

Advancement of Student Learning Committee
DRAFT (ASLC) Minutes

January 10, 2014
12 noon to 1:30 PM
Page Conference Room, TAC 417

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management
Connie Fulmer, Seaver College
Connie Horton, Student Affairs
Katy Kerr, School of Law
Amy Tuttle Guerro, Graduate School of Education and Psychology (T)
Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio
Ross Canning, recorder
(T) = Attended via telephone

Member Absent: Mike Shires, School of Public Policy

The ASLC meeting was called to order at 12:03 PM. Charla Griffy-Brown opened the meeting with prayer and business was conducted over lunch.

- I. Call to Order, Welcome, Announcements, Review of [November 11, 2013 minutes](#).
 - A. The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.
- II. Business
 - A. Program Review Guidebooks
 1. Connie Horton gave the background on the rewriting of the [Program Review Guidebook for Student Affairs & other Non-Academic Departments](#). She talked the Council through the sites where the academic and the non-academic guidebooks diverge.
 - a. A new introduction was written that is specific to non-academic programs
 - i. References to a graduating class or cohort were removed as they were not applicable outside of academic programs.
 - ii. The introduction highlights the educational role of non-academic offices in the University, which are involved in “supporting the broad spectrum [of] learning of students” (p. 4).
 - b. Section A II - Analysis of Evidence (pp. 8-9)
 - i. Service-related data collection and student learning outcomes are both really important so these areas were updated.
 - c. The whole document is staff-focused but there are still references to faculty (such as librarians) who play a significant role in some of the

- non-academic programs and offices.
 - d. Meaning, Quality, and Integrity defined (pg. 10)
 - i. This section was added to highlight the new WASC standards.
 - e. External review checklist updated to match the [Program Review Guidebook](#).
 - f. Amy Tuttle asked for clarification in Section II B (p. 8 of the [Non-Academic Guidebook](#)) regarding inclusion or not of Student Learning Outcomes and whether there should be language delineating when and where SLOs are required or not. In some cases, SLOs are a bit forced from some non-academic programs. OneStop is a case where one department has different functions under the same structure; for instance, the registrar may not have SLOs but the student advising office should have.
 - g. Departments and programs for whom this non-academic guidebook applies: student affairs, admission, career services,
 - h. After the update is made and the document formatted, the document will added to the [documents of record](#) folder in Google Drive.
2. [Program Review Guidebook](#) - Connie Fulmer and Lisa Bortman.
- a. Connie Fulmer related the history of the assessment guidebook that has become the new academic Program Review Guidebook.
 - i. Various updates have been made to clarify that both faculty and staff are involved with assessment of programs and monitoring learning outcomes; that the guidebook is going to be read and used by undergraduate as well as graduate school faculty and staff to draft their program reviews; and the glossary of terms section were added.
 - b. Lisa Bortman is trained by WASC on the meaning, quality, and integrity section of reports, so she can give tutorials if anyone has questions on how to draft the reports or needs more clarification.
 - i. The University Academic Council (UAC) wants to see the evidence for course or program changes. Any proposals for these changes that come to the UAC need to show this evidence in order to get the proposal accepted.
 - ii. At Seaver, every academic change needs to show evidence (data) and the Academic Council is not shy about returning proposals if they are incomplete.
3. Students can participate in some programs in either an academic or non academic way like *The Graphic* for non communication majors.
4. WASC wants to see how the five core competencies look at the time of graduation; not as general education course levels.

B. State of Assessment Reports

1. Assessment Scorecard: Lisa Bortman suggested that the Grading Sheet needs to be normed because the progress question needs to be on a continuum instead of a static radio button scale.
 - a. Lisa noted that most of the program assessment reports would be best served to spend energy on closing the loop and methodologies vs. what was important for the CPR and EER.
 - i. Amy Tuttle appreciates the annual report template section that notes what can be included as evidence.
 - ii. The Council discussed how triangulation of assessment to the learning outcomes is missing from most reports, e.g., “When you assessed the learning outcomes, did you also use any authentic assessment (e.g., science labs), direct (e.g., test, essay), or indirect assessment methods?”

C. RTP - Datasheet wording update

1. Charla met with the chairs of the tenure committees to discuss the recommendations of the ASLC to update the RTP data sheet wording. She will soon compose an email to the RTP committees to move the ASLC idea forward for the adoption of the assessment-related updates to the Datasheet.

D. Curriculum Procedures by School Project

1. The ASLC members reviewed a chart showing the myriad processes among the schools to get course and program changes made at the school and University levels. Lisa Bortman shared that a main difficulty with the disparate processes is that petitions for a program or course change are all too often rejected by the University Academic Council (UAC) because the applications do not contain justification supported by data to meet the UAC standards for a course or curriculum change.
 - a. Sometimes, annual and five-year reviews are the driving force behind the sought changes, in addition to external pressures or marketing needs that have short timelines for implementation.
2. The ASLC determined that it could help educate the school curriculum committees about the importance of data collection and triangulated justification on their applications for program and course changes as these proposals work their way up from the program, school and University Academic Council levels. The ASLC will make suggestions to the UAC to explain why data are necessary and how justification would help achieve the goals of the new programs or courses.
 - a. Lisa Bortman will draft a letter to Jay Brewster, chair of the UAC, to offer the ASLC’s help in showing the importance of data collection.

E. Annual Program Review Discussion

1. Annual Program Review Discussion

- a. Amy Tuttle noted how having access to all of the annual program reviews from all of the schools can inform programs and departments as they update their own reviews. She inquired where all of the annual reviews are stored at each school.
- b. The Council discussed the need for curriculum change processes to be aligned across the University. WASC wants annual assessments to be easily accessible. ASLC has decided that at least internally, full program and annual reports should be shared with the whole Council.
 - i. Annual assessments are located as follows and interested parties may contact the ASLC representative to get access.
 - i. GSBM - On Sakai "Learning Assurances GSBM"
 - ii. Student Affairs - Google Docs
 - iii. GSEP transitioning archive to Google Docs
 - iv. SPP?
 - v. SOL has no annual reports so storage is unallocated.
 - ii. The Council discussed what should be on public-facing sites and Lisa Bortman indicated that OIE is hosting program reviews for all of the schools; but the Council felt that the content needs to be approved by the deans for public access. Lisa Bortman is reviewing what is posted as OIE transitions its website to a new platform.

III. Other Business

- A. Lee Kats and Lisa Bortman shared that WASC has a new requirement for the accreditation process. Universities are required to benchmark themselves against a self-selected group of other higher education institutions to compare graduation and retention levels. Pepperdine University has been approached by the institutions below and Drs. Kats and Bortman suggest that we establish some reciprocal agreements to share our information with a select group of other institutions to meet this WASC mandate.
 - 1. We have provided our graduation and retention rate data to the following universities.
 - a. Loyola Marymount University
 - b. Chapman University
 - c. Concordia University
 - d. University of Southern California
 - 2. The selection of institutions can be very strategic as we determine with whom we will compare ourselves. The list of comparison institutions can be tailored to each Pepperdine school and does not have to match the peer and aspirational listings already in use.
 - 3. ASLC members were asked to enquire with their deans which schools would be the best to compare for this report.
- B. Charla Griffy-Brown asked the Council to review what will be on future agendas.
 - 1. The February meeting will include the following:

- a. Lists of comparison universities concerning graduation and retention rates with which we will have a reciprocal exchange of data for a new WASC benchmarking report.
 - i. ASLC Members will bring suggestions from their schools for their school-specific list. The lists do not have to match the peer and aspirational lists used for other benchmarking purposes.
- b. Annual Program Review
 - i. ASLC members will share the templates and show their progress on annual program reviews at their schools.
- c. New version of assessment scorecard
 - i. Lisa Bortman will give an update on the newest version of the assessment scorecard.
- d. Draft Language for the University Academic Council to communicate its requirements for program and course changes to the academic councils of the schools so more applications for these changes arrive at the UAC with the data and justification needed for Council approval.

IV. Adjournment

March

Lisa Bortman - Quality, meaning and integrity definitions.