Program Assurance Committee  
November 21, 2014; 9:00 a.m. 
Minutes

Present: Theo Addo, Iana Castro, Andy Do, Gary Grudnitski, Heather Honea, Kathy Krentler, Amy Randel, Patricia van Damme

Absent: Steve Gill, Nik Varaiya

1. CBA Policy File Update
Krentler reported that the CBA Policy File changes the committee recommended to the Steering Committee with respect to the PAC have been approved. The proposed changes will now go to a college vote.

2. 2013-2014 WEAVE Deadline
PAC was reminded that the deadline for inputting 2013-2014 assessment findings and planned loop closings based on those findings into WEAVE is December 1, 2014. The 2014-2015 cycle of WEAVE will open December 15, 2014. Fall semester 2014 findings will need to be input into that cycle by May 2015.
   a. “Close the Loop”/Action Plan Tracking on WEAVE
      The committee viewed the “Close the Loop” section of WEAVE which summarizes all loop closing activities for a program over time. Krentler encouraged the PAC to review this section for their programs and to update the status of each loop closing activity listed as appropriate.

3. Student Releases
All samples of student work posted to WEAVE must have a release signed by the student on file. Krentler distributed the release form that has been developed by the university. Obtaining releases can be done “in batch” at the beginning of a semester from all students in a class where assessment data will be collected or, following data collection, only from students whose work is to be posted. PAC discussed the pros and cons of these two approaches. It will be up to each PAC representative which approach he or she wishes to use. The question of whether a “blanket” release could be obtained at program orientation for students in the MBA and EMBA programs. Krentler will pursue getting an answer to that question.

4. PAC Form Revisions
The committee reviewed and discussed draft revisions to the PAC supplementary form that accompanies curriculum proposals in the CBA. Due to changes in the curriculum process (i.e. Curricunet), three versions of the PAC form are required to cover all possible types of proposals:
   a. Program Change
   b. New Course
   c. Course Change.
After some tweaking to the drafts under consideration the PAC agreed that the three versions of
the form should be posted on the CBA website and linked to the “PAC Form” link found on the
CBA Academic Affairs page. Krentler will work with Mat Whitney to make this happen.

5. CBA Assessment Culture Survey Results
Krentler presented the results of the 2014 CBA Assessment Culture survey and compared those
results to the three previous bi-annual administrations of the survey. These results can be
viewed at http://cbaweb.sdsu.edu/assessment/culture. Generally it appears that the CBA’s
culture with respect to assessment continues to move in a positive direction. PAC departmental
representatives were encouraged to present and share this information with their departments.

6. AACSB Applied Assessment Take-Aways
Krentler shared with the PAC a number of items she learned while observing an AACSB Applied
Assessment seminar in October:
   a. AACSB Peer Review Teams want to see three things: What has been done to help
      students (most important), AOL system improvement, Faculty involvement in AOL.
   b. Implementing change(s) as a result of assessment findings is not the definition of
      “Closing the Loop”. The loop is closed when a DLO is measured for a second time
      following the implementation of a change.
   c. The AACSB 2013 Standards highly encourage the use of indirect methods in addition to
      (not in place of) direct methods. The standards also require that external parties have a
      voice in AOL. The best and simplest way to accomplish this is to involve an advisory
      board.
   d. Solid ideas for AOL system improvement include:
      i. For DLOs that are consistently met, it is fine to reduce the frequency with which
         they are assessed if the resources saved by this reduction are directed to other
         DLOs that need work.
      ii. 4 – 8 Program Learning Goals and 8 – 10 Degree Learning Outcomes for a
          program are generally sufficient.
      iii. New Program Learning Goals can be added and existing Program Learning Goals
           can be dropped as a program’s assessment efforts mature.
      iv. Undergraduate and Graduate programs measuring the same or similar goals (for
           example, critical thinking or communication) cannot use the same rubric. It is
           expected that rubrics used in Graduate programs will have higher expectations.
   e. With regard to posting information, raw data should be posted (this can be done
      through the Document Repository in WEAVE). Easy to follow graphics are preferred to
      long reports.

7. PAC Reviewing
As part of the discussion of Item #4 above, the PAC agreed that it is a good idea to monitor the
consistent use of a common set of course-level Student Learning Outcomes in multi-section
courses. The committee discussed a variety of approaches for accomplishing this. It was
proposed that the administrative staff, when receiving course syllabi from faculty members,
could easily identify any sections of a multi-section course that were not using the commonly
established SLOs. These faculty could then be identified to the PAC who would work with the
faculty members to make needed adjustments. It was agreed that since this proposal involved a new activity for the administrative staff that it should be discussed with the Chairs/Directors. Krentler will request that the item be put on the agenda for a future Chairs/Directors meeting.

8. Spring 2015
In Spring term 2015, the PAC will meet on the 2nd and 4th Tuesdays of each month from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. The first meeting of Spring term will be February 10, 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Next Meeting: Friday, December 5, 2014, 9:00 a.m.; Dean’s Conference Room