

Advancement of Student Learning Committee

Minutes

April 10, 2017

11:30 - 1:30 p.m.

Page Conference Room, TAC 3rd floor

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management
Katie Dodds, School of Law
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
Brad Griffin, Seaver College
Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio
Michael Shires, School of Public Policy
Mary Ann Naumann, University Libraries
Agustin Vargas, Recorder

Absent: Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio

I. Welcome and Call to Order

Charla Griffy-Brown opened the meeting at 11:35 AM. The present members began eating lunch and meeting commenced during lunch.

While committee reviewed March meeting minutes, Lisa Bortman opened discussion regarding concerns within specific academic departments.

II. Business

A. Committee approved March 13, 2017 meeting minutes.

B. Charla provided an update and reminder of student events around meaning, quality, and integrity, and how to engage students more in the assessment process.

C. Program Review Assignments

1. Educational Leadership:

a. This program review provided good internal context and was a vast improvement from the last one.

b. Action Items: 1) Areas of improvement should be framed in terms of WASC standards as “areas of non-compliance” so as not to be

personal. 2) Areas of assessment should be added. Without them the rubric was unsatisfactory.

- c. It is the program's responsibility to report on the data even if it comes from OIE. Sports Medicine and Biology are good examples.
 - d. Amy Tuttle Guerrero reported that their intention of meeting the deadline and changes in leadership created challenges. Charla suggested including this challenge in the feedback, in addition to highlighting the vast improvement, and requesting a narrative to understand the data and support the next step.
 - e. Lisa confirmed that useful tools for measuring outcomes were not provided, leaving them unable to measure whether or not meeting program outcomes were met.
 - f. Amy asked whether or not QIPs are formalized. She recommended requesting a resubmission of the data with a focus on quality and integrity and providing support to their narrative. Moving forward, strengthening the assessment infrastructure, putting a plan for the future in writing and clearly demonstrating progress is needed, but may require too much involvement.
 - g. Charla concluded that the requested action was a resubmission with data to support QIP and a plan for the future by next April.
2. ELAP:
- a. There are 14 LO, but 15 are cited. Every course meets all LO.
 - b. There was recommendation of no more than 5 LO with faculty needing to determine the rubrics for measurement. Discussion of ways to incorporate evidence is needed as referring to tables and data is not helpful without explanation.
 - c. To improve it was suggested that they analyze and personalize information to the program.
3. SEC:
- a. Overall comments suggested that there is very little data review and no external review. There is no language about UAC in the report.
 - b. Amy reported that they were under the impression they had another month. Lisa confirmed they might need more time.
 - c. There was no clear list of LOs. ILOs and SLOs were provided. K1 and K4 are unclear. No program LO, market analysis or discussion were provided.
 - d. The reports contain too much jargon and internal speak. The language must change for an outside audience.

- e. QEP table was good, but lacked data to support the perceived compared to the expected.
 - f. There was a discussion of changing the curriculum, but no discussion of patterns or how this fits together. Also, the new location must be referenced in the program review.
 - g. Committee will return to programs with preliminary findings and give them more time to complete their report.
4. EDOL:
- a. Lisa reported that they demonstrated that they are actively completing assessment. An assessment plan is needed, as is direct and indirect data and analysis of how LOs multimodal assessments are being met. The list of 15 outcomes should be condensed to four with subsets and should include how standards of performance are being met and direction in areas of student struggle. A strong list of achievements, papers, participation in conferences, and monthly meetings need additional narrative and comparison.
 - b. Future report should include comprehensive exam results in livetext and program review and should take a more systematic approach.
5. MA Learning Tech:
- a. There is unique data, a small group of faculty and staff meeting regularly, a good introduction, including student feedback and evidence regarding action research report. Challenges are honest and price comparison is good, as the program is priced out of the market.
 - b. There should be a more systematic approach to assessment, alumni involvement, imbedding rubrics in livetext, adding reasons for thresholds, and a timeline of assessment. Due to the nature of the program, it would be interesting to have more analysis on student engagement, analytics, and enrollment.
6. ED in Learning Tech:
- a. Quality was noted, as well as high scores on faculty and staff qualifications and program availability. Success is determined by course grades and completion of dissertation research.
 - b. To improve the report there should be responses to some elements of the internal content and an addition of the infrastructure necessary to provide the data, an external reviewer report, and QIP. Charla inquired as to the history, the criteria for changes, and the proof behind a lot of general statements.

7. MA in Education:
 - a. A very strong report including satisfactory items like learning opportunities, curriculum comparison, some discussion, and changes of curriculum.
 - b. Future report should include interpretation of data and evidence of deliverables. Amy reported that latter meaning questions need more attention and that PLOS and incorporating the mission need clarity. After 16, much work needs to be done to add QIP and an external reviewer report.
8. MA in Psych:
 - a. The exemplary column provides good background. The internal context section is fantastic. The history of the program is good, and does not require revision often. This was a very thorough report.
 - b. To improve, report should include more pros. For example, adding access to orientations, the writing center, and counseling as elements in the co-curricular section. It is not obvious what is distinctive for the co-curricular section of this program.
9. All Ed Programs:
 - a. While waiting for external reviewer to submit reports, preliminary reports will be sent by May 1 to allow time for revisions.
 - b. There is a lack of assessment infrastructure and systematic review across all education programs.
 - c. There is an assessment handbook and there is work being done to identify an additional external support person to build assessment infrastructure, but it is also important to collect feedback from the committee.
 - d. Letters will be addressed to Amy, the Dean and the Associate Dean.
 - e. Lisa reposted grouping questions together to encourage better narrative, but without the desired results. Brad Griffin added that the groups do not seem to understand the need for a narrative.
 - f. Mike Shires noted a concern regarding the lack of conversation taking place in the division.
 - g. Brad added that the one external accreditation is not mentioned in the report.
 - h. Lisa reported that there is no version control on the re-submitted reports. They can see the new comments on main document, so committee members should include the date of their comments.
 - i. Amy will be looking at all reports and providing information on

what needs to be changed.

D. Adjournment

1. The ASLC adjourned at 1:11 PM. The next meeting is the annual ASLC Retreat and is scheduled for May 8, 2017 at the Loews Santa Monica Beach Hotel (1700 Ocean Avenue, Santa Monica, CA 90401) from 8:00 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.