

## ASLC Meeting Agenda -WLA

Thursday, October 7, 2010

9:30 a.m.

1. State of Assessment Reports (please bring a hard copy or email a copy to the group—again this is not a “complete” report, but a status update of what you are aware of)
  - a. Discussion items
    - a. Assessment infrastructure at each school
    - b. Action plans
    - c. Necessary components: SLOs, Alignment Maps, Assessment Plans, and WASC Exhibit 7.1 (see attached)
2. CPR Visit Review
  - a. Discussion items
    - a. Comments from the closing session (including the role of ASLC)
    - b. Consultation with Cyd Jenefsky, Joy Asamen, and Chris Collins
      1. Revisit the ASLC Charter
    - c. Path to the EER document (see attached)
3. Upcoming Meetings
  - a. Discussion items
    - a. Program Review Workshop, November 11 and 12
    - b. Half or full day meeting/retreat
    - c. Regular meeting schedule
      1. Proposed 2/month: 1 in person, 1 in teleconference

## MINUTES

Introduction of the agenda and discussion of consultation with WASC visiting team member Cyd Jenefsky.

Cyd encouraged us to look at structural issues, to define partners, and become agents for increasing faculty ownership and engagement of quality assurance.

Discussion of quality assurance, partnerships, change related to the UAC and the UFC.

The UAC will be an important regulatory partnership as it relates to ensuring the use of learning outcomes and overall curriculum structure (i.e. curriculum maps).

The role of the UPC is related to the budget, but the scope of the body and ability to influence is not totally clear. The UPC has the “illusion of inclusion.”

Discussion of charge to work across schools, and the question, “do the schools want to do this?”

We can work on recommendations that we would like to make concerning issues of collaboration.

Discussion about the consultative or decision-making role of the UFC.

Perhaps the UAC is where we get more collaboration while the body is in flux and we have an opportunity. The UFC because of history, politics, and personality is limited in its governance role and has had little function.

The UFC discusses faculty life issues.

International Programs and service learning are high impact areas that might help us to leverage collaboration. These are two big items that also help define Pepperdine, in addition to the Christian mission. Initiatives to bridge all five schools, and does not have to fit under any of the models we have. This might be an opportunity to brand Pepperdine as a single institution.

It was acknowledged that this is a very good idea. It allows us to accomplish something very quickly, good focused strategy, unifies us under the umbrella of our larger mission, less difficult to find people energetic about working together.

We need an organizational map and it needs to coincide with our resource map. This is a very good start. We have a more concrete idea about an organizational structure that may allow us to achieve the concerns about universal/shared goals.

The biggest partnership for ASLC is the UAC

The UPC theoretically has consultative authority with the executive structure.

WASC wants us to have a handle on where the money comes from and how it gets placed.

This will alleviate the suspicion. The power is in the hands of the Deans and the executive administration. In terms of faculty ownership that depends on individual faculty and deans.

It was acknowledged that this varies tremendously across schools.

Arbitrariness about funding comes from the external pots in the president or provost office that faculty are not a part of the conversation.

Discussion about transparency. We need a map between the organization and the resources. and if we are going to effect change by the EER we need to have a starting point.

It was agreed that we need to commit some quality time to this discussion, perhaps the retreat.

The important thing to point out is: Who makes decisions and what do they make decisions about? And why and how?

## INFRASTRUCTURE AT EACH SCHOOL

Connie F: Explanation of Seaver processes, role of the UAC proposals, program review workshop, role of Seaver Academic Council, formation of Seaver Assessment of Learning Council, first meeting is Oct 13. See State of Assessment

Joy: Challenge to find a point person in the education division: See State of Assessment.

To do: send Assessment Plan sample.

Mike: Focusing on what we mean by the language in our objectives. How do we take our own language and integrate them into the IEOs adopted by the university. We need to talk about what is distinguishing between what we do and revisit our curriculum matrix to capture those changes as well as additions from service and leadership. See Memo, SPP Assessment Development Plan

We haven't collected data on some things and we have not used the data in other areas.

Request to see rubric from internship in SPP.

Request to alignment maps to IEOs from GSEP and GSBM

Connie H: Student Affairs See State of Assessment

Charla: Graziadio, Infrastructure through AACSB and the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence, looking at IT infrastructure for storing assessment information. Biggest challenge is making sure we can automate the process and store the data. Standardization. Human resources are also a challenge. Graziadio's faculty council will increasingly plan an important role.

Next meeting: November 3, 2010, 2-3:30p.m. Counseling Center, Malibu

Retreat: December 15, 2010, 10 a.m.-3 p.m., Santa Monica

Phone meetings to be scheduled.