

# Advancement of Student Learning Council

## Minutes

January 8, 2018

11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Page Conference Room, TAC 316

### 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  
Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio  
Mary Ann Naumann, 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  
Jared Price, Recorder

- I. Welcome and Call to Order
  - A. Lisa Bortman opened the meeting at 11:38 a.m. in the Page Conference Room.
- II. Business
  - A. Approval of Minutes
    1. The council approved the December 11, 2017 minutes.
  - B. Upcoming Conferences
    1. Lisa invited the committee to be involved in submitting a proposal to present at a LiveText conference in Austin in June 2018. The conference organizers invited Lisa to be involved.
  - C. Accessibility of Program Reviews
    1. Michael expressed concern that program reviews are made public, citing a meeting with an external academic who had read SPP's 2013 program review. Lisa explained that California universities are required to make an edited version of program reviews available to the public and that before doing so OIE reaches out to programs to ask if they desire any part of their review to be kept confidential. SPP did not ask for edits to their program review..
  - D. Group Activity: Framing Essays

1. Council Members broke into the below groups to review their assigned program review letters, identify the strengths and weaknesses detailed in the letters, and add these to a table for future review. Groups met for 20 minutes and completed Round One.

<b>Assignments for “Framing Essays”</b>	
(Link: <a href="#">Program Review Letters Folder</a> )	
<b>ROUND ONE</b>	
Mike Shires and Brad Dudley	<a href="#">Biology</a> and <a href="#">Philosophy</a>
Brad Griffin and Mary Ann Naumann	<a href="#">Student Health Center</a> and <a href="#">Sports Medicine</a>
Charla Griffy-Brown and Lisa Bortman	<a href="#">History</a> and <a href="#">Nutrition</a>
Amy Tuttle Guerrero and Katie Dodds	<a href="#">Liberal Arts</a> and Counseling Center
<b>ROUND TWO</b>	
Amy Tuttle Guerrero and Charla Griffy-Brown	<a href="#">Community Standards</a> and <a href="#">Mathematics</a>
Brad Dudley and Brad Griffin	<a href="#">English</a> and <a href="#">Enrollment Management</a>
Katie Dodds and Mike Shires	<a href="#">Creative Writing</a> and <a href="#">MA in Clinical Psychology</a>
Lisa Bortman and Mary Ann Naumann	<a href="#">German</a> (or <a href="#">Hispanic Studies</a> ) and any other program review

2. After 20 minutes, the council convened and crafted 14 questions to frame a survey or focus group on program review. The 14 questions are:
  - a. BUDGETING: Is the timing and speed of the budgeting and program review process an issue? What follow-up is best to ensure the program review process achieves the goals of quality improvement? Who should be involved in this follow up and when should it occur?
  - b. NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS: Is the program review process meeting the needs of non-academic programs?
  - c. RESUBMISSIONS: How can the council improve and streamline the resubmission process? Is our record keeping appropriate for resubmissions? How can we improve our record keeping for resubmissions? How can we best follow-up on QIP and MOU for resubmissions?
  - d. QIP: Is the current QIP program effective? What examples or training could we provide to programs to improve their success?
  - e. RESOURCES TO WRITERS: What is the best way to share examples of exemplary and poor program reviews to aide program review writers?

- f. MOU: What is the best way to learn more about how MOU recommendations were or were not implemented? What is the best way to report this in the essays?
- g. RISK VARIABLES: When looking ahead, how do we best assess the risk variables of continuity and progress, but also disruption?
- h. CORE COMPETENCIES: How do we institutionally improve evaluation of core competencies?
- i. STUDENT NONPERFORMANCE: What is our best course of action for students who are falling short of standards?
- j. MARKET VIABILITY/STUDENT RETENTION: How can we best comment on student retention and market viability? What data is meaningful for the review?.
- k. STRATEGIC PLANNING: How do we best engage in a conversation on program review and strategic planning? Where should these conversations be focused? Who should they involve? When should they occur? Is this is the right vehicle to accomplish our goals? How should they be connected to budgeting?

E. Items for Upcoming Meetings

- 1. Lisa and Charla will create a survey to send out to programs about their experience with the program review process. During our February meeting, the council will to work through program review letters and discuss who to invite to a March meeting focus group. In March, the council will continue looking over program review letters and hold program review focus group. In the future, Charla would like the council to discuss market viability.

III. Adjournment

- A. The ASLC was adjourned at 1:06 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for February 21, 2018 from 11am to 1 pm in Page Conference Room (TAC 316) and via Adobe Connect.