

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

January 11, 2016

12:00 - 1:30 p.m.

Page Conference Room

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management
Brad Griffin, Seaver College
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
Colleen Mullally, University Libraries
Michael Shires, School of Public Policy
Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio
Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio
Ross Canning, Recorder

Members Absent Katie Dodds, School of Law

I. Welcome, Review of the November Minutes

Charla Griffy-Brown called the meeting to order at 12:10 PM. The minutes were considered and approved, pending any changes made by 5 PM.

Lisa Bortman shared that the Interim 2015 WASCUC report received a favorable review from the Commission which stated that they liked our work on the four areas of concern and are satisfied that we have addressed all of the issues and will close the case. We received commendations for the assessment piece. Our next WASCUC report and site visit are scheduled in 2019-2020.

II. Business

A. ASLC member assessment successes and challenges updates (Charla)

Charla shared the state of assessment activities at the Graziadio School expanding upon their work to align and improve the directed instruction portion of their curriculum and bring the full time and fully employed MBA programs on par with the online program offerings. Over the last six months the faculty has been working to improve syllabi, teaching methods, and aligning teaching time in programs that use co-teaching methodology to define directed instruction according to WASCUC guidelines.

Charla introduced the class-flow of an online course and briefly discussed the increased amount of time it takes to teach in this format, manage virtual classroom dynamics and participation, and make time to converse with students who are connected to each other and to the instructor constantly through social media. She then gave a tour of one of her classes and answered the ASLC members' questions about the

startup of the online program, incorporating analytics and LiveText assessment rubrics, etc.

B. Program Review (Colleen Mullally, Mike Shires, and Brad Dudley)

Brad Dudley gave observations regarding the GSEP Student Services Office program review concerning success objectives vs. student learning objectives in a co-curricular department. More student data would be helpful to align and support their conclusions.

Colleen suggested that focus groups and more face-time with students would benefit the office using various methodologies to poll the students' opinions and thoughts more thoroughly. The quality enhancement plan was not connected to the presented assessment data and their evidence was not organized to justify their conclusions. Using different methodologies to pull the student data back into the department's requests for changes or development would enhance the program review. Assessments need to be connected to the quality improvement plan (QIP) with evidence to support the QIP. Lisa mentioned that a future goal for assessment reviews is multimodal assessment that diversifies assessment intake and confirms or clarifies collected data using diverse methodologies. Additionally, the ASLC reviewers suggested providing better guidelines for external reviewers to avoid oversimplified suggestions such as requesting more money.

The major failure of the program review was trying to fit a student service department review into an academic program review template. The ASLC will look at creating a third guidebook for the administrative departments and programs that are tangential to student learning outcomes and fine-tune the questions geared toward developing better criteria for administrative and functional student and business services. Lisa noted that from the WASCUS perspective, the accreditor simply wants to know how departments influence or affect student learning. The ASLC members discussed reevaluating which departments and programs are considered for five-year reviews by the Assessment of Student Learning Committee and how or who should address the administrative areas more effectively. Charla mentioned that the Council will address these issues at the June ASLC Retreat and look at other models through institutional benchmarking to determine what to do with the administrative areas.

Regarding the Student Services Department review, the main comments of the ASLC are:

- The ASLC appreciates and commends the amount of work that the department did to complete the report.
- Noting more in their narrative the circumstances surrounding their department's review, such as this being their first five-year review, would be helpful context for the ASLC and other reviewers.
- Utilize assessment data as evidence to support conclusions and requests or include the rationale for the requests or findings if otherwise unsupported through evidence.

- Utilize more multimodal assessment collection techniques including benchmarking and best practice information from external sources.
- Look at drawing lines between student success or failure to the smooth operation of their administrative function at the university.

Lee Kats commended the ASLC representatives for their work to change the culture at the University to make assessment a regular part of every program's function.

C. LiveText Update (Lisa Bortman)

Lisa gave a report about how the first data collection has been progressing in LiveText. Some of the pilot groups worked better than others but every usage increases institutional knowledge and improves the assessment process.

Lisa showed Prof. Michael Murrie's LiveText assessment as an impressive example of innovative use combining assessment rubrics, external reviewers, and intertester reliability. Dr. Murrie had students compress and upload video files on which they gave speeches as though they were TV reporters. Prof. Murrie and an external reviewer scored the presentations on a 12-question rubric and utilized intertester reliability to rate the presentations. His work went above and beyond her expectations and she was elated with the results. A Seaver College rhetorics course uploaded 170 student artifacts for the oral communication assignment which will give a great foundation of data to analyze.

Lisa looked at the course for assessment over the next four years in preparation for the 2020 WASCUC visit. The University needs to start moving to incorporate multimodal assessment to establish its benchmarking for the 2020 accreditation reaffirmation visit, whose report is due in 2019. She doesn't want the pace of preparation to be as frenetic as the past preparation. Lisa would like to incorporate LiveText assessment along with learning outcomes assessment. She plans to look at joint projects with other institutions to check on Institutional Learning Outcomes and General Education Core Competencies to establish benchmarks. The ASLC decided to have 50% of the programs upload one key assignment by the end of 2016. Lisa wants faculty members to know that they can collect direct and indirect data using one collective process using one assignment. A survey taken before and after the core competency project would achieve this.

D. RTP Datasheet (Lee Kats)

Lee reported that the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee meets in February and he reminded them that the proposed changes to add requirements to do assessment need to be on the agenda for discussion/approval. The ASLC is eagerly awaiting the conclusion of this policy change.

E-1 Outstanding questions regarding Status Reports

[Background information from an email exchange following the last meeting:

Seaver College is moving to a 7-year program review cycle in which Year 6 will be the reporting year. The annual report would be replaced by the comprehensive report in year 7. The co-curricular areas of General Education (GE) will move to a 7-year cycle as well. Whenever possible, they will be tied to the program reviews. The "Christianity and Culture" GE requirement will be up for program review in the same year as the Religion Division, for example. Where the areas of GE do not mesh with one specific division or program, those areas will follow their own 7-year reporting calendar. Data will be collected each year, so this switch does not eliminate annual reports.]

E-2 Core Competencies presentation (Brad Griffin)

Brad reported on the strategies he is implementing at Seaver College to get the faculty on board to adopt the proposed changes to the annual and program review cycle. To start, each program will supply an assignment that will capture seniors in a major course with presentation component to upload the scored data using the AAC&U value rubric. OIE will crunch the numbers and produce a report which will be returned to the divisions and they will have a place to reflect on the core competency assessments in their annual reports, thus closing the loop on assessment. The core competencies will remain on a 5-year schedule, 1 per year. Brad shared the the [GELI \(General Education Learning Innovators\) committee's LiveText rollout plan](#) with the ASLC members.

The core competency schedule follows. The schools should keep these core competencies in mind the year before so articles can be identified to collect

- Oral Communication 2015-2016
- Information Literacy 2016-2017
- Critical Thinking 2017-2018
- Quantitative Reasoning 2018-2019
- Written Communication 2019-2020

E. Announcements (Charla)

III. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at about 1:50 p.m. The next meeting of the ASLC is scheduled for February 8, 2016, at noon via Adobe Connect and from the Page Conference Room, TAC 316.