCUC Projects.

WSCUC Projects:

1. Annual assessment rubrics with benchmarks
2. Annual assessment reports that align with program review, adopted by all schools
3. Review and revise the guidebook (student involvement)
4. Information sharing mechanism, info sheet, going to committees (UAC, UPC)
5. Program participants meet with ASLC

Program Review Process:

1. Students more involved in the process
2. Simplify language and streamline review
3. ASLC Presents to UPC
4. ASLC make a big picture report
5. Data
6. Better links between annual assessment and program review
7. Evaluate the evaluation and feedback given to departments
8. Program participants meet with ASLC

IV.   Program Review Guidebook Findings

A. Lisa discussed with the ASLC members reviewing sections of the Program Review Guidebook. Katie Dodds commented that the guidebook should be simplified. Streamlining the program Review Guidebook would be great.

Lisa asked Brad to take on the essay of Information Sharing. Lisa commented that in the Seaver group, 50% of them are doing great assessment, but a group of programs barely doing anything at all. They don't have the staff to do it. They put it on hold. One group's assessment has a terrible quality. They have no interest in doing the assessment, because they see no meaning to it. Lisa commented that information sharing could help this process.

Lisa created a slide for everyone who was doing well on their assessment. Lisa was giving out medals. People who didn't do a good job received a comment that the quality was fair. They were upset, and feelings were hurt, because of the comment. Lisa has to talk to all the division deans about it. They were scored on a rubric. It would be difficult to achieve 4 out of 4 and they get upset with the score of 3. Therefore, they don't want to participate in the project. It is not sending the right message. The letter sent from ASLC gets them angry. They don't want to participate in the process if they are not going to get praised for it.

Lee Kats asked Lisa, how is the discussion with the deans? Lisa replied that she asks each division dean what would work best for his or her area. Lisa commented that the problem is that everyone wants something different. It is not going to be a "one size fits all". Lee asked what can be done, and he commented that the division deans should be the enforcers. Lisa commented that the division deans do all the complaining, but they don't really know how to do assessment.

Lee Kats liked Seta's suggestion on setting up workshops just for the division deans. Lisa suggested, what if there was a two-step process for program review. They would submit it and they would receive feedback.

Heather commented that she met in January with a couple of people about program review. It felt like they have been asked to do the same thing in a different format. Lisa said it seems like they don't read what was sent to them. Livetext did not work. They can now submit it as a Word document. Lisa is hearing this comment: "It is a is a moving target". Heater commented that regarding the Program Review Guidebook, the lot of the language in the beginning is very good. But there is a part that describes that "this process is flexible". Heather doesn't see this process flexible. She thinks this description is not useful. Lisa noted that if UAC could see some of the findings, it would be very helpful.

Lisa noted that she is working on the sections of the program review. Lisa will discuss the edits. Lisa commented that everyone should pull their sections and edits into a Word document. Lisa will put the document into Google document without formatting. They will be in the shared Google drive.

Jeannie Gentile will send an agenda to ASLC to meet with Barbara Ross Davis. It will be between 10:30 am to 2:30 pm on November 12.

VII.   Adjournment

    A. The ASLC was adjourned at 1:15 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for November 11, 2019 from 12 p.m. to 2 p.m. in the Page Conference Room (TAC 316).