

Advancement of Student Learning Committee

Minutes

October 10, 2016

12:00 - 1:30 p.m.

Adobe Connect Virtual Meeting

Members present: (v) Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management  
Katie Dodds, School of Law  
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs  
Brad Griffin, Seaver College  
(v) Mary Ann Naumann, 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 opened the meeting at 12:05 PM in a virtual meeting format connecting through Adobe Connect and voice conference call.

II. Business

A. Approval of minutes

Charla Griffy-Brown called for consideration of the minutes, with changes to be made by 5 PM in Google Documents. The minutes were unanimously approved.

B. Program Review Responses from the Divisions

Computer Science Department

Brad Dudley and Katie Dodd reviewed the resubmission of the Computer Science Quality Improvement Proposal. The department remains frustrated with such a small number of staff and faculty and feel their ability to make impactful changes is severely limited. There were parts of the QIP that seemed actionable but the report has a feeling of deep-seated anger. The ASLC would like to help the department see how they can scale and grow and develop strategies for implementing

their QIP in an actionable timeline.

The ASLC pondered how they can best assist departments that seem to be struggling with program viability due to small faculty/staff and low resource allocation. The QIP touched on developing a strategy for increasing enrollment and noted the department's struggle with needing more resources in order to accomplish this goals. The ASLC encourages the department to implement this plan and be certain to collect data to mark the path of progress toward program viability.

#### Biology Department

Brad D. recommended that the Biology Department be thanked for following through with the updates to the QIP including a timeline for implementation.

#### Philosophy Department

Brad D. noted that the updated QIP doesn't specify enough change to warrant amending the report. There is a lack of actionable items that will impact the improvement trajectory of the program. Mike Shires said the QIP needed a timeline and a commitment of resources.

Charla suggested suggested that her letter will state the QIP is a lever to negotiate with the dean to identify resources and meet their timeline in the QIP. Brad G. volunteered to speak to the report author to see why the report is so general.

#### Sports Medicine Department

Brad G. reported that the Sports Medicine response regarding their QIP was notable in its thoroughness and clarity. He commended the department for the specificity on their timeline to implement their QIP.

#### Creative Writing

Katie Dodds shared that the department update did not address any type of assessment update, which is what the ASLC requested in its letter responding to their program review. There were a number of new ideas for things the department could do, but they don't seem to be addressing that missing component of the QIP.

#### Department of Chemistry

The ASLC discussed the Chemistry Department's response to the program review letter and their apparent unhappiness concerning the assessment process. The ASLC understands the frustration that program review can entail; and it encourages departments to remember that the purpose of assessment is more than jumping through accreditation hoops; it is meant to identify

strengths and weaknesses in programming and foster necessary change and improvement where needed.

The ASLC will work on collaborative communications with the divisions and educate the University on the differences between professional school and subject specialty accreditation: understanding on all sides what the overlap and differences are between multiple accrediting bodies.

#### C. Institutional Learning Outcomes

Lisa Bortman joined the meeting and introduced the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) Diversity report that is posted on the OIE website. Lisa is pondering how to close the loop on the ILO reports. If the ASLC is the body that will read the reports, it should send recommendations to the administration.

Lisa gave a synopsis of the findings from the student interviews. Interview data show that the students feel that they can get through a degree at Pepperdine without having to take diversity courses at all. The section on faith scored low because the students report that they study at a Christian university taught by Christian faculty, so there are few opportunities to learn about other faith traditions and expanding their knowledge beyond their own traditions. Diversity is found mainly through the co-curricular experience during study abroad, in clubs and organizations, through student life, and living in the dormitories.

#### D. Memoranda of Understanding

The deans are fairly slow in returning the MOUs to the programs following the five-year program reviews and analysis by the ASLC. The Council will need to talk to the provost and vice provost to find a better method for receiving these critical reflections from the schools and divisions.

#### E. LiveText grants

Lisa reported that 14 Livetext grants were awarded this summer and fall and are a big success. A workshop on Livetext will be offered soon to University faculty members.

#### F. Core Competencies

Brad G. gave an update on the Seaver College GELI Committee's review of Core Competency assessment. The process the committee will follow going forward is to review reports findings, rubric strength, sample size, and make comments with the goal of improving the process. Information literacy artifacts are being collected for the current year of core competencies.

#### G. Pulse of the Institution: Faculty Conference Panel Discussion

Lisa Bortman asked for thoughts and feedback from the faculty and staff leadership conference at which a tangential discussion began regarding WASCUC and what they would say about our assessing how we are building student character. The conversation was a thought exercise about how to measure moral character acquisition vs. professional skill development. The ASLC will discuss this at a future meeting.

### III. Adjournment

The ASLC adjourned at 1:36 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for November 14, 2016, at 11 AM as a lunch meeting in the Page Conference Room, TAC 316.