

ASLC Minutes

March 27, 2013

10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

TAC Thornton Conference Room 4/F

Members present: Barbi Appelquist, Joy Asamen, Lisa Bortman, Herb Cihak, Connie Fulmer, Charla Griffy-Brown, Connie Horton, Mike Shires, Sherry Woods

1. Sherry Woods and Barbi Appelquist, ASLC student representatives, were introduced by Connie F. and Mike.
2. Connie F. shared about the breakfast meeting in which the SALT members offered a workshop on conducting annual program reviews – 34 Seaver faculty members attended the workshop (see Appendix A for meeting agenda).
3. Mini-grants
 - a. Outcome of mini-grant reviews:
 - i. G. Batcheller – not funded; the request was not for a learning assessment project but rather standard practices such as the development of program learning outcomes and assessment tools
 - ii. C. Castaneda-Sound et al. – funding approved
 - iii. O. Hall – not funded; a continuation project, and as such, no longer meets the criterion of “innovation”
 - iv. J. Jones et al. – not funded but recommend revising and resubmitting next year; although the purpose of the project could benefit the program, the proposed methodology requires further development, including attention to issues that might affect the quality of findings
 - v. S. Salas – not funded but recommend revising and resubmitting next year; although the purpose of the project could benefit the program, the proposed methodology requires further development, including the alignment of the qualitative method with the study purpose and attention to issues that might affect the quality of findings
 - b. Prior to issuing the next call for mini-grant proposals, consider the following issues:
 - i. Should stipends for faculty and staff, regardless of status, be allowable budget items?
 - Faculty/staff stipends should not be allowable
 - Graduate/research assistantships are allowable
 - If mini-grant awards are used for faculty stipends, benefits are factored in, which last year was absorbed by OIE – if stipends are disallowed, this is a moot issue; if stipends are allowed, applicants should be informed the full

amount of the award will be reduced to accommodate for the costs of benefits

- ii. Are applications from faculty who were previously funded allowable?
 - Faculty should not be allowed to apply for continuation projects
 - Since some projects might use the mini-grant award as seed money, a request was made to OIE to research and develop a list of potential sources of funding for assessment projects
 - iii. Should a “revise and resubmit” option be added as a potential outcome of the review process?
 - Beginning with next round of mini-grant applications, include addition of revise/resubmit option
 - iv. Might the operational definition of “innovative” need to take into account WASC redesign?
 - Tabled for a future discussion, although appears a logical “next step”
 - c. To elevate the quality of the applications, more training on writing proposals and planning methodology is recommended
4. Program review process
- a. Connie H. raised some discrepancies in the sequence of steps of the program review process described in the *Guidebook* and the steps presented in Appendix A – the sequence of steps presented in Appendix A is the correct order
 - i. Lisa is editing the *Guidebook* for these inconsistencies and will distribute to the members for review/comment
 - ii. In the editing process, the members emphasized the importance of not changing the program review process in substantial ways since the faculty/staff have grown accustomed to the current process/procedures and such changes could be disruptive to maintaining forward momentum.
 - b. ASLC internal review checklist
 - i. Connie H. suggested points of revision that involved seeking to make the language clearer and in sync with the *Program Review Guidebook*. She will provide a revised draft of the checklist at the next meeting.
 - ii. May need to consider multiple versions of checklist to more effectively address unique feature of programs – undergraduate, graduate, and student affairs – but regardless, the form should be kept succinct (one-page preferred)
 - iii. Lisa suggested we might wish to hold off on a complete revision of the checklist since it might need to change still again after the redesign elements are added to the *Guidebook*.
5. April 29th meeting
- a. Lisa will provide a succinct overview of WASC redesign and what she envisions as the “next steps” for the University in this regard

- b. The schools/student affairs will reflect on what this might mean for our respective contexts and suggest how OIE can support our work
- c. The voting members approved inviting Lee Kats to the meeting and the invitation has been extended and accepted

Addendum to Minutes

April 4, 2013

1. 4 of the 6 voting members approved of the more detailed description of the mini-grant reviews in the minutes.
2. Minutes were unanimously approved by the voting members.

Appendix A

Refresher Session on Writing Annual Program Reviews

March 27, 2013

Wednesday

8-10 a.m.

Faculty Dining Room

CONSULTANTS

Tips on Preparing the Annual Report

Lila Carlsen

Collecting Data

Tim Willis

Developing Rubrics

Stella Erbes

Reporting Learning Related to Diversity

Candice Ortvals

Reporting on Learning Related to Core Competencies

Carolyn Galantine

Reporting on Learning Related to GE Requirements

Cooker Perkins

Student Involvement and Closing the Loop

Brad Griffin

Motivation and Collaboration

Ken Waters

Preparing 7.1 and 8.1

Valerie Skinner

Analyzing Data

Khanh Bui

Using e-Portfolios

Ellen Caldwell, OIE

Students:

Aaron Schott

Paulina Taylor