Advancement of Student Learning Committee
(ASLC) Minutes

March 10, 2014
12 noon to 1:30 PM
Page Conference Room, TAC 316, Malibu Campus

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
Mike Shires, School of Public Policy
Amy Tuttle Guererro, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio
Ross Canning, Recorder

The ASLC meeting was called to order at 12:04 PM in the Page Conference Room, TAC 316. Business was conducted over a working lunch following Michael Shire's blessing on the food.

I. Call to Order, Welcome, Announcements, and Review of February 10, 2014, minutes.

    A. Minutes - The minutes were approved by common consent.

II. Business

    A. Final deliverable requirements and/or support for mini-grants from ASLC.

        1. Last time the Council discussed the support needed and deliverables for which grant winners are responsible and what information needs to be made available to the awardees so they are better supported and know what is required.

        The Council discussed the timeline of the mini-grants and agreed that the cycle should change to a two-year term; invitations will still be sent out in April 2014 for the future cycle.

        The ASLC members suggested that each school follow up with the grant winners to remind them of the deliverables and find out how they are doing. Additionally, the ASLC members will suggest outlets for publication of the grant project to the winners which can include journals, University events (such as the Fall Faculty Conference) and others to present their deliverables to the wider scholarly

community. The ASLC will provide a more detailed list of expectations for the grants and where grant winners should publish or present their work when completed. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will post final publications on the OIE website.

B. Draft Language for the University Academic Council (UAC) 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.

1. The ASLC was going to provide some language on how the process of UAC works. Lisa Bortman will draft a version and run it by Charla Griffy-Brown and then bring it to the ASLC for comment.

Lisa Bortman reported trying to make tables for the UAC course and program approval but there is no way to unify the schools' disparate processes. She suggested starting with the UAC requirements and work from the top level down to the school committees. The Council discussed the different foci among the UAC, school curriculum committees and the ASLC. The determination was to make an annotated example of a good proposal to provide to the various committees and councils in order to streamline the curriculum and program updating process.

C. Validate scorecards for your last report.
Katie Kerr has the School of Law's form and Amy Tuttle and Connie Fulmer uploaded theirs on the Google Drive.

The Council discussed the usefulness of the scorecard and whether the numeric data points will be abused/misinterpreted in the future. Internally, we understand what the numbers mean and need to make certain that the qualitative narrative continues to be held close to the quantitative data.

The value of the scorecard is to look at strengths and weaknesses. The faculty are encouraged to discuss the outliers on the scorecard, keeping in mind that the data is not intended to average out and show trend lines over time.

D. Review the Retention,Tenure, and Promotion policy suggestions from ASLC regarding course and program assessment.
Charla will follow up with the schools to see where the process has moved within the committee levels of each school. Ultimately, the decision will be sent to the Provost's Office for enactment.

E. The WASC Meaning, Quality, and Integrity definitions presentation.
   1. Lisa Bortman, director of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Pepperdine's Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) for WASC, will offer a synopsis of the WASC "Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of the Degree" Workshop.
   "... Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees"

   Lisa reported that the workshops on assessment, surveys, and other topics are going very well and many faculty members are participating.

   The WASC Interim Report outline has been given to each of the schools' representatives. The timeline for completing the Interim Report will be discussed at the ASLC summer retreat. The sections for each school should be started as soon as possible, aiming for concise narrative and good examples from the school context. The plan is to have a draft by fall.

   The ASLC members discussed the importance in WASC policy of having student representation on school- or university-level program review and assessment committees. Few of the Pepperdine schools have student representatives on their assessment committees. The Council decided it was important during mini-grant and program review time to have student members attend the ASLC meeting(s). An update to the Council charter is pending.

   Interim Report

   Lisa Bortman reviewed the WASC Interim Report handout that outlined the areas in which Pepperdine University must improve and which the interim report will address. These include:

   1. Assessment infrastructure
   2. Transparency
   3. Strengthening learning outcomes
   4. Strengthening assessment methodologies
   5. Closing the loop
   6. Benchmarking
   7. External Constituencies
   8. Program Reviews
   9. Teaching and Learning
   10. General Education
   11. Student Affairs
   12. Institutional Learning Outcomes; Assessment of Faith and Heritage; and Community and Global Learning

   Lisa believes that overall, the University is doing well. One segment on which to work is the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), that the dean or

unit vice president/provost must write in response to the program review report. Currently, the MOUs are not returned to the assessment committees (neither the ASLC nor the schools' committees) so closing the loop is an issue.

As the University matures, the outcomes should be more sophisticated and mature. The level of the learning outcomes need to be improved. We need to have more transparency about how we will close the assessment loop and need to improve our benchmarking and analysis of programs using documented sources. WASC can see that we are doing assessment, but the next step is to note how the University is benefiting from the exercise of assessment; how it is impacting teaching and learning; and how trends across programs and schools are being improved. One of the most challenging sections is the collaboration between the school academic programs and Student Affairs, as the goal from WASC is to show how Student Affairs' programs and efforts are improving the meaning, quality, and integrity of all of the degrees and programs at the University.

Meaning, Quality, and Integrity (MQI)

Lisa outlined seven of the main components of MQI according to WASC (see Meaning Quality and Integrity handout, pp. 5-6). WASC wants us to consider what any given degree looks like at the University. Upon graduation, how can we show that MQI criteria are being met? What are our standards of performance? What does a student accomplish upon graduation and what makes us look unique and how the mission of the University accomplishes this task successfully?

Lisa led the Council through an exercise of reviewing an assessment from the view of a WASC evaluator using the lenses of MQI. The key questions to answer are

In an assessment report, quality is demonstrated by defining the outcome to measure; identifying the tool used to make the assessment; defining the methodology of the assessment tool; and presenting the results clearly and concisely. Short concise treatment of these points is preferred.

The Council discussed the components that WASC reviewers are looking at including benchmarking, which is a comparison between two or more things based on a standard or baseline and measured against other instances of the test (external benchmarking) or against itself over time (longitudinal benchmarking). To establish quality, one must have a standard against which to compare. A threshold must be set and compared to itself over a period of time or compare it against other sample sets using the same survey or test. The purpose of the benchmarking is to establish whether one's set threshold is significant, valid, sustainable, and/or reasonable; and to reset

the threshold or base line, as needed, following analysis of the benchmarked trend.

The Council will discuss further examples in the future. Charla Griffy-Brown and Lisa Bortman acknowledged that this sort of MQI assessment is the next step to which the University programs must strive.

F. Peer and aspirational school lists for the WASC review concerning retention and graduation.

Lisa Bortman reminded the graduate school representatives to pass her the lists for their four peer and aspirational schools including the reasoning for their inclusion on the graduate school's list. The list does not need to be exclusive to California schools.

IV.   Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:48 PM. The next meeting of the ASLC will be at noon on Monday, April 14, 2014, on Google+ Hangout.