

Advancement of Student Learning Council
Minutes
May 27, 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

- 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 April 13, 2020 minutes.
- III. Finalizing Program Review Academic and Non-Academic
 - A. Lisa shared the program review Google documents with the ASLC members. For each program there is a letter template. Lisa commented that she and Charla will send out this completed letter template. Lisa noted that the way this for works is that a category will be given to meet expectations, if it was exceptional it will receive a commendation. If it didn't meet expectations, it will get a recommendation. It is important to include the comments. Lisa shared the program review letter. There is a general introduction to the letter and the commendations. Lisa went through the template and she noted that under recommendations make sure to give action steps.
 - B. Philosophy Program Review
Heather Thomson-Bunn and Jeremy Whitt reviewed Philosophy Program Review. Regarding the mission value statements, Heather felt like that was a recommendation. They met expectation for their program learning outcomes.

Heather gave them a commendation. She thought that they have articulated it very thoughtfully and clearly. There is a recommendation for curriculum changes. Both Heather and Jeremy thought that this was an area of recommendation. Heather thought it would be helpful to have a brief rationale included for curricular changes particularly guiding the additional removal of specific courses. Jeremy commented that they changed the curriculum but they did not say why. They were not clear if it was based on assessment or how they came to those conclusions. Lisa asked Jeremy if this is something that he wants them to correct. Jeremy responded that it does not require resubmitting. Lisa suggested that the action step for this should be that the next time they submit a program review they should pay special attention to the fact when they are making curricular changes it should be based on evidence. It needs to be documented in the program review. Under Co-curricular experiences Heather gave commendation for demand for the program. The report had well-presented data on enrollments and student demographics over the past five years. Jeremy commented on sequencing. He noticed on the mastery map that they indicated that students attained mastery early on. The external reviewer pointed out that some of the students who aren't seniors are taking the senior seminars. They might want to take a look at that PLO. Charla commented that more language should be added around that in the letter. Charla noted that there are a lot of commendations and just a few small recommendations. Lisa commented that recommendation should be reexamining their PLOs, it was noted that students attain mastery early in the sequence. Jeremy commented that they have strong co-curriculars and strong faculty advising. Indirect assessment was a strong commendation. They are doing a good job tracking their graduate students. Charla made edits to the Philosophy letter.

C. Religion Program Review

Mike Shires and Heather Thomson-Bunn worked on Religion Program Review. Lisa went over Heather's comments. On Mission and Values, Heather gave them a commendation. She noted that Program Learning Outcomes meet expectations. Curricular changes met expectations. Lisa reviewed the recommendations and commendations for Religion. Mike Shires was concerned about the masters program. The external reviewer brought up the issue of the attention to the graduate students. The issues are pointing to the need to treat the masters as a separate program and revisit their learning educational outcomes and assessment models. They just don't pay that much attention to the grad students. The question of diversity is not present. Lisa commented that she didn't know that the Religion program has to be all Church of Christ. Lisa commented that it is one of their challenges. Charla suggested to combine some of the recommendations. Commendations should be on Mission and Value statements. Charla commented that she wants to take out 3. Program Depth and Breath. Charla suggested to eliminate demand for the program and she will take out trends. Lisa suggested to take out Core Competencies. Lisa commented that the master's degree is the overall problem. Charla noted to keep the comment about diversity. Charla suggested to combine 4 and 5 and it should be called Demand for the

Program. Charla combined Trends with Demand for the Program. Charla edited the letter for Religion.

D. OIE Program Review

Lisa showed what the data looks like when the form is filled out. Brad gave Lisa a name of a person who takes care of Google. Lisa had to provide the name of every program at the university with CIP codes, that is how she uncovered that there is a huge problem with the CIP codes in the university. Lisa is doing a six month project to clean them up. Lisa said nobody is in charge of CIP codes. The federal government is not lined up with WASC, which doesn't line up with any of the catalogues. Every school takes care of their own programs and sometimes they put them in PeopleSoft under a different name. Lisa cannot get this fixed until she gets the programs fixed.

Charla and Katie worked on the OIE program review. Katie commented that this program has gone through so many changes and more has been added to it. It was important to have that context. Charla commented that as the university is moving to the next stage of strategic changes in program review, the history shows how the university is building towards connecting to strategic planning, information sharing and the things the university is doing with WASC. Charla noted that she did not find anything that did not meet expectations. Katie noted that this was the first time that she used the non-academic program rubric. For this department Katie changed students to constituents. Charla agreed that OIE serves students but indirectly. Katie noted that there was plenty of survey data. Lisa commented that it is required that a program review is done on the OIE office for the WASC visit. Lisa commented that the only programs that do a comprehensive review are academic and co-curricular. Lisa asked: What are other programs are doing for review? Lisa noted that they get audited if they have problems, but there is no formal review.

E. GSEP Program Review

Brad and Seta worked on the GSEP Career Center. Brad noted that he will comment on the sections together with Seta. Outside Communities received a recommendation. They had opportunities to talk with clinics they work with and internships. They have outside involvement but Brad did not see this information in their section. Seta will go back and review this section. Seta will complete her part in the next couple of weeks. Regarding Program Learning Outcomes, Seta thought that they did a good job. They went back and they made sure that they were aligning. She said they should be commended because they made an intentional effort. There is a commendation under Services. It is a clearly explained and very strong section. There is a recommendation under Program Review Changes. Brad noted that it is important to discuss how the changes were made since the last program review. Under Benchmarking, Seta commented that she was not sure what measure Career Center would normally have. Brad commented under Student Trends, there is data and they need to put it into the correct section. Seta commented that they don't have the support to analyze data. Charla asked if there is any feedback on the rubrics. Brad commented that it was

easier and more clear. By next year we will have program reviews that were written using the new template and using the new rubric and things will align better. Seta responded that the Google form was easy to use and it was easy to read the comments. Charla commented that they will send out the next round of program reviews. They are still working on the WASC essays. Charla thanked everybody on the ASLC who worked on the program reviews. Lisa commented that next year all of the program reviews had been moved.

IV. Adjournment

- A. The ASLC meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.