

**Advancement of Student Learning Committee  
Minutes**

June 13, 2016

12:00 - 1:00 p.m.

Adobe Connect Video Conference from the Page Conference Room, TAC 316

Members present: v. Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management  
Brad Griffin, Seaver College  
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs  
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio  
Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio  
Ross Canning, Recorder  
(v. remote video attendance via Adobe Connect)

Absent: Katie Dodds, School of Law  
Colleen Mullally, University Libraries  
Michael Shires, School of Public Policy  
Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology

I. Welcome and Call to Order.

Charla Griffy-Brown called the meeting to order at 12:03 PM in a virtual meeting format.

II. Business

A. Approval of [May 10, 2016 Minutes](#)

The Minutes were considered and approved by common consent with any changes to be made online by 5 PM.

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

<b>5-year Program Review</b>	<b>Reviewew 1</b>	<b>Reviewer 2</b>
<b>Science: Biology</b>	Shires	Dudley
<b>Science: Mathematics</b>	Griffy-Brown	Tuttle Guerrero
<b>Science: Computer Science</b>	Dodds	Dudley
<b>Science: Sports Medicine</b>	Griffin	Mullally

1. Biology Five-Year Review

The reviewers thought that the program review was outstanding. The Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) makes some suggestions without providing a decision on the plans or an exact roadmap/timeline on what to change. Changes to the curriculum were also noted but no decision was made within the QIP. The program review overall was the best one written to date. Assessment was

multimodal and informative.

2. Science: Computer Science

The reviewer found the program review a challenge because it was missing entire sections of the report. A very successful internship program in application development was completely omitted which was a missed opportunity to represent high impact learning.

The external reviewer was more like a consultant than a reviewer because a complete program review was not available. No data was used to support the QIP, although the outline of what to do and timeline were in good form.

The ASLC decided to write a letter to the department indicating that the report was incomplete, lacked data, and would not be accepted. The department will be asked to submit a complete report within the next year.

Lisa noted that a pattern exists in which QIPs lack supporting data or ask mostly for additional personnel which is not the purview of the academic five-year review requested by the ASLC. Furthermore, curricular changes must be handled through the University Academic Council.

3. Science: Mathematics

The reviewer noted that the five-year review lacks a connection to the curriculum. Connecting assessment data to QIP requests is imperative for the overall assessment to be complete. Unsupported requests lacking assessment data are problematic. The first action item on the department's QIP pertains to curriculum but then transitions to personnel requests which are inappropriate in this document. The reviewers would like to see clearer assessment links to strategies for the recommended changes to the curriculum and initiatives.

4. Science: Sports Medicine

The program review QIP includes only a request for another faculty member with data to support the need. The report notes that curricular changes are suggested in the review but the QIP does not mention this. The ASLC recommends a resubmission of the QIP to amend this important oversight but it will remain optional.

### III. Discussion

- A. The programs below will receive conditional acceptance letters, which require additional work by the departments to bring their five-year reviews up to standards required by WASCUC through the ASLC guided by the Program Review Process Levels outlined below:
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

- English - Program Review Conditionally Accepted (Level 3): Re-submit review adding assessment data and a QIP and timeline (due in 3 months).
- Physics - Program Review Conditionally Accepted (Level 3): Re-submit with a plan for assessment and compiled assessment data (due in 12 months)
- Chemistry - Program Review Conditionally Accepted (Level 3): Re-submit review adding assessment data and QIP and actionable timeline (due in 3 months)
- Computer Science - Program Review Incomplete (Level 4): Submission of a completed program review within three months' time including a Quality Improvement Plan and timeline for implementing the QIP. 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 Officer
- Mathematics - Program Review Incomplete (Level 4): Submission of the full program review in three months' time, including a Quality Improvement Plan 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.
- Biology - Program Review Conditionally Accepted (Level 2). A resubmission is required to include a timeline to implement the QIP within one month of the receipt of the review letter from the ASLC chair
- Sports Medicine - Program Review Accepted (Level 2): The ASLC recommends an optional resubmission of the QIP to include the curricular changes discussed in the report but which are missing from the QIP.

#### IV. Setting the calendar for next year's meetings based on workflow and goals

Ross will be sending out the calendar dates for next year and the ASLC members should contact him if there are any major difficulties with the second Monday of the month schedule.

The program review cycle scheduled this next year spawned discussion on whether the timing of the program review due dates should be rescheduled into two groups. The program review schedule for AY17 includes four divisions with multiple programs in each including Seaver College: Communication Division (7); Student Affairs: Housing and residence life, Health Center, and

Community Standards; and both divisions of the Graduate School of Education and Psychology (5-7 programs each). Charla suggested the ASLC take a pulse among the programs in September and determine the due dates for later in the fall or spring.

Lisa shared that she is offering a LiveText Mini-Grant to faculty or staff who set assessment and analysis goals based on how many program outcomes they outline in their proposals. The grants range from \$1000 - \$5000.

V. Adjournment

The ASLC adjourned at 1 PM. The next meeting is scheduled on September 12, 2016, at noon in the Page Conference Room, TAC 316.