

*Academic Senate Program Review
Memorandum of Progress/Closure Report*

Academic Advancement Program (AAP)

Review Dates: AY 2012-13

Progress Review Meeting: *May 11, 2015*

Participants:

Charles Alexander, Director, Academic Advancement Program
Masai Minters, Director of AAP Communications and Evaluations
Jonathan Carver Davis, AAP Graduate Student Researcher
Pat Turner, Dean and Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education
Jim Gober, Chair, Undergraduate Council
Alex Bui, Chair, Graduate Council
Ellen Carpenter, 2012-13 Review Team Chair
Kyle Cunningham, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate Office
Matt Robinson, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate Office

[This report summarizes the issues that were raised during the Progress Review meeting. Please refer to the Department's and the Dean's report for a detailed description of the actions taken by the faculty and the administration in response to the recommendations of the review report.]

Background

The purpose of the progress review meeting was to discuss the Academic Advancement Program (AAP) response to the 2012-13 Academic Senate Review report and to ascertain what progress has been made in response to its recommendations. Written responses were received from the program and Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education on April 10, 2014 and May 7, 2014, respectively. On May 30, 2014, Review Team Chair Ellen Carpenter recommended that a progress review meeting be held, and the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils approved delaying the progress review meeting until Spring 2015 so that AAP could collect and analyze important program data. AAP Director Charles Alexander provided multiple data reports on April 28, 2015. This meeting, on May 11, 2015, was an opportunity for Director Alexander, AAP director of Communications and Evaluations Masai Minters, and AAP Graduate Student Researcher Jonathan Carver Davis to discuss the evaluative measures put in place since the 2012-13 Review.

Evaluative Approach

Director Alexander explained that AAP has formed a research collaboration group that includes research experts from UCLA Division of Undergraduate Education. This group determined that AAP was too large and too diverse to evaluate as a single unit. Instead, data was collected and analyzed for the various parts of AAP, including the Freshman/Transfer Summer Program, the

Peer Learning Program, and general, ongoing review of AAP students' GPA and academic performance.

Freshman/Transfer Summer Program

Review Team (RT) Chair Carpenter asked for a summary of the findings for AAP students who participate in the Summer Program compared to those that do not. Director Alexander responded that one main goal was to gauge student satisfaction and see how much students utilize the services offered. Because the summer bridge students represent the students with the highest need in the AAP program, it can be difficult to compare them to non-summer students. Even so, the analysis shows that students grow in confidence, find the program worthwhile, and feel prepared for UCLA. RT Chair Carpenter asked how the analysis gauges confidence, other than asking students how confident they feel. Associate Director Minters answered that they looked at the students' willingness to meet with faculty members during office hours and willingness to engage Teaching Assistants for help.

General AAP Analysis

Graduate Student Researcher Davis explained that compared to other institutions, UCLA's AAP student fare well in terms of graduation rates and GPA. Associate Director Minters added that UCLA's Black and Latino AAP students have the best graduate rate in the UC system, and are second in the country to the University of Virginia

Ongoing Assessment

Vice Provost Turner asked if this process has helped develop a "culture of assessment" in AAP. Director Charles responded that previously, it was difficult to track AAP members. Now, though, through the "Community of Scholars," AAP has cohorts that it can track. This has fundamentally changed the approach to analysis at AAP, and data is routinely collected in multiple formats. He added that he is finishing a paper on the assessment model to share with the academic community. Associate Director Minters added that AAP used to advertise itself and make programmatic decisions based on anecdotal data and feedback. He and the rest of the AAP staff are glad to have firm data in hand to back up this anecdotal data. For example, anecdotally, AAP saw higher participation from female students. The cohort analysis backed this up, so the program is taking steps to encourage more male participation.

Recommendation

The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils acknowledge that AAP has responded satisfactorily to the 2012-13 Academic Senate review. The councils hope that the actions taken after the review have helped to develop a "culture of assessment" in the program, and that this will continue. The councils recommend closing the review and scheduling the next program review on a normal 8-year cycle in AY 2020-21.

Approved by the Undergraduate Council: May 22, 2015

Approved by the Graduate Council: May 29, 2015