

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

June 16, 2014

9:00 AM to 12 noon

Catch Restaurant, Casa Del Mar, Santa Monica, California

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
Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology (via Adobe Connect until noon)
Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio
Ross Canning, Recorder

Members absent: Mike Shires, School of Public Policy

I. Welcome, Announcements, Review of the May 12, 2014 Minutes - Charla Griffy-Brown

The meeting was called to order at 9:32 am. Lee Kats gave a blessing on the food and the meeting. The May minutes were approved by common consent with changes to be made by 5 PM on 16 June 2014.

II. Program Review Updates - Discussion of Content and Feedback

The ASLC discussed the program reviews process and content in 2013-2014 and how to improve them. The Council recommended a chart of annual reviews and their requirements to help keep track of what needs to be included; this will be added to the guidebooks in the closing the loop section.

The presentations to the University Planning Committee (UPC) are short so presentations have to be on target and aimed toward the UPC members. Lisa Bortman noted that the UPC might benefit from some background information on the review process and learning the language of assessment. The Council discussed whether the UPC is the best committee for program reviews as the Deans' Council is where decisions are made with regard to programs and courses; and program reviews are usually conducted in the University Academic Council or it's equivalent at many other universities.

With three new deans coming on board now is the perfect time to make changes in closing the loop. The provost and vice provost can set the expectations and, in consultation with the ASLC, invite the deans to consider the following.

Steps for closing the loop

- A. ASLC receives program review from the department/program administrator(s)
- B. ASLC analyzes the program review
 1. ASLC provides feedback to the review writers
- C. Dean meets with the writers of the program review
 1. Dean writes MOU including the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP)
- D. Depending on what is needed following the results of the review, dean routes the MOU to UPC for an awareness and visibility presentation. If resources are needed, the dean shepherds that through. If curriculum change is needed, route to UAC for academic change.

Lisa suggested adding the new assessment process flow chart showing MOUs go back to the assessment director of each school and from them to their curriculum committee equivalent. Lisa will add the ASLC Assessment process for each school to our program review manual.

III. Mini-Grant reviews and decisions

The ASLC reviewed and discussed the four mini-grant applications for the 2014-2015 year utilizing the [Mini-Grant Assessment Rubric](#) to score each submission.

The ASLC reviewed the mini-grant applications and scored as follows.

1. [Melissa Huy](#), Measures of Student Learning Outcomes in Psychological Assessment: Does Technology Enhance Student Learning?
 - a. Progress Purpose/Contribution - 25
 - b. Literature - 10
 - c. Methodology - 20
 - d. Innovation - 20
 - e. Score 75 = The ASLC will ask Prof. Huy to reapply with more literature added for further consideration. Submission is due the first week of July 2014.
2. [Julie Chesley](#), REAPP: Rubric for Evaluation & Assessment of Pepperdine ePortfolios
 - a. Progress Purpose/Contribution - 25
 - b. Literature - 20
 - c. Methodology - 10
 - d. Innovation - 20
 - e. score = 75. The ASLC will ask for more insight into the proposal. The need methodologies and some specifics on which ePortfolio to use; and the faculty investigator should show focus on how to learn from the consultant

for rubric development - The ASLC will ask Prof. Chesley to resubmit her mini-grant application.

3. [Natasha Thaper-Olms](#), Piloting Classroom Response Systems in a Psychology Research Methods Course
 - a. Progress Purpose/Contribution - 20
 - b. Literature - 20
 - c. Methodology - 20
 - d. Innovation - 10
 - e. Score = 70. This technology is not used yet by the School of Psychology. Lisa Bortman suggested that clickers could be purchased and made available through the library to any faculty member who wants to use them. The ASLC will provide evaluative feedback to the applicant.
 - i. The Council wants a report on the results and sample size of the course piloted.
 - ii. The faculty member should be available for training/use by additional faculty.
4. [Owen Hall](#), Crowdsourcing Learning Assurance
 - a. Progress Purpose/Contribution - 25
 - b. Literature - 20
 - c. Methodologies - 20
 - d. Innovation - 25
 - e. Score = 90. The ASLC wants to ask Dr. Hall to do a research brief with OIE on past mini-grants and do a peer review publication. Outcomes include a peer review, a research brief, and an assessment process write-up.
5. The ASLC is looking at changing the rules so no more than three consecutive mini-grants may be granted to a single faculty innovator.

Break

IV. Writing WASC Interim Report (team exercise)

The members compiled the sections in teams which the ASLC needs to address from the WASC accreditation reaffirmation report from 2012. Charla will integrate the writings from the Counsel into a unified document showing how we have met the requirements for the next meeting. Any examples from other areas in the Interim report about which the ASLC member becomes aware should be sent to Lisa Bortman so she can help integrate it into the overall report.

--Continued--

V. Setting Goals for the Year. The ASLC discussed and planned for the following items in AY15.

- A. Process for “completing the loop” – connecting Program Reviews to budgeting process and resource allocation.
- B. Establishing Learning Assessment as part of Retention, Tenure, and Promotion.
- C. Finishing the ASLC portion of the WASC Interim report.
- D. Administrative inclusion in discussion, process, and awareness of program reviews.
- E. Look at the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) to see if any changes need to occur across the University.
 1. How can students be included more fully in the process?

The ASLC members should communicate with their schools and programs so the faculty and staff are aware of how their reports fit together and whom they touch; as well as demonstrating how they are useful in the program review and Learning Outcome processes. Information-sharing will show the community that the University is indeed making progress. We can offer feedback on how much work is enough so program reviews and assessment is not done to excess: e.g., performing too many surveys or collecting too much of the same sort of data.

The September and October meetings of the ASLC meeting will focus on solidifying the Interim Report text. The ASLC should communicate to the faculty the AY2015 timeline for program reviews, assessments, and the Interim Report. Connie Fulmer is sending each division chair a list of which departments have done an annual review over the past year and how they need to be included when compiling the overall 2015 report.

Charla Griffy-Brown will set the calendar for next year’s meetings based on workflow and goals so we can finish the ASLC portion of the WASC Interim report in a timely manner. Additionally we will continue alternating meetings between Malibu and Google+ Hangout video conference.

VI. Adjournment

The ASLC meeting adjourned at 1:35 pm with the conclusion of lunch at Catch restaurant. The next ASLC meeting will be on the Malibu Campus 8 September 2014.