

Advancement of Student Learning Council Minutes

November 9, 2022

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Braun Conference Room and Zoom

Members Present: Tonya Wood, Chair, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
Katie Dodds, Caruso School of Law
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
Charla Griffy-Brown, Graziadio Business School
Lee Kats, Vice Provost, ex officio
Seta Khajarian, Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Kim Miller, Online Programs
Dean Mark Roosa, University Libraries
Michael Shires, School of Public Policy

Members Absent: Heather Thomson-Bunn, Seaver College

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks

A. Chair Tonya Wood opened the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

II. Business

A. The Advancement of Student Learning Council approved the October 12, 2022 meeting minutes.

1. Item IV on the minutes was discussed and it was clarified that a high-level ILO overview is what will be presented at the Board of Regents' Academic Affairs Committee meeting. The suggested revised ILOs will not be shared. The ILO revision process and the Board of Regents' role in it was reviewed.

III. Program Reviews

A. Seta Khajarian presented that because the Chemistry and Nutrition programs undergo extensive external reviews for accreditation, to respect faculty time, these programs will not complete a standard program review. They will instead submit their external report along with an addendum addressing any information requested in ASLC program reviews that is missing from that report.

1. A member noted that a similar conversation arose in last week's University Athletics Committee meeting, as athletic programs are perpetually assessed by accrediting bodies including NCAA. It was asked how assessment is adjusted for programs that undergo more frequent, in-depth assessment than others due to their external assessments, to cultivate a more equitable environment for assessment. Current methods were provided, including working with specialized certification assessment data in program reviews.

The difficulty of coordinating over 100 programs and external specialized accreditation schedules with internal program reviews was acknowledged. Suggestions for coordination were discussed, including an aggregate document listing assessment dates. It was noted that external reviews do not address the program's relationship with Pepperdine's mission and values which is a core purpose of the program reviews.

2. A member asked how it is known which programs are due for review. Seta Khajarian explained the tracking process and brought to attention information available on the OIE website.
- B. Seta Khajarian highlighted updates for future program reviews.
1. Sections will be added to program reviews on equity and ILOs. Prompts for the equity section will be shared with ASLC at the Retreat. The ILO section will serve to encourage programs to start thinking about data collection.
 2. Creating a template for doctoral degree programs was discussed. The current template addresses undergraduate programs' focus on core competencies and GEs, but omits the doctoral programs' other foci.
 3. The Committee was updated on the Campus Recreation program's later review this year pending the Director's return from medical leave.
 4. Seta Khajarian commented on encouraging programs waiting for their external review to submit their other review materials once ready, instead of waiting for a complete packet, if that suits them.

IV. Flash Report Summary

- A. Chair Tonya Wood led the Committee in discussing the logistics of Flash Report presentation for the UPC and UAC. It was decided that Chair Tonya Wood will present. Various ASLC members offered support given their knowledge of the Committees, their focus, and questions that might be asked. It was clarified that the Flash Report summary of ASLC's work from 2021-2022 year program reviews would be presented, rather than a specific program review's data, and that the Committees would not be asked to respond but be encouraged to ask questions.
- B. The history of ASLC presentations at these committee meetings was reviewed. It was described that there was a presentation of a program review, followed by the program's Dean/Vice President/Director discussing their response to the review. A member commented that this step will proceed, but would follow the Flash Report summary presentation of strength and improvement themes found across all 18 program reviews the year prior. It was suggested that this is part of ASLC contributing to Knowledge Sharing and accountability.
- C. A member suggested framing the presentation in the context of supporting the Strategic Plan, and that financial impacts on the institution might be requested. It was responded that the financial impact is not known at this point but this may be

forthcoming with the QIPs. Members discussed what aspects may be emphasized to be relevant to each Committee.

- a. UAC was described as a beneficial audience as they approve the programs, thus sharing this information would provide followup for this work.
- b. UPC was described as one where a brief refresher on the program review process would be helpful, followed by a tie to the Strategic Plan and accreditation. As program reviews inform the budget, and UPC works on the budget process, presentation of MOUs was described as beneficial. It was commented that the budget process is about to start so this presentation is behind schedule, and ASLC should get back on track with coordinating these presentations earlier so that the data can be used to inform the budget process decisions. It was clarified that MOUs for last year are still being collected.
- c. Providing each program's program review flash report was suggested as a way for members to review complete content before the presentation. This may be particularly helpful for presentation to the programs' Deans/Vice Presidents/Directors as they recommend changes in resource allocations.

D. Chair Tonya Woods will learn more about adding this presentation to upcoming UPC and UAC agendas.

V. ILO Finalization

- A. Members reviewed the tracking sheet of proposed ILO revisions. The process was summarized. Members reviewed whether each of the former ILOs were represented in the suggested ones. Pepperdine's mission statement was referenced. It was explained that there is a tracking sheet of how PLOs map onto ILOs, and that this mapping is not expected to change much as the suggested ILOs contain the same core concepts of each previous ILO; what would change is the number ILO the PLO is mapped to, not the idea. Members tested the applicability of the suggested ILOs on an existing program's current ILO mapping.
- B. Why ILO revisions are advantageous was reviewed, including reducing redundancies and updating verbiage. A member who recently worked on mapping expressed that mapping would be made easier with the suggested ILOs as in their example their work would be more applicable the way the ILOs are phrased in the suggested revisions. A member commented that when a new program begins, PLOs and courses could be more intentionally mapped around the ILOs as this is difficult to do for older programs before mapping was tasked. Members were reminded that this project is not a requirement, and it was explained that ASLC takes on a University project every 2 years, OIE presented ILO revision as an idea to align with peer institutions, and thus it was pursued. How, and the purpose for, ILO incorporation into the rubrics was reviewed.

- C. Language being changed rather than tied together between the former and suggested ILOs was discussed. It was decided that “faith formation” will be suggested as this is an element the University is recently articulating more intentionally as part of their Christian narrative and as a distinguishing University characteristic. Incorporation of diversity, equity, and inclusion terms were discussed. The implications of using these words given the current social justice context as well as leaning into the University’s more prominently adopted terms of “community” and “belonging” was discussed. The Pepperdine Community Belonging page, Strategic Plan, and WASC and CHEA language were referenced. Members were reminded of the project’s purpose to condense and make more efficient the ILOs and that language change appears to be more of a substance change. Members were reminded that these suggestions are preliminary and will be reviewed by numerous stakeholders before adoption.

- D. Members decided to continue the ILO discussion at the next ASLC meeting and acknowledged continuation of the Committee’s year theme of equity through this discourse.

VI. Adjournment

- A. The meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m. The next ASLC meeting will convene on January 11, 2023 in the Braun Conference Room and via Zoom.