

**Advancement of Student Learning Committee
(ASLC) Minutes**

April 12, 2013

9:14 a.m. to 11:55 a.m.

Catch Restaurant, Hotel Casa Del Mar, Santa Monica, CA

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown (chair), Joy Asamen, Herb Cihak, Connie Fulmer,
Connie Horton, and Mike Shires;

Visitors: Lee Kats and Ross Canning (taking minutes).

1. Welcome by Lee Kats and Charla Griffy-Brown
 - a. 9:14 am call to order and introduction of guests.
 - b. Vice Provost Lee Kats commended the work of the ASLC. He shared that the Board of Regents Academic Affairs Committee asked savvy questions about assessment and was appreciative of the work of the ASLC. It also appreciated the initiative of the ASLC to make assessment data an integral component of tenure and promotion.
 - i. The Council shared affirmations of Board member awareness of the importance of assessment and highlighted the need for communication among and between the University Board and University councils and committees.
 - c. Dr. Kats addressed the importance of creating a One-stop model for faculty grant and research questions and procedures in the University; in time, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness will take on that role (see item 5 below).
 - d. Ross Canning, executive assistant to the vice provost, will take minutes for the ASLC going forward.

2. Library Program Review
 - a. The ASLC member had a long discussion regarding the Library's program review which will be presented to the University Planning Committee (UPC) in fall 2013. The discussion focused on the importance of:
 - i. Drafting a new program review guidebook for service-oriented programs, since the academic guidelines do not mesh well with co-curricular and service offices (see item 4 below);
 - ii. Growing the working relationships between librarians and faculty members regarding meeting faculty teaching and research needs and training students in information literacy; and
 - iii. Stronger peer and aspirational institution benchmarking, substantiation of data, and source citation of data used in the report.
 - b. Process for responding to external reviewers
 - i. The Council discussed the importance of maintaining the integrity of the review process and the need to clarify the report submission in the new

guidebook.

1. All reports will be submitted as a PDF to the ASLC chair.
 2. Third-party reviewers are welcome to send comments, clarifications or alternate opinions on submitted reports to the ASLC chair.
 - ii. The ASLC will send a letter to the Library requesting an original copy of the 2013 Program Review and include a statement that the review guidebook will be updated to include detailed report submission processes.
3. Goals for Academic Year 2014
- a. Draft a new program review guidebook for service-oriented programs;
 - b. Understand and support the connection between program reviews, the budgeting process, and resource allocation.
 - i. The ASLC's program reviews go to the deans and provost who write executive summaries and MOUs which are presented to the UPC for information and budgeting consideration.
 - c. Promote the inclusion of learning assessment as an integral part of the faculty Retention/Tenure/Promotion (RTP) process.
 - i. The Council drafted the following RTP guidance statements, which the chair will discuss with the provost and vice provost.
 1. Faculty Data Form
 - a. Add under the University Service section:
 - i. "Describe your participation in the assessment process."
 - b. Add under University Scholarship section:
 - i. "Please also list any publications or presentations related to the area of student learning and assessment in which you have engaged."
 2. Best Practices for Tenure and Promotion Review:
 - a. Add, "In view of the University's commitment to achieving its mission and the culture of assessment, faculty members are encouraged to explain how they have advanced and contributed to the assessment of student learning."
4. The Council discussed the importance of identifying the correct assessment metrics for service areas (e.g., Student Affairs, Student Employment, Libraries, and other non-academic departments) in contrast to academic program review guidelines and metrics.
- a. Metrics collection, data substantiation, and program analysis is integral to program and co-curricular service reviews and essential for the complete assessment of student learning at the university.
 - i. Some purely business-oriented departments might be exempted from comprehensive program reviews due to business needs, staffing limitations, and funding priorities.

- b. OIE is uniquely qualified to pull relevant data for academic and non-academic areas to help them prepare for program reviews.
 - i. Such work will provide quality metrics, assessment and help prove program integrity in the marketplace.
5. Role of the OIE and how it works with the ASLC
- a. Vice Provost Kats has the vision of a One-Stop service model for faculty grant and research questions or application/administration procedures at the University. As OIE completes five-plus years of change and transition, it will eventually fill this need for the University faculty, administration, and staff.
 - b. The “Big Picture” is for OIE to perform business analytics and research projects that cut across all schools.
 - i. The ASLC seeks open dialogue to identify needs and define the partnership between ASLC and OIE.
 - ii. An ASLC wish list for projects in FY14 will be forwarded through the ASLC chair to open a dialogue. Some sample questions include the following.
 1. Collect and report data annually that can be utilized by all academic areas to inform their program planning, including post-graduate work, employment trends, dropout rates, etc.*
 - a. Look at the data with regard to each program vs. by school or by major alone.
 - b. Migration of students from majors showing trends
 2. Produce packets of data tailored to each department to assist them in annual planning and five-year program reviews
 - a. Have this data posted online for departments to access.
 3. Develop methodological standards
 4. Identify other models for assessing student success
 5. Use factorial models to look at intersections of data variables to inform program reviews and planning.
 6. Track longitudinal data regarding shifts in attitude and behavioral changes: which students are getting more oriented toward service or mission areas?
 7. Identify and report pertinent output data, which is as important to have as input data for major areas of study.
 - a. Retention, graduation data, etc., disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, domestic, international, etc.
 - iii. *The ASLC recommends an annual meeting between OIE and directors who are writing program reviews that year to identify the types of data and research questions which would be helpful to draft their reports.
 - iv. OIE assistance is needed to support smaller understaffed service-oriented offices up for program review due to their small staff size and

- the burdensome workload involved.
- c. Vertical connections with stakeholders
 - i. Relations among OIE, IT, and ASLC are important and are a priority for the vice provost.
 - 1. IT and OIE have a close working relationship to help mine data and filter it.
 - ii. Defining the process of submitting reviews will give clarity on connections.
 - d. Interim Report for WASC
 - i. The vice provost plans to reconstitute the combined chairs' meetings which will include the High Impact Practices (HIP) committee, the University Diversity Council (UDC), the University Faculty Council (UFC), the ASLC, and the director of OIE.
 - ii. The ASLC recommends a deeper discussion regarding alignment and responsibility for the WASC report, ensuring substantial faculty participation and leadership in the process.

The program shifted at about noon to honor the work of outgoing ASLC chair, Joy Asamen, and her leadership over the past four years during which she helped bring assessment of student learning to the fore at the University; and for her work drafting and editing large portions of the WASC reports. The meeting concluded with lunch and adjourned at about 1 pm.