ASC Research/Evaluation Theme Team Minutes - FINAL  
Tues., Nov. 12th, 2013  
12:00pm – 1:30pm  
Campus Center – 2

**Members Present:** Pat Flood, Sarah Master, Monica Moreno, D’Art Phares, Dennis Schroeder, Bob Smazenka

**Members Absent:** Michael Allen, Angela Echeverri, Leslie Milke, Mike Reynolds, Jan Silver, Hanh Tran

**Guest:** Dr. Matthew Lee

1. **Review of current agenda and the minutes from the 10/8/2013 meeting**
   - Both the current agenda and the minutes from the 10/8/2013 meeting were reviewed and accepted

2. **Discussion of the suggested timeline for the completion of the tasks that are outlined in Dr. Lee’s gap analysis report**
   - The group reviewed a handout (attached) that listed the four tasks from Dr. Matthew Lee’s gap analysis report in one column, and in another column the specific actions that need to be taken to achieve those tasks as well as target completion dates for each action were listed.
   - There was consensus that the actions and timelines looked acceptable. It was discussed that some of the dates may not be feasible, but that we will do our best to achieve the targets that have been set.

3. **Discussion/revision/adoption of the proposed system for setting priorities among research projects and review of the proposed contents for the associated research request form**
   - The group reviewed a handout of suggested guidelines for assigning priorities to research requests and a handout outlining suggested contents for a research request form.
   - There was consensus that both handouts looked acceptable. It was discussed that requestors need to be specific/explicit in the reasons they give for their requests and that this can be a focus of the training that goes along with the rollout of this new system.
   - There was a discussion that “distributed research” is necessary and that tools could be provided to users who are interested so that they can access the data they need on a basic level. Smazenka agreed to draft a recommendation (for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, or OIE) to this effect.
   - It was agreed that all research requests being sent to the OIE should be copied to the appropriate department chair (for Academic Affairs requests) or to the appropriate immediate supervisor (for Student Services and Administrative Services requests) so that they can be aware of the requests being made and can also help supply data/information if applicable and available.
   - The proposed system for setting priorities among research requests and the accompanying form (once it is created) will be forwarded to the President for his consideration.
4. Brainstorming on “campus training needs in the development, application, and interpretation of data, particularly though not exclusively for participants in the program review and outcomes assessment processes”
   - Smazenka proposed that training be offered on how to acquire data (e.g., “data access and execution of research”). It was discussed that we would need to find out how much interest there is in such training.
   - It was discussed that people need help understanding what they are looking at in the program review screens and need help with basic data interpretation.
     i. It was suggested that, at Flex Day, a breakout session could be offered (for just department chairs?) in which we could go through the program review screens to discuss how they should be completed.
        1. Could give examples of what good and not-so-good responses are on the program review screens
        2. Session could include discussion of trends, patterns, outliers, etc.
     ii. Those who complete the program reviews for the Student Services and Administrative Services units could also use help at a basic level with trends, patterns, and outliers even though they are looking at different types of data
     iii. One-sheet primers could be created on how to interpret the data presented, and this could be a topic of discussion at a “brownbag” type session as well.
   - It was discussed that, after receiving basic training on data interpretation, it would be helpful to ask department chairs what additional data they would like to know in order to be more effective and to make improvements in their departments.
   - Another training topic of interest is outcomes assessment using rubrics.

5. Items from the floor - None

6. Adjournment

Next meeting: Tuesday, Dec. 10th; 12:00pm – 1:30pm, CAI Arroyo Room
### Suggested Task Timeline

#### Draft, November 8, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Suggested Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>i.</strong></td>
<td>Develop and recommend to the President a system for setting priorities among research projects. OIE should then disseminate the approved system, and adhere to its provisions in allocating research resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ii.</strong></td>
<td>In consultation with EPC, SLOAC, the Council of Instruction, the SSSC, Administrative Services management and staff, and others as appropriate, determine campus training needs in the development, application, and interpretation of data, particularly though not exclusively for participants in the program review and outcomes assessment processes. Then develop a calendar of training sessions to help meet those needs during 2013-14, effectively disseminate that calendar with a sign-up mechanism, facilitate the sessions, and provide the opportunity for participants to evaluate them and suggest additional training. The Deans and Vice Presidents should strongly encourage all participants in the program review and outcomes assessment processes to sign up for at least one training session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>iii.</strong></td>
<td>Evaluate and recommend specific improvements in the data OIE customarily collects and provides (or should collect and provide) for program review in both instructional and noninstructional areas, and in other major planning and evaluation processes (such as the outcomes cycle), in light of the increasing need for data disaggregated in multiple ways to illuminate diverse student needs. The Dean should implement those improvements that can use existing data sets and production tools at the earliest feasible time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>iv.</strong></td>
<td>Evaluate and recommend concrete improvements in OIE support of ongoing, robust, and pervasive dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. Included in the improvement options considered should be a series of periodic research briefs, reports, or newsletters to inform the campus community about research resources and findings, to promote campus-wide dialogue about institutional effectiveness and student learning, and to help develop a culture of evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested focus for 2013-14: Program review process**

- OIE development of preliminary list of improvements, based in part on program review feedback: November-December 2013
- PROC discussion and revision of preliminary list of improvements: Meeting of December 10, 2013
- OIE and IT review and revision of preliminary list of improvements: December 2013
- Feedback on preliminary list of improvements by EPC, PROC, SLOAC, and other groups as appropriate: December 2013-February 2014
- RATF review and adoption of final list of improvements for Spring 2014 cycle: Second meeting in February 2014, TBD
- Gain approval(s) as needed: February 2014
- Implementation: OIE and IT to implement improvements by the beginning of the Spring program review cycle
- OIE analysis of feedback from planning and evaluation processes and other evidence, identification of further improvements as appropriate, and implementation of improvements for the next year: Spring 2014 and annually thereafter

**OIE development of list of suggested improvements: November 2013-January 2014**

- RATF review, revision, and adoption of recommendation: Meeting of February 11, 2014
- Gain approval(s) as needed: February 2014
- Implementation: Spring 2014
- Evaluation and improvement to take place annually as part of OIE program review process