ACADEMIC PLANNING, ASSESSMENT, & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Date: December 13, 2016

Time: 3:00-500pm

Place: Academic Affairs Conference Room

<u>Present:</u> Michael Visser (chair) Kathy Morris, Daniel Soto, Suzanne Rivroire, Kaura Krier, Karen Moransky, Karen Schneider

<u>Minutes:</u> Kathy Morris

- Agenda Approved
- Minutes: Approved

REPORTS FROM THE CHAIR:

- Program review policy from UPRS will be circulated prior to the winter break. It has a template that looks complete. Richard Whitkus will be invited to come for the first meeting in January to give us an introduction to the process. One question is how School Curriculum Committees are to be utilized. The goal is to run it by EPC some time in early February perhaps.

BUSINESS:

<u>1) Discussion of Budget Cycle</u>

Budgetary Priorities:

Michael's scheme to come up with a list of 10 or so items that we could start with and get feedback to scale back to 5-6. Goal is to come up with some items (low hanging fruit) that we can all get behind. Michael's brainstorm:

- o   Student related issues:
    - ➢ advising effectiveness (including workloads/ratio in all "high demand" programs); proactive engagement with students (e.g., having background info ahead); build systems for infrastructure for advising; (usability and does it save people time).
    - ➢ Enhance career services (alumni, workshops, mentoring, internships, mock interviews, resume building, job fairs…) -- has a social justice component to it and it could improve graduation rates … tied academic trajectory

> ➢ plan to reduce/eliminate academic obstacles for students (e.g., unnecessary forms, automate the unavoidable ones);

- o Faculty/staff/admin related issues
  - ➢ systemic morale problems with inversion, compression, and stagnation for faculty, staff, and admin.
  - ➢ "reset" the appropriate rights and responsibilities of faculty. (Kathy- caution to think about "shifting normal" Daniel – attention to "time budgets" of how faculty's time is

- o Programmatic Issues
  - ➢ Sustainable systematic assessment. Karen M. will be a good resource here.
  - ➢ Faculty Development
  - ➢ Infrastructure/Technology for instruction and other work (perhaps we're in the process of establishing better systems, e.g., the sub-committee will be vetting tech for supporting instruction and co-curric…)

Job for committee members to continue thinking about these categories, other categories, lists…

We want to keep things on the list, even if we see that they are being currently addressed/focal… (e.g., Stevenson renovation – they seem like they're on it, but we want to reiterate its value.).

Strategically we might want to have plausible mechanisms/strategies in mind, but we don't necessarily link the strategies with the priorities. We ought to include the rationales for each of these. And ensure that there are metrics.

Budget Cycle Process:

Not a policy – but just a tool to keep ourselves on track.

What is our process for reaching everyone who plausibly should have input? (Probably not a survey)

Probably there should be an end of year senate report.

- August/September/October — Outreach
- October/November/January — Synthesis
- February/March/April/May — reporting and advocacy,
- June & August - reflective period (assess/program review/watchdog)

2) Faculty Consultation and Budgetary Policies:

Michael met with Richard Senghas and Ben Ford to begin to talk about updating the Decision Making policy and on rescinding the Budgetary Matters policy. Ideally we'll be ready for a 1st read of the revisions in January.

There is a need for consideration of grainsize (university/school, etc. level.) This may pick up something from the document that is being rescinded, acknowledging that "sub University level" consideration is important. Perhaps adding a phrase about "administrators providing transparent information in budgetary complexity" in order for recommendations to be made in informed ways. Laura points to and emphasizes the mutuality of sharing budgetary information and considerations.

(Michael shared Lauren Morimoto's quote from a previous meeting, "we need to empower our administrators to take bold actions". Taking the "budgetary Matters" policy off the books is an expression of trust for the current administration." Policy should be forward looking and based on setting the culture we aspire to. "(consultation, mutual, shared, transparency,) language signals a shift.

Section B: primary responsibility of faculty is a major clause. Laura suggests being quite careful on the last sentence, e.g., Title 5 in the ed code.

Might be language to clarify or replace the middle sentence in section b.

Action Item: Michael will work on this for the next meeting.

3) Assessment

Karen M.: 3 levels of assessment. The latter 2 of them are the province of this committee — Assessing the Assessment.

    a) Course level assessment, how to improve assessment, etc.
    b) Program level assessment
    c) Institutional Assessment

➤ **Program level assessment:** APARC might be summarizing program review, consider the kinds of assessment programs for example: are doing that are both direct and indirect.. (that is, indirect = student satisfaction survey for example, direct = using what students are actually doing, evidence of learning outcomes to evaluate programs.)

APARC could push depts.. and/or push for more faculty development around direct assessment for example.

If more data is needed in specific areas, Karen's office can find ways to gather more data or find it... for specific questions.

School assessment coordinators group may also be useful including Heather Smith, Emiliano Ayala, Kirsten Ely, … to help provide consultation.

➤ **Institutional Assessment:** We can get better at framing that institution wide story.

Years of data in *NSSE surveys* that are just in Sean Johnson's office. Part of the routine, we might factor in time for us to talk about what those data are telling us? (e.g., a questions in that data is "would you come back to SSU" and "would you recommend that others come to SSU" Nobody has every had a

systematic way of looking at/summarizing these. APARC could look at this to help us prioritize based on student feedback.

Also – institutional learning outcomes— "best practice" that WASC is pushing for. We could have conversations about what we might want as a campus. Also, the *Core Competency Assessment.* We have this data that we've developed and collected. We haven't figured out how to disseminated or used.

There is a need to be careful that we don't make WASC to be the whipping boy… We want to do assessment because we want to know how our students are doing, base our decisions based on actually what our students are learning and struggling with. Not because wasc tells us we have to. But there is a reality of needing to also provide information.

GE Assessment: another level of institutional data that is under-interrogated. We need to figure out better ways of assessing, figuring out the important data…

Action Item: Karen will get Core Competency Data to Michael.   Karen will get Sean Johnson's NSSE Data to Michael as far back as it is digital.

Karen requests help in looking at and summarizing the core competency and the NSSE data help us tell the story (ideally for WASC chapter 4).