

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

May 11, 2015 Retreat

7:30 to 11:30 a.m.

Catch Restaurant, Casa Del Mar, Santa Monica, California

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management
Katie Dodds, School of Law
Connie Fulmer, Seaver College
Connie Horton, Student Affairs
Colleen Mullally, University Libraries
Amy Tuttle Guerrero, 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

Members absent: Angela Hawken, School of Public Policy

I. Welcome, Announcements, Review of the March and April 2015 Minutes - Charla Griffy-Brown

Charla Griffy-Brown called the meeting to order at 7:40 a.m. The Council reviewed the March and April 2015 Minutes which were approved.

The Council discussed the Interim Report 2015 naming conventions for the 2015 appendices. The ASLC members should name their files by the title of the document and send the renamed appendices to Ross Canning or upload them directly to Google Drive by Friday, May 15, 2015.. Files should have a descriptive name of the appendix content to facilitate its inclusion as supporting material for the Interim 2015 Report.

Lisa Bortman will put subheadings into the text to call out the questions which are being answered. The body of the report must conform to the requirements set by WASC to answer only those parts of the 2012 Education Effectiveness Review Commission letter.

The Interim Report must be condensed and show both process and examples to answer the specific questions asked by the WASC Commission letter from the Educational Effectiveness Review. Noting both what the University has done to improve assessment since the last Commission visit and where the specific question subheadings are will help with clarity of the document.

II. Program Reviews

The ASLC discussed the Program Review deadlines schedule and whether the schools'

multiple programs should have their deadlines staggered to allow the ASLC more time to read and recommend the processes. April 30 and May 15 were chosen for due dates and would be assigned each year to the schools.

The ASLC review teams reported on their assigned program reviews and discuss the Council's responses.

Bachelor of Science in Management (BSM)

Two reviewers provided feedback on the program review suggesting that the interpretation of indirect and direct data is not consistently used and can be improved. Focus groups or faculty meetings may be used to analyze why the results turned out the way they did. They suggested better integration of indirect data to measure the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

Assessment software would be helpful to maintain the ability to aggregate and disaggregate data sets which will provide a richer base for trends and analysis while keeping the student identification information secure. More clarification on the meaning of Learning Assurance Standards is needed.

The reviewers found the student quote at the beginning of the document to be captivating and that was helpful for the reviewers. The ILOs and meaning, quality, and integrity sections were excellent. For the next program review they recommended including the plan to address those sections that were not meeting standards. This is an example of needing to know who the students they are so the populations can be better tracked and served.

The reviewers suggested going to a 4-point scale if using the decimal system of 1.25, 1.5, and 2, etc. for greater meaning and clarity. The Student/Peer evaluation was a great addition and the longitudinal report was well received.

FEMBA Program Review

The reviewers for the Full Time MBA program liked the interpretation of the data. There was a poor measure of diversity but they did a nice job looking at enrollment. The client feedback was great and the outline of lessons-learned-by-year was an excellent way to present the information. A recommendation for triangulation of student longitudinal data, tables, for each goal they want 20% of students but how many is that? A random sample would be fine for this vs. struggling to get the target N volume.

MSML (Management Leadership)

The evaluation team asked whether the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) were at competencies measured at graduation and noted that "increase" is not an outcome but a measurement of change. The curriculum changes were the result of sequencing (a change in when courses fall in the program). The reviewers asked why this change was made and asked for examples of how the program knew this change should be undertaken.

Assessment was not as strong as the former two programs at the School. Changes in curriculum did not include the reasons or process for these modifications begging the question of whether they looked at the changes systematically.

Full Time MBA

The reviewers found little clarity of where the assessment came from for this review. More background information and process are needed. An example of the need for more information is the absence of a justification of why 70% was chosen as the target threshold to reach and what was being done for the 30% of students who did not meet expectations. The assessment process is being strengthened but need more detail on the timeline and the 3rd party consultants (EDUVANTIS and Noel Levitz) and peer institutions to come more often. Need more detail on closing the loop. the ethics goal is commendable and good addressing of it in the progress report.

A response to the review should be added to the checklist.

Master of Science in Applied Finance (MSAF)

A reflection by year including results was helpful. “Issues raised, and issues addresses” was a good way to open this report. If integrity is reviewed, the assessment is really reviewed quarterly. Institutional Educational Outcomes are addressed in addition to Student Learning Outcomes which is great. The reviewers asked how the surveys chose their number value “N” and whether it was representative? The reviewers wanted to know what the action plan is for those students who are not meeting expectations. Goal 2 has a very difficult syntax to measure and the reviewers suggested revising it to make it more measurable. The ASLC suggested defining “integrity” for the program in the future as the full definition was it was unclear. The student data breakdown received praise from the reviewers.

Executive MBA

The reviewers noted that the class advisor roles need to be explained more fully. The scores on the rubrics were all very high so they suggested taking another look at redefining the rubrics. An explanation of the acronyms and colors in the graph would be helpful as well as the acronyms used on the evaluation report: “ME” = Meets Expectations. for example should be spelt out at least the first time. Grade inflation seemed apparent for this program and needs attention from the institution to determine if change is needed.

Presidential and Key Executive MBA (PKE)

This review was postponed until the next meeting.

Master of Science in Global Business (MSGB)

This review was postponed until the next meeting.

Master of Science in Organizational Development (MSOD)

The reviewers noted that a wide range of methods were used and the program was doing well closing the loop using a variety of sound strategies. However, the report lacked an external reviewer response and disaggregation of certain data. Another reviewer noted the program's students go to more than one country and the differences were clearly outlined but no comparison was presented.

Overall comments on the program reviews.

The ASLC members discussed the process by which reviews are written and distributed. Some outstanding questions remained including whether the ASLC wanted mid-cycle progress reports to be written and followed up. Additionally, they asked what kind of follow-up would be done to ensure that the program is addressing areas of concern raised by the ASLC; whether the deans and the provost should be engaged in this; and whether/where there is a problem with the program.

Charla outlined the historic stages of assessment at Pepperdine University: First is the stop-gap or Blocking & Tackling mode in which the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) was written and published in 2010 and the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) was published in 2012. The Compliance mode followed in which annual and five-year reviews were becoming the norm and a future Strategic Engagement mode is the next step in which the deans are more closely engaged in ensuring that the follow-up work in the Memoranda of Understanding are being implemented among their constituent programs. The ASLC recommended that the Provost become involved in planning out this next phase of the overall assessment strategy of the university.

III. The Nature and State of Assessment in the Academic and Co-Curriculum

The representatives gave a brief report of their assessment endeavors and share best practices with the rest of the Council.

Connie Horton reported that Dean Mark Davis asked his department heads to give him their Strategic Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Direct and authentic assessment processes are in place in the Co-curriculum and evolving to include fewer, better review projects vs. assessing everything. Closing the loop is a process that needs to be improved. The Council noted that one of the dilemmas they face is determining how much assessment is reasonable. Some schools have a dedicated staff or staff person to do that job while other programs have assessment added as an addition to very full job descriptions.

Connie announced that Brad Dudley will be taking on the Student Affairs ASLC position starting August 1, 2015 when she steps down in August to focus on her growing areas of responsibility in Student Affairs. The Council voiced their appreciation for her hard work on assessment at the university.

Katie Dodds noted that the School of Law is coming up on its American Bar Association (ABA) assessment deadline in the next year. The School is moving away from the stop-gap stage to the compliance stage of assessment management in preparation for the site visit which now requires

assessment. The Association of American Law Schools (AALS) has a three-day workshop which three School of Law staff will attend to learn what is expected by the accrediting body regarding required assessment. The site visit team is writing up the self-study and a new committee is rewriting the assessment and moving into the strategic engagement level described by Charla. The shift to a culture of assessment is slowly taking hold at the School.

The Strauss Institute is working on updating its assessment questions and helping the faculty update their syllabi to reflect assessment questions independent of the School of Law programs.

Charla Griffy-Brown - Graziadio School of Business and Management - Charla reported that the Learning Assurances Committee at the Graziadio School was not seen to have a strategic function so the members were not engaged deeply. The committee is now called the Strategic Management Council and is overseen by a program chair. The chairs are responsible for their own area assessment in each of the programs. Strategic Audits are required and include competitive analysis, connecting marketplace skills, and pushing alignment with school and institutional goals.

Colleen Mullally - University Libraries - A new information literacy framework was adopted by a national libraries body on which Pepperdine Libraries is working to realign itself. The framework is concept-based vs. skills-based. Information literacy is becoming a core competency and getting student work for Seaver College is an area which needs to be improved. The model of fewer, better projects is also being implemented at the Library.

The competencies to be attained by graduation are being reviewed and there is a discrepancy among the graduate student engagement and undergraduate engagement: the latter has a longer history of assessment data collection than the graduate programs. OIE is working on helping the Libraries sort this out. The University Libraries are interested in sharing assessment data with other departments and being a resource to help others complete their annual assessments and program reviews.

An assessment of library space use this spring will ascertain how the division is supporting students' use of space.

Colleen will be working on an program this summer regarding first-year student athlete study needs and how this population is studied across the University.

Connie Fulmer - Seaver College - More strategic engagement by the Seaver dean is occurring and the associate deans are working well with the new expectations. There is a long list of program reviews due this year and next year. The General Education assessment plan is ongoing and basic skills assessments are underway. Core competencies of writing and data analysis are being collected. Faculty attended two seminars looking at how to best start the assessment process.

Lisa Bortman - Office of Institutional Effectiveness - The alumni surveys were not about teaching and learning so OIE has been redrafting them. Specific questions were rewritten to ask about majors and add questions about learning. OIE sent off Humanities' and Natural Science's surveys last week under a faculty member name and the responses have been higher within just a

few days.

Amy Tuttle Guerrero - Graduate School of Education and Psychology - Parts of the division are in the Blocking & Tackling phase and others in Compliance and Engagement. Amy met with Dean Williams who is interested in engaging in assessment and receiving more WASC assessment training. One of the main emphases is revising syllabi to incorporate assessment, align with the University mission and strategic plan, and the Meaning, Quality, and Integrity definitions.

The School would like to engage students in the assessment process but is seeking a way to integrate students in a meaningful way with faculty support. A pilot will iron out the wrinkles and prepare the program to roll out across the two divisions. A quick fact sheet has been developed that will have key pieces of the assessment process and data collection laid out to ease adoption and collection of assessment data by the faculty.

The Psychology division has a group that completed the mini-grant but they do not want the report to be published. Executive summary would be fine. The final mini-grant report would be kept by OIE without publishing online.

Assessment artifacts need to be collected and retained; an LMS system will help with this and enable data mining.

A signature assignment can be within or external to the curriculum. A capstone can be used as a signature assignment but not vice versa.

Student work and confidentiality

The ASLC discussed how to code surveys so that students' identifying markers are removed but the unique identifier is retained to aggregate and disaggregate data as needed. Codes would be retained by a staff member on an encrypted computer. Student reviewer access to assignments that they have not taken yet is a concern at some of the schools and potentially stands in the way of more student involvement in program review work. Some of the schools have a printed statement for students to sign as part of their syllabi that some of the work will be archived for assessment purposes. Other schools voiced interest in utilizing such a statement.

Charla ended the sharing time by stressing the importance of communicating the larger strategic goals from the ASLC representatives to their schools and back to the ASLC.

Charla asked about the status of the Retention and Tenure Process and where the approval process was with regard to the provost. Charla will remind Lee Kats to ask Rick Marrs at their next meeting.

IV Assessment Software

Lisa Bortman updated the Council on assessment software. She recommends CampusLabs, TK20, or LiveText. The packages were evaluated on the following features: accreditation package, rubric, searchability, table production and graphs, surveys, integration with the LMS, student account upload, faculty accounts, and ePortfolios. The last item were deemed to be expensive so that requirement was dropped.

After a great deal of negotiation among the companies, LiveText will provide services for a 25% sample of students for \$45K per year. Institutional Effectiveness can contribute \$25K toward the project with a \$5K contribution per school to cover costs. Lisa will send the comparison information on the assessment programs to the ASLC members. The ASLC recommended advancing the LiveText option to the deans, provost, and budget officers to evaluate the program and find the funding for the program.

Charla asked that by the end of the week all appendices and description for the Interim Review should be submitted and any changes uploaded. Lisa Bortman will subtitle to sections (lisa)

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at about 11:30 AM. The final meeting of the academic year for the ASLC is scheduled for June 8, 2015, at noon in the Page Conference Room, Malibu Campus.