

Advancement of Student Learning Council
Minutes
April 13, 2020
12:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

Members Present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair, Graziadio Business School
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex
Officio
Katie Dodds, School of Law
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
Lee Kats, Vice Provost, ex officio
Seta Khajarian, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
Michael Shires, School of Public Policy
Heather Thomson-Bunn, Seaver College
Jeremy Whitt, University Libraries
Ildiko Hazak, Recorder

Guest Present: Kailee Rogers

I. Welcome and Call to Order

A. Lisa Bortman opened the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

II. Business

A. Approval of the Minutes

1. The Advancement of Student Learning Council approved the March 25, 2020 minutes.

III. Program Review Update

A. Lisa shared updates regarding program review. Lisa commented that she has not finished the non-academic rubric. Charla suggested to put the non-academic rubric in a Google form. Seta asked about the academic rubric. In the past there was a score but this form has just the check, so Seta wanted to clarify how will this form work. Lisa responded that OIE has made a decision not to give it a score, instead indicate “meet expectation” or “not meet expectation”. Kailee Rogers shared the academic rubric Google form with the ASLC members. She explained that all sections of the form has to be filled out before one can move to the next part. The category section on the form shows “meets expectations” or “not meet expectations”, “commendation” or “recommendation”. Kailee explained, when OIE receives responses they can open them in a Google sheet. Brad commented that tabs can be added to the bottom of the Google Sheet.

B. Philosophy

Jeremy Whitt and Heather Thomson-Bunn completed the Philosophy Program Review. Heather completed the Google form and she made a recommendation to try to synthesize the mission and values of the program in one concise section. Heather commented that in their discussion of curricular changes over the past five years there wasn't much ration behind the curricular changes. Heather noted that it would be helpful to have some kind of rationale included why certain courses were removed or added. Jeremy agreed with Heather that there was not much basis for the changes made. Charla asked Jeremy and Heather if there was anything that stood out. Heather commented that Philosophy did a nice job of articulating the PLOs. Jeremy commented that the sections related to student success and the co-curriculars were good. Some of their indirect assessments, the survey of the graduating majors, showed a high satisfaction of students who graduate from the Philosophy program.

C. Religion

Mike Shires and Heather Thomson-Bunn completed the Religion Program Review. Heather commented that she didn't think the Religion Program Review was well done. The main recommendation she made was giving a rationale for curricular changes, particularly in terms of adding units to the minor and making some changes or additions to the courses required for the minor. Mike commented that usually theologians and philosophers are not huge data consumers. The evidence they present is anecdotal. When they talk about pedagogical models they have every faculty member write a summary. The high-level overall perspective is missing. They look at their alumni and then look what positions they had in the last 4-5 years. They are collecting data but there is no discussion about the fact that only two of the alumni are in churches for the religion division. Mike continued that early on in the report they talked about the fact that their role is not training ministers, but they are not talking about where the students are going and what they are doing after graduation. The next step of analysis is missing. There is no real attention to each of the three master's degrees. Their curriculum map is pretty much the bachelor's degree. Their assessment is focused on the bachelor's degree. Heather thought that the report was on the undergraduate degree. If the report was supposed to capture the master's degree program then that part was not there. Mike commented that even when they did their peer comparisons, they focused on the bachelor's degree and there are only a couple of lines on the master's degree. Heather commented that they didn't do that step regarding what actions they are going to take. One of the main points the external reviewer made is that the master's students don't have a real master's experience. They are just stuck in a classroom with 20 undergraduates. Charla commented that the issues Mike discussed should be added in the comments. Charla asked Kailee how Heather can go back to add a comment in the Google form. Kailee responded that Heather can submit a new Google form. Kailee can also share with Heather the Google sheet and Heather can add her comments into the sheet. Kailee will check to see if the Google sheet would keep the current data if she adds to it. Brad commented that the responses can be edited. Lisa asked if everybody submitted

their QIPs. Kailee responded that everyone has submitted their QIPs except for Business and GSEP Career Services. Charla asked Mike to include his comments in the document. Charla suggested to Mike to add questions at the end like, What is the status of the master's programs? Mike also commented that Religion has never talked about their cultural diversity. Heather added that Philosophy is at a similar position regarding diversity. Heather asked a question regarding diversity: "Is WASC going to expect that Philosophy looks at its enrollment numbers and looks at its data and addresses the fact that most majors are male? Lisa responded that WASC expects that Philosophy has a process in place. Mike noted that the external reviewer did a great job with his recommendations. Kailee added Religion's QIP into the Google folder. Charla suggested that ASLC should put out these program reviews that are really solid. Lisa noted that in the new program review form everything is there. OIE will put all the data into the report for them.

IV. WASC Update

- A. Lisa commented that the subcommittees are making a lot of progress. The standard committees respond to every single CFR and they also do an overview in their essay. In their theme essays they discuss their strengths, challenges, fixes and results. Lisa asked the ASLC members to talk about their deliverables.
- B. Katie commented that for the Meaning, Quality and Integrity subcommittee, their big deliverables are creating an annual reporting function. It is a one-page sheet that departments and programs can use to record their annual assessment report, all on one page. All the data goes into a table and there are 3 or 4 questions that ask what their methodology was, how did they use indirect evidence and how are they sharing this with their department. The idea is that programs will do one of these each year. At the end when they get ready to write their program review document, all of that data goes into another report which is a summary report. They take the data from each of the program learning outcomes and they enter that data into a table. All of the outcomes and all of the data can be viewed in one spreadsheet. The first thing is to create the annual review and then to streamline this to feed into the program review document. The second thing that document does is to start changing the culture by changing the language. In this annual report document the "assessment" word does not appear anywhere. The focus is on student achievement and not on assessment. The third thing is the benchmarking project. Lisa has been working on this and meeting with the deans and department heads and helping them establish what their benchmark is. All of this information rolls into the new streamlined program review document.
- C. Seta presented an update from last month. This essay is for quality assurance and improvement, program review assessment and use of data and evidence. The first part will be a joined intro. Seta talked about some of the strengths that were captured from the interim reports, from the external documents and the ASLC documents. Strengths include, mission, vision and values that are well stated and

clearly stated. Some of the strengths were the program review process and the seven-year cycle. The self-study reports are reviewed internally and externally. As far as challenges, those come from some of the UAC files, some of the internal reports and external reports. One of the challenges was that the university needs to connect the process of strategic planning with the quality assurance processes of the program assessment and review. Strategic planning is often not linked directly to data. Another challenge is that the internal evaluations of the review process indicate that the role of the assessment data in the program review is not always clear. Another challenge is that faculty are concerned that teaching and curriculum can be negatively targeted. They report that there will be little gain from these efforts. Another challenge was that the review of the graduate programs could demonstrate a strong integration of the WASC standards with disciplinary and other external accrediting agencies. The last challenge was that most of the MOUs were broadly written and the feedback from faculty would indicate that probably the process was not transparent. Perhaps ASLC could have a generic MOU to standardize that last point.

There are six deliverables:

1. Academic and non-academic program reviews
2. Annual assessment reports
3. Rubric development
4. Change in the progress review
5. Change in the governance process where there is a direct ASLC tie to the UAC and UPC
6. Information sharing, these are the infographics, flash reports

D. Brad presented his deliverables. His committee's primary deliverables include, the one page flash report, where everyone will be able to put their primary information from their program review on to one accessible information report. His committee is working with schools to figure out how best to share that information. For ASLC, they will be able to put together a flash report that allows them to pull together the information from all the program reviews for the year, highlighting any themes that they see and can be used in strategic decision-making by university administrators. His committee is partnering with Jonathan's committee to make sure there is a searchable knowledge bank of all program reviews, searchable knowledge bank of faculty research and a communication plan for the strategic plan 2030. Kailee will be putting the non-academic guidebook rubric into a Google form. Seta, Brad, Katie and Charla will work on the non-academic program review. They will finalize the two non-academic programs at the next meeting.

V. Adjournment

A. The ASLC meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for May 18, 2020 from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. by Zoom Meeting.