

Advancement of Student Learning Council

Minutes

February 22, 2022

2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Zoom Meeting

Members Present: Katie Dodds, co-chair, School of Law
Brad Dudley, co-chair, Student Affairs
Jacqueline Dillion, Seaver College
Charla Griffy-Brown, Graziadio Business School
Seta Khajarian, Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Lee Kats, Vice Provost, ex officio
Kim Miller, Director of Online Learning
Jim Prieger, School of Public Policy
Heather Thomson-Bunn, Seaver College
Jeremy Whitt, University Libraries
Tonya Wood, Graduate School of Education and Psychology

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks

A. Brad Dudley opened the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

II. Business

A. The Advancement of Student Learning Council approved the January 25, 2022 meeting minutes.

III. Program Reviews

A. Updates on previous reviews:

1. Seta Khajarian and Jeremy Whitt provided a DBA update for which more information was received. They plan to provide a final summary at the next ASLC meeting and will add information to the rubric for members to review.
2. Kim Miller asked Charla Griffy-Brown additional questions regarding the BSM review via email since the last meeting. Additional questions were asked and discussed regarding enrollment trends, BSM's strategies to address them, and how ASLC can support. Clarity on BSM:Seaver synergies and data to corroborate BSM's value added were addressed. Charla Griffy-Brown intends in the future to request more data representing the program's impact be included.

- B. Kim Miller and Brad Dudley presented their MS in Organization Development Program Review findings summary.
1. Commendations: It was presented that this is a great program overall, specifically doing well in self-assessment, PLO mapping, and articulating mission and values which mesh well with the University's. The program does well at addressing the emergent need for diversity, equity, and inclusion throughout the curriculum, exemplifying their strength for self-assessment. Student learning data was abundant along with evidence of its use to make program and curriculum changes. WASC core competencies were well planned with clear demonstration of data alignment.
 2. Recommendations: More detail in mission and values was suggested, particularly in how they are acted on or expressed. Data reflects a downward enrollment trend though larger trends indicate this is a growing field, so it was recommended to use their self-assessment to develop strategies to expand the program. Resource allocation information was missing. It was explained that midway through the Program Review, there was a reorganization which may have affected the review. ASLC was encouraged to ask the program whether the recruiting and marketing is in the right place regarding resource allocation, especially in light of the expectation for growth due to the strong market. The co-curricular examples provided were curricular, so it was suggested to use this as an opportunity to present their service learning, external work with clients, etc.
 3. It was noted that this program took a hit with enrollment in 2020 as it is tracked, involves residential participation, and many students opted to defer; however enrollment should be back to where it should be.
- C. An additional comment was made that members should take care in editing the rubric Excel sheet as it can affect how others' notes are saved.
- D. Katie Dodds and Jim Prieger presented their MS in Real Estate Program Review findings summary.
1. Commendations: PLOs, core competencies, mapping, and alumni surveying were identified as program strengths. Leadership competency model alignment was appreciated as meaningful. The commentary explaining curriculum changes was strong in corroborating their understanding of student backgrounds and needs through the program.
 2. Recommendations: The concern was raised that "faith" and "ethics" are used synonymously in the Program Review, and it was suggested these terms' use be revised. The low percent return on alumni surveying was noted and

incentivizing the process was suggested to increase the return on invested resources. There is no mention of adjunct faculty and faculty number and work loads. It was suggested to share data on the Center's budget detailing both faculty and financial resources, particularly given the new research Center while concurrently increasing teaching loads. It was noted that there were many PLOs and that they were expressed with mid-level verbs, so it was suggested to work on the PLOs' language. Concern was mentioned for three point rubrics for not having enough gradation to be meaningful. It was suggested to adjust these for effectiveness and efficiency.

3. Charla Griffy-Brown commented that there are no faculty solely dedicated to this program; rather they are drawn in from other areas. It was noted that ASLC asking questions and providing suggestions around faculty and resource allocation would be helpful for the program to build in sustainability, particularly around the Center.

E. Jeremy Whitt and Heather Thomson-Bunn presented their Online MBA Program Review findings summary.

1. Commendations: It was noted that overall this Program Review was well done. A reviewer commented that the PLOs having subcategories supported PLO definition and metrics and demonstrated their intentionality. Awareness and self-reflections in growth areas, how the program is starting to address them, and responsiveness to student needs were noted as additional strengths. It was commented that they have laid out the work, so if the program focuses on these improvement areas they are in great shape.
2. Recommendations: Connecting students' request for increased one-on-one faculty interactions and the trend that less experienced students are participating in the program was suggested. Faculty ratios were missing. Improving PLO assessment scheduling was suggested as a reviewer noted the current plan may be unsustainable. Rather than adding more PLOs, it was suggested to tie new PLOs in with others.
3. Charla Griffy-Brown added that the Professor who used to handle assessment passed away, so the transition may have influenced the Program Review significantly. It was also added that the program is entirely reimagining the on-ground programs and then will scaffold in the online. The questions reviewers posed were encouraged to be included in ASLC's letter as it could guide programmatic adjustments and show support.

F. The general consideration was raised that many committee members are having difficulty finding the information needed because the Program Review and rubric

are arranged differently. A member suggested reorganizing PGBS' review in the next iteration to streamline this.

- G. Katie Dodds and Seta Khajarian presented their MS in Applied Finance Program Review findings summary.
 - 1. Commendations: It was noted that the Program Review was well written with lots of data, and that demand problems were well identified. The plan to include a global perspective to a PLO and that it has no associated cost was commended.
 - 2. Recommendations: Proficiency levels were stated in the PLOs, so it was suggested to revise the language such that the skill is noted without an identification of the proficiency. Three point rubrics were identified as misleading. A reviewer added that PLO language could be refined to be less descriptive and more quantifiable, measurable objectives; examples were provided in the rubric response. It was recommended to add a budget to four of the program's Quality Improvement Plan goals. A reviewer suggested clarifying what is required to have students work together, and that co-curriculars should be more intentional rather than optional. Concern was raised regarding the program cost being far out of line with higher ranked, lower priced schools in the area, so it was suggested to define their value added. Faculty overview was missing.
 - 3. Clarifying concerns: A reviewer noted concern for the implications that the program having 95% international students has on students seeking an American higher education institution learning experience. This additionally raised a question on recruitment.

- H. It was suggested for ASLC to consider requiring a minimum goal completion commitment as a response to a WASC Visiting Team recommendation.

- I. Tonya Wood and Seta Khajarian provided an update on the GSEP Psychology Program Review. No review has been done since 2011, so Tonya Wood and Seta Khajarian discussed different assessment types. It has been decided that the Program Review will happen next year with no external reviewer. Given recent program changes and growth, Tonya Wood noted that this review will provide a framework for the program's work going forward.

IV. Review ASLC Letters: FEMBA and EMBA

- A. Katie Dodds presented the FEMBA and EMBA Program Review cover letters. Members were encouraged to share comments and suggestions.

V. ASLC Information Sharing Timeline

- A. Seta Khajarian presented a timeline for ASLC's information sharing (a WASC deliverable). Charla Griffy-Brown already presented to UAC in 2021. Edits to the timeline were proposed and discussed. It was suggested and generally accepted to use the ASLC Annual Retreat to collect themes across the Program Reviews. These would be presented to the Dean to evaluate, and then share in their meetings (UPC,UAC, etc.). Members were reminded of the importance for ASLC to have a presence in such meetings as some of the most important data fueling these teams' decisions can be provided by ASLC.

VI. Retreat Update

- A. Seta Khajarian provided an update on the annual ASLC retreat. Program Review theme collections to take to UPC and ASLC information sharing timeline revision will be added to the agenda. Taking an ASLC group picture was proposed to add to the website so people may place faces to committee member names. Members were encouraged to offer retreat agenda items. Charla Griffy-Brown and Petra Rickertsen offered retreat logistics planning support.

VII. Adjournment

- A. The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m. The next ASLC meeting will be on March 22, 2022 in the Page Conference Room.