Advancement of Student Learning Committee
Minutes
June 19, 2017
12:00 - 2:00 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 Griffin, Seaver College
                           Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
                           Mary Ann Naumann, University Libraries
                           Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio
                           Courtney Scott, Recorder

Absent: Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
                           Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives,
                                  ex officio
                           Michael Shires, School of Public Policy

I.   Welcome and Call to Order

     A. Charla Griffy-Brown opened the meeting at 12:08 p.m.

II. Business

     A. The committee approved the minutes from the May 8, 2017 meeting.

     B. The committee reviewed the Education programs and Enrollment
        Management:

        1. Education Programs: The committee edited a general letter to the
           Education Division together, noting a desire to help, but a need for
           more assessment and data to do so.

           a) ELAP: In discussion, the committee noted that this
              program did not have the benefit of a report from an
              external reviewer. With a WASC report due in 2019, two
              years remain for data collection. This needs to become a
              priority now. Specifically, PLOs should be reduced from

14 to five and indirect evidence should extend beyond the Noel-Levitz Survey. There must be more evidence of faculty conversation and demonstration of meaning, quality and integrity. This requires infrastructure, which Amy is working on this summer.

b) SEC: The committee noted a large amount of overlap between ELAP and other Education programs like SEC.

c) EDOL: In discussion, the committee noted that this program did not have the benefit of a report from an external reviewer. The committee reviewed EDOL as part of the larger conversation surrounding all Education programs.

d) MA in Learning Technologies: The committee noted a comprehensive external review, but also the lack of assessment.

e) ED in Learning Technologies: The committee noted the benefit of a good external review. However, not enough information was provided to allow for a full review.

f) MA in Education: In discussion, the committee noted that this program did not have the benefit of a report from an external reviewer. The committee reviewed MA in Education as part of the larger conversation surrounding all Education programs.

g) The committee agreed that all Education programs will need to resubmit in 2018 with some nuances for each program, overall recommendations being:

   (1) Assessment Infrastructure: On the whole, the faculty need to develop a sustainable plan for collecting assessment artifacts on an annual basis. There needs to be an assessment infrastructure and the faculty need to collect the data and write the reports.

   (2) Meaning: For many of the programs there are too many program learning outcomes. It is

unreasonable to think that the faculty will be able to assess 14 (or 15) program learning outcomes within a 5-year assessment cycle, especially when nearly every course in the program meets multiple learning outcomes. One of the most pressing needs for the faculty is to come together to revise and reduce the number of program learning outcomes. The recommendation is no more than five learning outcomes for the program. These learning outcomes need verbs derived from Bloom's Taxonomy that demonstrate higher-order thinking and that are measurable. The faculty need to determine the rubrics that will be used to measure these outcomes, and then they need to agree on the assignments (artifacts) that they will evaluate using these rubrics.

(3) Quality and Integrity: The faculty need to discuss ways in which they can develop better methodologies. Methods should incorporate direct with indirect and authentic assessment. The Noel-Levitz Survey should not be the sole instrument used to gather indirect evidence. Focus groups, reflective assignments, and faculty conversations are also forms of indirect evidence. At the level of an Ed.D. program, authentic (real-world) evidence should be fairly easy to establish using internship experiences or interactions with outside agencies.

(4) External Review: Each program needs an external reviewer that will actually deliver on the work required. The reviewer that was paid needs to submit a report.

2. Enrollment Management: The committee edited Brad Griffin's letter together. Lisa Bortman noted that it was good report, but that it's quality improvement plan only had one item for each major section. The report did not contain a lot of reflection or assessment. More could be done with sub-populations. More granular data could be reported through the

disaggregation of data as well. Benchmark data and an external review should be added.

    a) Overall, the program review was conditionally approved pending additional submission of the following materials: comparison to a minimum of three peer institutions, external review and closing the loop section.

III.   Adjournment

    A. The ASLC adjourned at 1:58 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2017, at 11:00 a.m. in the Page Conference Room, TAC 316.