

Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee
September 27, 2007 (Approved)

Present: Carlos Andres, Fan-Yu Lin, Whitney Ragsdale (recording secretary), Rosanne Roy, Jim Tuedio

Absent: Chad Stessman (excused-at UEPC), Erin Bowe

Guest: Bowman

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm.

1. Meeting day/time

Consensus: Meet once a month on Thursdays, 1-2, in FDC 113. Check on UEPC dates to assure no conflict for Stessman.

2. Election of Chair

Jim Tuedio was elected. Bowman to notify Chair of UEPC.

3. Carryover work from last semester

a. Review of Charge

Roy summarized discussion at the last meeting of the 06-07 ASL Subcommittee regarding the problem of turnover on the committee. It takes a while for the new faculty coming on each year to get up to speed regarding issues and priorities. Assessment is a specialized area and if you don't have background, it's difficult to contribute to an informed discussion. So, the question discussed at the last ASL meeting was whether members of the PACs have a specialization that should be present in the makeup of this committee. Tuedio suggested at the very least we should invite a few of them to attend our meetings when we think our discussions would benefit from their input. Roy stated last year's ASL committee wanted a more permanent position with them. Lin added that last year's PAC seemed more connected to UEPC than the ASL Subcommittee in regard to its focus on learning assessment. Roy stated it is important to have people who are doing assessment involved in the process of addressing the issues that are under the purview of the ASL Subcommittee. Tuedio asked how the PACs get their instructions and Roy replied she works with them as Faculty Coordinator for Assessment and her role is to support faculty assessment. The Vice-Provost also plays a role in determining priorities for the PAC's. Roy stated she feels assessment is growing on campus and that the ASL Subcommittee needs to be more involved in overseeing what is going on. The committee members concurred with this observation.

Tuedio wondered whether the new GE Director, who will have considerable responsibility for assessment (since the charge is written suggesting this person will effectively manage assessment of GE), should perhaps serve on the ASL Subcommittee as an *ex officio* member? Roy replied that although no relation to the ASL Subcommittee is stated in the position description, it would be very important to establish one. The committee concurred with this and Tuedio agreed to communicate our recommendation to SEC before they finalize the draft position description for Senate approval.

Lin asked if ASL Subcommittee worked with any committees other than UEPC and Roy replied no, though the Assessment Coordinator and the Chair of the ASL Subcommittee do sit on a new university-level assessment oversight committee that is projected to meet several times a year. The ASL Subcommittee has not been visible on campus. In fact, part of the focus of the Inquiry Circles is focused on trying to fine-tune the role the ASL Subcommittee should play in the larger assessment picture.

Bowman suggested inviting Chair of UEPC Filling to the next meeting to discuss any work UEPC might want ASL Subcommittee to do. It will also be helpful to talk to Stessman since he was Chair of GE last year.

Tuedio questioned who is managing PAC and Roy replied she is, but leadership comes from two directions. She stated she tries to stick to what is meaningful to faculty, but the funding of the PACs is from the Vice Provost's Office. Originally there were specific expectations for PAC's, but we have learned we need to be more flexible with departments. But in the end, she stated, her role is to make sure the PACs are accountable while trying to keep the process meaningful to them. She coordinates the meetings and takes feedback from the PACs, but there is pressure from the Vice Provost's office to look to see who hasn't produced viable outcomes. Tuedio asked if there has been any reaction from the Vice Provost's office to what has been produced. Roy replied it has been positive. We have gone from non-assessment to a process where many departments are now starting to produce assessment initiatives from the ground up. Funding was originally given for a two-year experimental period but the reality is the assessment work is extremely time-consuming and most PAC's agree it would be important for this funding to continue to support the departmental coordination of additional assessment practices. She noted that since we are in a WASC review cycle, and we have incentive start-up funding in place, it might not look good when they come back later and see the funding was taken away. So, she is hopeful funding will continue. Roy suggested we might try to get money moved out of the Vice Provost's office into Faculty Development to help ensure that assessment initiatives remain a faculty-driven enterprise. Although the Vice Provost's office has been fairly flexible in response to PAC and faculty concerns, we have no way to gauge how much longer this will continue. What is clear is that this flexibility has been crucial to the success of the PAC process up to this point.

Tuedio asked if the ASL Subcommittee has any responsibility to review what the PAC process produces. Roy replied the PACs have been producing plans and updates to what is happening in departments. But thus far the ASL Subcommittee has not had a chance to review any of the assessment practices (which are only now reaching a stage of implementation). It would make sense for the ASL Subcommittee to be involved, but we have to have people informed of the process. Tuedio suggested the idea would not be to micromanage the process but only to review the accomplishments of PAC activity to see what the outcomes look like, to get a sense for what have become assessment priorities for programs, and to become more familiar with the practices they are experimenting with. At some point those lagging behind will start to feel pressure. They might very well come to the ASL Subcommittee for advice on how to respond. It would be helpful for us to have a sense of what's going on as a result of the PAC activities. Roy advised that the current initiative is to put all assessment plans on the CSUS website. We can download and look at them. Tuedio asked if other CSU's are doing this and Roy replied yes. But she has not had time to review their materials to see what they're doing; she stated she will try to download a couple of models for the committee to look at. Tuedio suggested it might be good to access materials from campuses and programs with which we have commonalities. It should all be about highlighting possibilities, not conforming to other practices.

Tuedio asked what kind of relationship this committee is supposed to have with the Academic Program Review Subcommittee. Bowman replied that this committee was dissolved when faculty approved the Academic Program Review Policy and she thought this policy shifted these decisions to the college level. Tuedio wondered if the ASL Subcommittee should consider developing a relationship to the college level of review. Bowman will provide the link to the Academic Program Review Policy for subsequent review and discussion.

After much discussion, Bowman will provide the following documents to be reviewed:

- ASL Coordinator position
- GE Director Position
- 2006/2007 ASL Subcommittee Report
- Assessment Plan
- Proposed changes to the ASL Subcommittee, membership and charge

- Program Assessment Coordinators description

Roy to provide the following documents:

- Assessment Leadership Team description (Johnson felt there may be too much overlap)
- Roles of people in Academic Affairs (I'll talk to Rosanne about this)

Carryover item from last year's agenda:

Proposal to amend ASL Subcommittee membership to include PACs.

Bowman explained if this amendment was sent to UEPC, and if approved there would then go to SEC, then to FAC (for constitutional amendment), then back to SEC, then to AS, then to GF and, if approved, to the President.

Re: Agenda for next meeting:

Review the recommended revisions to the charge of ASL Subcommittee.

Review the proposal to have members from PAC serving on the ASL Subcommittee.

Tuedio suggested the GE Director might be an appropriate member to have on the ASL Subcommittee. After discussion, there was consensus to recommend to SEC that the GE Director serve as an *ex-officio* non-voting member of the ASL Subcommittee. Tuedio will develop a letter stating such and send to Speaker Johnson before next Tuesday's SEC meeting (10/02).

Roy noted that while Faculty Director Schulz is a non-voting member of the ASL Subcommittee, the two of them discussed his role and decided that Roy would act as a liaison to him. Still, it is important for him to remain an *ex-officio* member of the committee since he has some responsibility to secure and provide resources for instructional assessment; so he will remain 'on call'.

Note: Roy asked if the committee was going to meet next week with the external reviewer for assessment. Bowman replied she has not been contacted (though later in the day we were notified to attend). Tuedio stated if the committee meets, have the Principles of Assessment on the table. Bowman to provide.

Meeting adjourned at 1:50 pm.