

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

June 8, 2015

12:00 - 1:30 p.m.

Page Conference Room and Adobe Connect

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management (online)
Katie Dodds, School of Law
Connie Fulmer, Seaver College
Connie Horton, Student Affairs
Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio
Ross Canning, Recorder

Members absent: Colleen Mullally, University Libraries
Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
Angela Hawken, School of Public Policy
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio

I. Welcome, Announcements, Review of the May 2015 Minutes - Charla Griffy-Brown

Charla Griffy-Brown called the meeting to order at 12 noon. Connie Horton opened with prayer and Charla thanked her for her service to the ASLC.

II. Business

The ASLC considered and approved a few minor changes to the PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDEBOOK for Academic Departments. The Core Competency section under General Education will be changed to include the following.

“Core Competencies General Education (for Seaver College Undergraduate Program)”; and the section on General Education was postponed for additional language review and will be taken up again in the fall.

A. 2015 Program Reviews - Seaver College Five Year Reviews 2015

Business Administration Division (Charla Griffy-Brown and Connie Fulmer)

The reviewers found the AACSB documentation very apropos. The outlining of the program to the University Mission and Strategic Plan was very well done. Their matrices were clear and

helpful.

The demographics section was strong. The reason for changes had a good analysis but did not cover why the change was being sought in the first place. Structure and overall writing of the report made it difficult to understand if there is a consistent culture of assessment. The repetition in the document was distracting. The sections did not reveal an understanding of assessment vs. looking at student grades. The report seemed to focus on individuals' courses vs. a review of the program as a whole.

The faculty seems to neither understand why the division is losing faculty nor what to ask and from whom and therefore what to change. The students who pass the CPA were historically strong but over the last five years the numbers have declined one percent per year.

Charla will send the review and call the chair to discuss the review and to help the program succeed.

II. Program Reviews

A. French (Connie Horton, Angela Hawkens)

Overall it is a good review. The reviewers appreciated having the whole department faculty involved in the writing process. They highlighted the inclusion of a strong curriculum map and lauded the work to connect the Malibu and Lausanne programs. Some things to work on include following the recommendations of the external reviewer to keep advertising and recruiting for the major: No action plan was included to take this suggestion into account. The Student Learning Outcomes and curriculum were both present. The reviewers suggested that the Quality Improvement Plan needs work.

B. German (Connie Fulmer, Lisa Bortman)

The reviewers noted that the program had many of the same challenges as the French program. It is devoid of assessment data and consists more of a description of the program vs. how well it is performing based on hard data. The high changeover of faculty and use of adjunct faculty inhibits continuity in developing the program. It is important to retain the program since Heidelberg campus is owned by the University. The Quality Improvement Plan has many of the same points as the French program review above.

The Council discussed the trends of many of these smaller programs at the University and

their difficulty with recruiting and retention of students and the need for a more stable faculty base that can offer continuity in the programs' development. It was suggested that doing program reviews with so many small departments that have so few faculty and students may not be a good model as the sample size for assessment is too small for statistical relevance. Additionally the building and classroom issues are consistently a challenge to the mission of educating the students in the program. Charla Griffy-Brown will draft a memo that Lee Kats will pass on to the deans to communicate these insights and trends to the administrators to take into account as they plan for program improvements and funding.

C. Italian (Katie Dodd, Charla Griffy-Brown)

The reviewers noted similar problems with their PLOs and strengths as the other language programs. There was a good overview of the program and good international standards for benchmarking. The sample sizes for internal assessment is too small to be statistically relevant. This program used student interviews instead of random sample polling, which resulted in some rich data. The external reviewer was outstanding. The programs are small and get to be so internally-focused that the reviewers reiterated the idea of combining their efforts to maximize the value of assessment vs. working in silos as well as informally inviting outside reviewers to come in periodically to do a spot check and encourage collaboration among the faculty members across International Studies and Languages.

D. Hispanic Studies (Katie Dodd and Lisa Bortman)

The reviewer noted that the department presented their curriculum matrix and value rubrics while the other programs did not. They had a good connection to the University Goals. Their polling samples were of an adequate size for statistical viability and they had QIPs and a much better sense of where they are going. The recommendations stated in the were well thought out and connected to the data that they presented

C. International Studies (Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Charla Griffy-Brown)

The program reviewers will submit their comments to Charla at a later date.

D. Religion (Charla Griffy-Brown)

The reviewers said it was a good overview; the authors aligned the SLOs and PLOs well. Though the introduction was good the assessment data did not connect the dots well between direct and indirect evidence. The section on closing the loop was sparse and hidden in an appendix. The call for more staff in a program that has falling numbers of students seemed out of step. A strategic audit may be well received and useful. The assessment management software would be extremely useful.

The pain and frustration of the staff and faculty comes through strongly. The Council recommended that the program heed the comments of the external reviewer and look to a greater focus on the general education portion of the departmental responsibilities and through that it may attract a greater number of majors in the future.

E. Graduate School of Education and Psychology Program Review

GSEP Career Services Program Review (Connie Horton, Charla Griffy-Brown and Angela Hawken)

The reviewers said that for a first attempt it was pretty good. Their response to their external reviewer was weak. What specifically is needed by the division to improve in the areas that the external reviewer suggested? The report used direct and indirect assessment as well as benchmarking. Student success data was used but they did not have a plan on how to close the loop but this is their first five-year review. They need to answer the Meaning, Quality and Integrity section for career services.

F. Student Affairs

Intercultural Affairs (Katie Dodds and Charla Griffy-Brown)

Good program description, addressing history of the program and included past reviews. They included matrices to show degree alignment with the school and University Strategic Plans. They were unclear if the articulated standards were at the point of graduation or not. The assessment plan and evaluation methods were a little thin which seemed related to a change in staff.

They had an amazing external review but the program did not seem to understand who they are and where they want to go. Their suggestions were finance-neutral unlike many other divisions. There is a need to connect the dots to make certain the quality improvement plans are connected to the self and external assessment comments and findings.

Themes that were identified in the five-year review process:

- The need for standardization and shared resources particularly for smaller programs
- Faculty and Staff salary and support
- Methodology in connecting the dots
- Program viability, esp. the external audit

The process needs to look at the expectations of review-writing and parameters for small departments across the University including some which are departments of one. The timing, content, and resources made available to these micro-departments is of great importance.

III. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned for the year at 1:40 p.m. The next meeting of the ASLC is scheduled for September 9, 2015, at noon in the Page Conference Room.

Doug Hurley will join ASLC in August 2015 and at the first meeting in September.