

**Advancement of Student Learning Committee
Minutes**

April 28, 2016

10:00 - 11:00 a.m.

Adobe Connect Video Conference from the Lamb Conference Room, TAC 134

Members present: v. Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management
Brad Griffin, Seaver College
Katie Dodds, School of Law
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
Colleen Mullally, University Libraries
v. Michael Shires, School of Public Policy
v. Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio
Ross Canning, Recorder
(v. remote video attendance via Adobe Connect)

Absent: Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio

I. Welcome and Call to Order.

Charla Griffy-Brown called the meeting to order at 10:03 AM in a virtual meeting format.

II. Business

A. Discussion regarding the comments on LiveText Program Assessments.

The ASLC members discussed some of the logistics regarding inputting five-year program reviews in LiveText vs. the former paper format. They commented that there are two areas in which comments may be made: on the form and another location within the rubric itself. The latter records comments anonymously while on the form, the user name is associated with comments.

The ASLC discussed the various levels of accepting and approving five-year reviews and settled on a staged plan in which the review will be accepted conditionally with various levels or sections of the report pending further writing or clarification. This will help the deans draft their Memoranda of Understanding and the Quality Improvement Plans for which the department will be responsible to implement.

The processes of drafting the assessment report by the ASLC chair and the MOU by the deans were discussed. The Council agreed that centralized comments from the ASLC would be most helpful. The Council discussed and agreed upon the process for accepting reviews as follows.

~Continued~

Program Review Process: Levels of conditional acceptance of a program review

1. Program Review Accepted (Level 1). ASLC chair will send a letter indicating how to improve future reports. The department/program may proceed with ongoing assessment and QIP implementation and the next review will be on schedule in 5-7 years according to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness's Program Review schedule:
<http://oie.pepperdine.edu/program-review/program-review-schedule.aspx>
2. Program Review Conditionally Accepted (Level 2). A resubmission is required for an incomplete report section within one month of the receipt of the review letter from the ASLC chair
3. Program Review Conditionally Accepted (Level 3). Re-submission required of all missing items by the date indicated by the ASLC chair
4. Program Review Incomplete (Level 4): Submission of the full program review in three months' time, including a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) and timeline for implementing the QIP, required. After re-submitting the plan an interim report will be required following the WASCUC mid-cycle review model at a time to be determined by the ASLC chair in consultation with Pepperdine University's WASCUC Accreditation Liaison Office

The ASLC will work to clarify the program review core competency requirements and invite divisions to join an assessment process training meeting when a department is asked to re-submit a plan. The next steps include focusing the MOU on the program level and range from asking those who have done assessment to upload the past annual reviews or for those who have not begun assessment, to develop an assessment plan as part of the Quality Improvement Plan.

The ASLC discussed the data input and review process of recording comments for reviews in LiveText and settled on the following process.

Review-entry process in LiveText:

- 1) Input comments into rubrics
- 2) Chair takes notes at meeting
- 3) Chair copies notes into Overall Comments section, and
- 4) sends a review summary letter to the department chair

When departments are falling short of assessment and program review best practices, the ASLC will ask them to write an assessment implementation plan and submit an interim report on their progress. Departments must make sure that they connect to the mission and use data to support their claims and/or have evidence supporting the basis for change. The ASLC noted that student involvement needs to be included in all programs.

The ASLC reported on the following program reviews during the meeting.

5-year Program Review	Reviewew 1	Reviewer 2
Science Physics	Mike	Amy
Science Chemistry	Katie	Brad G

III. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at about 11:15 a.m. with plans to continue presenting the remaining program reviews at the Annual Retreat to be held on May 10, 2016, at *Catch*, Casa del Mar hotel, Santa Monica, California: 7:30 AM breakfast | lunch at noon | adjourn around 2:30 PM.