Attendance

Holly Menzies, Andrew Chavez, Jessica Dennis, Michele Dunbar, Benjamin Lee, Parviz Partow, Andre Ellis, Laura Whitcomb, Karin Elliott Brown, Jennifer Miller, Bill London, Michael Willard

Not in attendance: Amy Bippus

Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

Announcements

- Michele announced that part of the NSSE results may be available at the end of summer, rather than in October as it was previously reported.

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Ben motioned to approve the agenda. Laura seconded the motion and the agenda was approved. Jessica motioned to approve the minutes from July 5. Ben seconded the motion and minutes were approved.

Review of Essay 5

The Essay 5 team leads will have draft a final by August 2. Jen will be adding in some data on Student Life assessment.

Essay teams should make edits based on feedback from steering committee members. They should save any content that is cut from the essay on a separate page so that other essay teams could use it, if necessary.

CFR Feedback:

- CFR 1.2 – This CFR is addressed adequately in Essay 4. Once the final draft is compiled, the Steering Committee will decide which pieces of supporting evidence of compliance with this CFR should go in each essay.
- CFR 2.7 – This CFR is addressed adequately in program review. However, this essay will need to more evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations (examples of evidence: President's Advisory Board, Centers and Institutes, Alumni Survey, Career Center, EPIC Office, S4, CCOE connections)
- CFR 2.13 – The section of the essay that addressed this CFR (Student Life/Support programs) is strong and well-written but needs more links to the specific student support areas as evidence.

General Feedback:
- The description of transfer pathways needs data to support the narrative.

- The 6-Year Graduate Rates chart should be edited to reflect that the 55% goal comes from the Chancellor's Office and that we aspire to improve beyond the 55% goal.
- It should be included in the essay that the campus is increasing visibility through the expansion of programs through PaGE (i.e, DTLA Campus).
- The charts and figures on page 6 are already included in Essay 1 and should be removed. Those included on page 7 can still be used in Essay 5.
- One or two sentences of description are necessary to help the reader understand tables and figures.
- When the abbreviation "URM" is used in the report, there should be a footnote explaining that Cal State LA uses a different term for underrepresented minority students but we recognize that URM is a .
- Terry Iler may be able to provide some more information on the Student Success Strategist initiatives and Grad 2025.
- The section on the WPE and the GWAR should be removed.

Review of Essay 6

The Steering Committee provided the following feedback on Essay 6:

- Though we have examples of how we have changed curriculum based on assessment, we don't have as many examples on institutional decisions that have come from assessment. One example to highlight in the essay is the syllabus audit for General Education which identified that not all syllabi had PLOs and was used as evidence to help establish the CACs.
  - Jason Shiotsugu may have some information about external grants awarded to the institution that could serve as evidence for institution-wide changes based on assessment.
  - Another example of evidence to include is how the institution has made changes based on student outcomes survey data from Institutional Research, such as the NSSE.
  - The committee members questioned whether the continuous improvement aspect of the essay is adequately addressed. Some examples to support this component are: university-wide staff trainings and workshops, ITS strategic planning, university-wide strategic planning, library strategic planning.
  - Marcia Murota may have data or information on how advising has been improved since the introduction of the Student Success Fee for advising.
  - Another example to include is how the advising center in the College of Business and Economics keeps track of student appointment information and how it uses that information to change their advising processes.
- It could be highlighted that the Associate Dean of HHS is starting a college assessment committee. ECST and CCOE currently have one and NSS may be starting one.
- The committee suggested adding two headings titled "Resources for Assessment" and "Institutional Faculty Development".
- For information on the library, Essay 6 can refer mostly to Essay 4 but Essay 6 can highlight some examples of how resources and support for information literacy were improved as a result of assessment.
- For the section on Staff and Faculty Change Management, the language can be changed to "sixteen" instead of "nearly seventeen".

- Related to continuous improvement, it was mentioned that the Office of the Dean of Students has received more student complaints than in previous years as a result of the restructured and streamlined grievance webpage. However, only one of those complaints has become a formal grievance.

5-10 Minute Reports from Team Leads (if any)

N/A

Questions or Concerns for the Steering Committee

- Should essay leads begin to cut down the essay?
  - The leads can begin by considering the feedback from the committee members. Then, as they edit their drafts, they can remove any narrative sections and keep them in a separate page for use by other teams once all drafts have been compiled into one report.
- Should the CFRs be identified in the essays?
  - Team leads should include CFRs at the beginning of their essays. If they are already included in the body, leads don't have to remove them from the essay and can instead move them to the start of their essays.
- The Steering Committee will review the updated calendar at the next meeting.
- For Essay 7, statements about campus resources can include financial resources, human resources, or infrastructure. Examples don't all have to include financial data.

Summer Meeting Schedule: 7/19, 8/2

Essays 3 and 7 will be reviewed on June 19th.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:32 a.m.