

**Advancement of Student Learning Committee  
(ASLC) Minutes**

May 12, 2014  
12 noon to 1:30 PM  
Page Conference Room, TAC 316

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management  
Connie Fulmer, Seaver College  
Connie Horton, Student Affairs  
Katie Kerr, School of Law  
Mike Shires, School of Public Policy  
Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology  
Pheysaun Crawford, Student Representative, Seaver College  
Claire Kewish, Student Representative, 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

I. Call to Order, Welcome, Announcements, and Review of [April 14, 2014 minutes](#).

The ASLC meeting was called to order at 12:02 PM in the Page Conference Room, TAC 316, on the Malibu Campus. Connie Fulmer offered the blessing on the food and the deliberations. The two student representatives were introduced: Claire Kewish is a Seaver graduate in public relations who is studying in the GSEP Teacher Preparation program; and Pheysaun Crawford is a Seaver College student. Amy Tuttle joined the meeting in progress.

Charla Griffy-Brown gave an update on the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) policy update that incorporates assessment, which is still making its way through the faculty groups. Due to summer breaks, the various school committees and faculties will have to take up the amendments to the form again this fall when the CFA meets again.

II. Business

- A. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) has changed its name and the division to which we report will be called the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC).
- B. WSCUC Interim Review Preparation Status and Audit Form - Lisa Bortman
  1. Lisa developed a new form for the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) use

called Alignment of Project Inventory 2014 following her participation at the WASC ARC conference in Los Angeles. It highlights what needs to be included for the next WSCUC institutional report due in 2015; allows the ALO to keep track how the institution is moving toward being in compliance with the new WSCUC standards by school and program; and offers a place for the ASLC members to highlight outstanding examples of departments or programs doing great assessment work or provide examples to areas that need additional support as they work on assessment for their departments/programs.

2. Should the annual and five-year reviews be made open to the University community or only within the schools?

The Council discussed the pros and cons of opening the reviews to a wider audience. Some schools are okay sharing across the University and others preferred to keep it in-house. Each member will make their repository available to Lisa Bortman as ALO.

#### C. 2013 - 2014 Program Reviews

1. [Seaver Teacher Education with GSEP](#) - Charla Griffy-Brown & Connie Horton

Connie and Charla felt the program review was good overall. Multiple methodologies were used to assess the program as well as varied benchmarking systems. They commented that the small sample size made the use of some graphs questionable.

The external reviewer had one big finding: Provisional Accreditation was granted because the schools did not meet Standard 2; but in the Quality, Improvement, and Integrity section, this was not addressed.

The report demonstrated that the program meshed well with the mission of the University and showed how.

Charla Griffy-Brown thanked Connie Fulmer for clarifying that this report was based on another. She noted that because the population is so small, the program must find methodologies that allow for the program to dig deeper.

Claire Kewish said she had a great experience in the Teacher Ed Program at the master's level. The hands-on part of the experience made it very memorable and applicable to the job. There were some challenges with

instructor accessibility, course material access, and clarification of requirements, such as the CSAT scores being current throughout the program.

Mike Shires suggested that the report needs to have more explanation about closing the loop and the section on concluding thoughts; each needs to be more fully developed and be more complete. The transition was abrupt and the content too abbreviated to communicate it well.

Connie Fulmer noted that the two sides of the program (Seaver and Graduate School of Education and Psychology) need to have a single standard for orientation, program delivery, and access to faculty for office hours.

C. Seaver Student Affairs: [Pepperdine Volunteer Center](#) - Connie Fulmer & Michael Shires

1. [Pepperdine Volunteer Center: Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education - Self Assessment Guide](#)

Mike Shires commented that the Pepperdine Volunteer Center has very strong assessment process. It has well-defined outcomes, assessments and methods for reviewing their results.

The Volunteer Center is focussed on diversity but that is fairly one dimensional; further investigation regarding gender, faith, and other diversity markers/measurements would strengthen their report and potentially expand their program opportunities to many other areas that may not have an equity component but which could be worthy endeavors. Most of the assessment methods are survey-oriented and could be expanded into focus-group or interview methodology.

The program utilized many direct measures, especially in the Jump Start program in which work study is *required* but is sponsored by the Volunteer Center, which seems to be in conflict. Shires recommended that they look at more than body counts as a marker of program strength.

Connie Fulmer asked where the Volunteer Center got its data. It was self-collected, according to Lisa Bortman. Dr. Fulmer applauded their choice of external reviewers who were extremely complimentary. The reviewers recommended starting an advisory board, which the Volunteer Center had in 2010.

Several suggestions were made concerning Step Forward Day and working with other departments sponsoring service-learning programs.

Pheyschaun Crawford spoke regarding the benefit of the Volunteer Center. The federal Jump Start program requires a certain number of work study hours in order to participate. This last year a student who was eligible for fewer than the minimum number of hours available had to pay the difference back to the school or program in order to participate. The students would like to have more information, clarity, and balance to the policy to allow more students to participate.

Claire Kewish participated in the Social Action and Justice (SAAJ) program and was frustrated that she could not continue to volunteer in the program after she was no longer enrolled in a class that required those hours. Students would benefit from having clarity regarding which volunteer programs are open to volunteers and defining why some options are closed to students who are not registered in a particular course.

Lisa Bortman reviewed the assessment portion of the review and noted that too much assessment was done for this report. She recommended picking and choosing which ones to do year after year so there can be some longitudinal data analysis for the next five years review. Select repeating questions for annual surveys but avoid survey fatigue.

The ALSC members gave feedback that the school programs might dive deeper on a few questions vs. asking a multitude of questions and surveying that becomes excessive. They also recommended more collaborative projects in the future between institutions.

PowerPoint from Synergy consulting was used in the production of this review.

D. Seaver Student Affairs: [Counseling Center](#)

1. [Counseling Center Student Program Review - Synergy Consulting Presentation](#)

Amy Tuttle commented that the report was clearly written, was thorough, and followed a well-defined assessment process. The report was written according to the old guidebook which had some sections missing from the new ASLC review guidebook.

Amy noted a number of segments in the report that would benefit from some

additional information or tying together sections through linkages to their evidence from the assessment data. Her report may be found [here](#) with further details regarding the following categories:

- Self-study: professional development recommendation should be addressed by the department.
- Assessment plan: the Counseling Center data collection had no information listed.
- Closing the loop: seek professional development and disclose what and how it is going to be done.
- STUDENT EVALUATION DATA: Consider more attention to diversity
  - How do they account for gender difference?
- Explicitly disclose and label evidence type as direct, indirect, or authentic.
- MEANING, QUALITY, INTEGRITY: How can we support programs in providing a more evidence-based discussion in this section?
- Consider discussion of students not accessing services.
- STUDENT SUCCESS: Include all schools in percentage of students graduating; not only one school.
- When reporting statistical opinions, report the full range, not just a subset; or perhaps leave it out.
- Use of Undergraduate/Graduate Students to Deliver Programs: feasibility and collaboration across the University?
- DECISIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS: More direct connection to SLO assessed
- ACTION PLAN/CLOSING THE LOOP: Method of tracking improvement could be more clear.
- DECISIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS PRIORITIZED FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGETING: Connection to strategic planning and budgeting could be more clear.

Connie Horton clarified that the mission of the Counseling Center is the Malibu Campus. Three areas in which the Counseling Center focuses: 1) Counseling, 2) outreach and prevention, and 3) training (of resident assistants, among others).

Katie Kerr was impressed with the breadth and depth of data collected and how much assessment was done. She had a number of comments on the mechanics of the report.

Pheyshaun commented that the counseling center was a useful resource and that it was so accessible to the students.

Lisa Bortman mentioned that it is difficult to do assessment in some programs like counseling because of client confidentiality. The Counseling Center is doing well despite this limitation. Focus Group assessment was very good methodology for the Counseling Center to do because there are no surveys that are adequate to get into the data. The best part of this five year review is the external assessment. It was suggested that programs might collaborate more to reduce the number of surveys to help alleviate survey fatigue among the students.

E. Two agenda items were tabled until the next meeting:

1. Assessing the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and School-level Learning Outcomes - Charla Griffy-Brown
2. ePortfolio Update - Charla Griffy-Brown

III. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:48 PM. The next meeting of the ASLC will be at 9 AM on Monday, June 16, 2014, at *Catch* restaurant in Casa del Mar hotel, Santa Monica, California.