

Approved June 13, 2016

**Advancement of Student Learning Committee
Minutes**

May 10, 2016 Annual Retreat

7:30 AM - 2:30 PM.

Catch restaurant, hotel Casa del Mar, Santa Monica, California

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
Brad Griffin, Seaver College
Colleen Mullally, University Libraries
Michael Shires, School of Public Policy
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
(v. remote video attendance via Adobe Connect)

Absent: Katie Dodds, School of Law

I. Welcome and Call to Order.

Charla Griffy-Brown called the meeting to order at 8:03 AM at *Catch* restaurant, hotel Casa del Mar in Santa Monica. The members briefly spoke about summer plans. Michael Shires offered the blessing and breakfast was served.

The Council discussed LiveText and how reviews might be combined through a report for ease of the Chair's review when writing the ASLC program review reports.

General Education (GE) at Pepperdine is half a degree (63-65 units) while the national average is 37 units. Many of the departments rely on the GE courses to fill out their teaching loads and increase their enrollment, which might otherwise be lower. The Seaver College Director of Assessment position did not have a single applicant. Seaver College is reassessing the position description and the dean will speak to the faculty about assessment coordination needs and a way forward at the fall faculty conference.

The Council discussed the current tenor at the College and the challenges to curricular change; the necessity of increasing tuition revenues; and what would be needed from University leadership to foment change.

Questions that the programs need to ask are: "What are we trying to do as a program and

how do we assess that?” The assessment process has a disconnect between the activity of assessment and a clear idea of what the meaning of the degree is and how many courses and units are needed to achieve that goal.

The ASLC discussed inviting the deans to meet with the Council next year. Dr. Kats suggested that the ASLC Chair and a few ASLC members attend a deans’ council meeting first to give all of them an overview of the Assessment of Student Learning Council purpose and program.

II. Business

A. Approval of the [March 14, 2016](#) and [April 28, 2016](#) Minutes (Charla Griffy-Brown)

The minutes were considered and approved unanimously by common consent.

III. Program Reviews - Part 1

1. Humanities: English - Brad Griffin and Brad Dudley

Some program reviewers shared that LiveText was very helpful when entering the review as well as reading the review.

The reviewers found the Humanities program review student learning data understandable and helpful but the alumni success data was deficient. Additionally, they thought the program could have utilized their internship data to greater effect. The Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) lacked details about how they were going to improve the program based on the assessment data collected and they suggested that the English department complete a timeline to assist their plan to increase enrollment.

Some missing data points included their current enrollment, the use of arbitrary benchmarks, a lack of student involvement in assessment, and failure to link assessment to outcomes in their QIP.

Lee Kats noted the trends of misunderstanding of how to establish benchmarks, needing student involvement in assessment, training faculty and staff assessment processes, and the need to use assessment data to inform and support the QIP. Lisa noted that LiveText has an exhibit hall tool in which program reviewers can view examples of best practices when composing program reviews.

2. Humanities: History - Mike Shires and Charla Griffy-Brown

The reviewers noted that the program set arbitrary benchmarks and did not show how to rise to national standards. There is a disconnect between assessment data and program

improvement plans. The program review lacked basic information such as enrollment and graduation data and a discussion regarding their pedagogy.

3. Humanities: Liberal Arts - Amy Tuttle Guerrero and Katie Dodds

The reviewer reported that the Liberal Arts department used a good assessment and planning process, utilizing their Program Learning Outcomes and matrices. The alignment map needed a narrative, including how a degree in liberal arts from Pepperdine is unique from other institutions and defining its value.

The tables for student success, among others, were helpful. The reviewer suggested using more of a narrative to evaluate the data and give it meaning and correlate the data stronger with the Program Learning Outcomes. The reviewer commended the authors on closing the loop narrative, though the conclusions could be better supported and include a timeline for completion of the QIPs. The department was commended for doing assessment, incorporating students in the assessment process, and using data to support proposed changes.

4. Humanities: Creative Writing - Colleen Mullally

The reviewer was impressed with the well-written and purposeful analysis. The Program Learning Outcomes did not exactly match up with the Institutional Learning Outcomes but did an excellent job with analysis of the curriculum and assessment thereof. The question that programs really need to answer is “does this degree or courses fit the marketplace?”

The program could do more to connect between direct and indirect assessment formats. Neither a national rubric nor a departmental rubric were included in the report. The program personnel are few in number and they thoughtfully laid out an argument for additional human resources. The synthesis between the external reviewer and the program review was missing and the closing the loop section was weak because the external account was largely ignored.

Lisa Bortman shared that the department needs to reexamine their PLO's because they are too basic for the maturity of the assessment process. Arbitrary benchmarking with randomly selected percentages and the lacking of a plan to close the shortfall gaps were evident. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) will work over the next year to educate the reviewers about where to find assessment and survey data. Overall, the report was thoughtfully written.

5. Humanities: Film Studies - Charla Griffy-Brown and Colleen Mullally

The reviewers noted that the meaning of the graph aligning the ILOs and PLOs was not clear. There were many indirect measures; and though the graphs were understandable the prose needed attention. The reviewers commended the program for using students in the assessment process. They expressed concern that an appendix and rubric referenced in the text were not included in the report although the rubric's description and implementation were robust. There are a lot of direct and indirect data that need to have connections drawn together and made to tell a good story.

The action items were not always clear; there is a need to connect the data and analysis with the programmatic changes that were suggested and to include these in the Quality Improvement Program. QIPs often act as a wish list for the departments but do not often inform themselves from the data collected nor utilize data to support and justify the requested changes. The external and internal reviews seemed to be completely disconnected. The Film Studies discipline is in Humanities as well as Communications but the two divisions do not seem to mesh well. The Film Studies department did make a strong case for how they used mission fit.

One reviewer suggested the following process for program report writers to keep in mind:

- Diagnose problems with evidence;
- Propose how to fix issues;
- Make a case for why these fixes were selected; and
- Support with evidence.

6. Science: Biology - Mike Shires and Brad Dudley

This agenda item was postponed.

7. Science: Mathematics - Amy Tuttle Guerrero and Charla Griffy-Brown

This agenda item was postponed.

8. Science: Sports Medicine - Brad Griffin and Colleen Mullally

The reviewers felt that the review was strong and incorporated the ILOs and PLOs as well as effectively benchmarking and stating their methodology and reasoning. The report discussed the pedagogy among the faculty in a meaningful way. The reviewer noted that the program should correlate its PLOs with benchmarks against the biology national standards, which are the only ones that exist. That will make a stronger foundation for assessment.

The reviewers noted that the sample size could be larger on the surveys for a more robust analysis. Sports Medicine accepted that not all of the ILOs and PLOs converge but they are taken care of elsewhere in the Pepperdine University experience. The review authors gave a very thoughtful treatment to the whole review for which the reviewers commended them.

9. Science: Computer Science - Katie Dodds and Brad Dudley

This agenda item was postponed.

10. Philosophy - Brad Dudley and Mike Shires

The reviewers commented that the department did a good job benchmarking against peer and aspirational schools. The PLO/ILO reconciliation is messy across the University and needs more attention through training; this department also struggled with it. The PLOs were aligned to the Core Competencies. The external review was phenomenal. The QIP says that the department is solid and needs to expand into GE even though there is no data supporting that. The Reviewer noted that changing PLOs needs to become a part of the department assessment process.

11. Student Affairs - Amy Tuttle Guerrero and Brad Griffin

The reviewers praised the review as excellent throughout. The level of direct and indirect assessments focus closely on program outcomes. One reviewer noted that the department had a very strong report referencing research and was transparent about what is needed to improve. The reviewers asked the department to think about what meaning identifying who uses their program has on the program and urged them to collect more data that supports the student outcomes to strengthen future reports. The reviewers wondered what the infrastructure of the assessment process was in the department and whether they performed a variety of assessments. Overall the report was deemed strong.

12. MFA Writing for Screen and TV - Katie Dodds and Colleen Mullally

The reviewer expressed satisfaction with the fine job the department did in providing an internal context. It would be stronger if the basic demographic and historical detail about the program were included, as not all readers have the department's or institutional knowledge about the program and its context.

Evidence supporting mission, purpose, goals, and outcome were strong. The report writers did a good job showing the sequencing of the degree but need a curriculum map. There was a lack of a narrative talking about why the benchmark institutions were selected and how they stood in comparison to the Pepperdine program. The report talked about how to keep the MFA current but did not address the

co-curricular or provide demographics about who is taking the courses: how many graduate and undergraduate students, etc.

The external reviewer provided the background information that was missing from the department's report so the data exists somewhere, but was not included in the five year review.

Survey results were analyzed but the connection to assessment was missing. There was no mention of sample size or information on the program financial viability provided. Facilities were only discussed by the external reviewer. The department apparently did multimodal assessment but did not provide benchmark information. There were no changes in programming or curriculum deemed necessary by the department and the Plan of Action to close the loop was missing.

13. American Studies - Charla Griffy-Brown and Colleen Mullally

This agenda item was postponed.

14. Science: Nutrition. – Lisa Bortman

The reviewer thought the Nutrition review was very good. She suggested more integration of direct and indirect assessment data and increasing their “n” value for all of the required data from their reports.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at about 2:30 p.m. The next meeting of the ASLC is scheduled on June 13, 2016, as a virtual meeting at noon via Adobe Connect and in the Page Conference Room, TAC 316.