ASLC Minutes

March 4, 2013
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
WLA Campus, Room 586

Members present: Joy Asamen, Herb Cihak, Connie Fulmer, Charla Griffy-Brown, Mike Shires
Absent: Lisa Bortman, Connie Horton

1. Mini-grant rubric
   a. The discussion of the mini-grant rubric began with the question of funding and what OIE has allocated to support faculty scholarship in the area of assessment
      i. The voting members present unanimously agree that continuing support in this regard is critical to sustaining a culture of assessment.
      ii. Examples of how faculty who have been recipients of awards have advanced discourse on the topic of assessment in their programs and profession-at-large were cited, and we agree that continuing support of such endeavors is important to sustain the momentum from the last 3 years.
   b. Revisions to the rubric
      i. Remove column on "Scholarly Literature" and focus instead on "current practice" by embedding this emphasis in the "Project Purpose and Contribution" column.
      ii. Remove reference to "direct evidence" as a criterion indicating "exemplary" status for the Project Purpose, although it might be an appropriate consideration for the Methodology column.
      iii. Remove point allocations and revise rating categories as follows: (a) Well Developed, (b) Developed, and (c) Needs to be Developed.
      iv. Create a checklist format within each rating category and provide anchor points for each rating category that have a stronger applied scholarship focus than one that is research oriented.
      v. Joy will revise the rubric and circulate it to the voting members of the Council for review/comment.
2. Orienting student representatives
   a. Connie F. will meet and Mike has met with the student representative from their respective schools.
   b. Content of orientation
      i. Purpose of ASLC, membership of ASLC, and role of student representatives
      ii. Talk about the two major tasks for which student input is sought
         1. Mini-grant applications
         2. Program reviews
   c. Documents to share with student representatives

       i. Charter
      ii. Mini-grant application
     iii. Rubric
     iv. Program Review Guidebook
  d. Connie F. and Mike will introduce the students to the group on March 27th.

3. Use of term "self-study" in *Program Review Guidebook* – do **NOT** remove references to self-study in the *Guidebook*
4. Assessment travel budget
  a. The voting members unanimously support continuing the current disbursement practice of receiving the full amount at the beginning of the year with one of the following two ways of handling any unused funds:
    i. Offset budget allocated for the next year by the unused amount (preferred option) or
    ii. Return unused funds to OIE no later than mid-June.
  b. Schools/units are required to submit an accounting of assessment related expenses to OIE no later than June 15th.
  c. For this academic year, no school/unit will likely have assessment travel monies remaining between WASC ARC, pre- and post-ARC workshops, and the NASPA Assessment Conference.

Addendum to Minutes

March 6, 2013

1. Minutes were circulated and unanimously approved by the voting members.
2. The mini-grant rubric was circulated, edited, and unanimously approved by the voting members (see next page for copy of revised rubric).

Innovation in Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: Mini-Grant Assessment Rubric

Rating	Project Purpose and Contribution	Methodology, Timeline, and Budget	Innovation
Well Developed	☐ Project's aims are *clearly* delineated. ☐ The benefits to the program and/or university are *explicitly* addressed. ☐ How the proposed project contributes to assessment best practices is *unequivocal*.	☐ Methodology is *appropriate* for addressing the project aims and a *detailed* description of the model of inquiry and procedures is provided. ☐ *Detailed* timeline for project completion is provided. ☐ *Detailed* budget is provided and appears *appropriate* for meeting project aims.	☐ *New* initiative for program-level assessment of student learning. ☐ *Detailed* description of why initiative is being proposed, i.e., what evidence from annual or 5-year program reviews prompted the initiative?
Developed	☐ Project's aims are *satisfactorily* delineated. ☐ The benefits to the program and/or university are *sufficiently* addressed. ☐ How the proposed project contributes to assessment best practices is discussed.	☐ Methodology is *appropriate* for addressing the project aims and a *sufficient* description of the model of inquiry and procedures is provided. ☐ Timeline for project completion is provided. ☐ Budget is provided and appears *appropriate* for meeting project aims.	☐ *New* initiative for program-level assessment of student learning. ☐ *Sufficient* description of why initiative is being proposed, i.e., what evidence from annual or 5-year program reviews prompted the initiative?
Needs to be Developed	☐ Project's aims could be more clearly delineated. ☐ The benefits to the program and/or university could be more clearly addressed. ☐ How the proposed project contributes to assessment best practices could be strengthened.	☐ Methodology could be strengthened and the description of the model of inquiry and procedures could be more clearly delineated. ☐ Timeline for project completion is described in a vague and general way but needs to be more specific. ☐ Budget is provided but appropriateness of projected costs is unclear.	☐ Initiative for program-level assessment of student learning appears to be for something that is an assumed standard of practice, i.e., a project for developing SLOs, curriculum map, or an assessment plan. ☐ Description of why initiative is being proposed could be strengthened.