

Advancement of Student Learning Committee

Minutes

May 8, 2017

8:00 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.

Loews Santa Monica Beach Hotel, 1700 Ocean Avenue, Santa Monica, CA 90401

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
Brad Griffin, Seaver College
Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
Mary Ann Naumann, University Libraries
Michael Shires, School of Public Policy
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio
Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio
Courtney Scott, Recorder

Absent: Katie Dodds, School of Law

I. Welcome and Call to Order

Charla Griffy-Brown opened the meeting at 8:21 a.m. While the present members reviewed the minutes from April's meeting, Amy Tuttle Guerrero opened a general discussion regarding changing the culture around assessment. The theme of support from key leadership surfaced several times - specifically mentioning the provost, deans and associate deans.

II. Business

- A. The committee approved the minutes from the April 10, 2017 meeting.
- B. The committee reviewed the Psychology programs:
 1. MA in Psychology: Really well done report that made good progress in putting together a structure and a process for accomplishing assessment based on the last five-year review. It was detailed, straightforward and well-documented. The external review included very positive comments about the faculty, the students, the staff and the curriculum. The program review was thorough without being wordy, and it addressed the questions directly without any attempt to deflect the reader's attention from

weaknesses.

The report demonstrated a sustained, robust history of assessment in the MAP program, and in the Psychology program generally. The discussion of curriculum changes involving student feedback was enlightening. Faculty CVs and qualifications well-presented and impressive.

Suggestions for fine-tuning included:

- a. Methodology: Need to increase student samples as they fell below 20 percent. Also, there was no national survey data, such as Noel Levitz annual survey data.
 - b. Degree Quality: Need to rethink co-curricular offerings and include these in the report.
 - c. Student Success Data: Need to include retention and graduation data.
 - d. Degree Meaning: Provided a well-defined sequence by quoting the handbook, but need further discussion, clarification and analysis.
 - e. Analysis, Reflection and Closing the Loop: Need additional analysis in terms of takeaways.
2. MA in Clinical Psychology: A really well done report that made good progress in putting together a structure and a process for accomplishing assessment based on the last five-year review. It was detailed, straightforward and well-documented. The external review included very positive comments about the faculty, the students, the staff and the curriculum. The program review was thorough without being wordy, and it addressed the questions directly without any attempt to deflect the reader's attention from weaknesses.

There was clear evidence that they are doing assessment in an ongoing way and reflecting on it in a systematic way. Their committee assessment process and the fact that faculty rotate through and participate was highly commendable. Faculty involvement was a priority. There was a strong sense of faculty ownership of the process. The report addressed well how they deal with students who are not meeting standards.

Suggestions for fine-tuning included:

- a. The report could use greater reflection over the last five years as a whole and not just the annual reviews.
- b. Integration and bigger-picture thinking about the program

- could be stronger with longitudinal reflection on the data.
- c. Analysis was enrollment- and application-driven. Quality was not addressed, especially with respect to applicants.
 - d. Integration of high-impact practices and co-curriculars would enhance this work by including reflection on how the pieces of the program fit together.
 - e. There should be more attention on retention and graduation as it relates to student success.
 - f. The report includes excellent suggestions on how to improve assessment infrastructure. Quality improvement plan is very procedural - need additional reflection on areas of improvement would add strength.
3. PsyD in Clinical Psychology: A really well done report that made good progress in putting together a structure and a process for accomplishing assessment based on the last five-year review. It was detailed, straightforward and well-documented. The external review included very positive comments about the faculty, the students, the staff and the curriculum. The program review was thorough without being wordy, and it addressed the questions directly without any attempt to deflect the reader's attention from weaknesses.

There was clear evidence that they are doing assessment in an ongoing way and reflecting on it in a systematic way. Their committee assessment process and the fact that faculty rotate through and participate was highly commendable. Faculty involvement was a priority. There was a strong sense of faculty ownership of the process. The report addressed well how they deal with students who are not meeting standards. There was a striking level of detail in the student learning outcomes and impressive direct assessment.

Suggestions for fine-tuning included:

- a. The report could use greater reflection over the last five years as a whole and not just the annual reviews.
- b. Integration and bigger-picture thinking about the program could be stronger with longitudinal reflection on the data.
- c. Integration of high-impact practices and co-curriculars would enhance this work by including reflection on how the pieces of the program fit together.
- d. There should be more attention on retention and graduation as it relates to student success.

- e. The report includes excellent suggestions on how to improve assessment infrastructure. Quality improvement plan is very procedural - additional reflection on areas of improvement would add strength.

C. The committee reviewed Community Standards and the Health Center:

- 1. Community Standards: The report is extremely well written, with excellent engagement in benchmarking and an outstanding, well-integrated external review. It does an excellent job of evaluating the achievement of community standards. External review and recommendations are strong.

Suggestions for fine-tuning included:

- a. Meaning: Need to add information on offered services to strengthen the report.
 - b. Benchmarking Integrity: Need comparison of percentages on Disciplinary Action by Race/Ethnicity Table to overall student percentages.
 - c. Degree Quality: Need information on how the office interfaces with graduate schools.
 - d. Degree Meaning: Need to articulate connection with the University mission and ILOs, but may not need a map. Also need an organizational chart along with names.
 - e. Methodology: Need clearer general explanation of service usage. This could enhance tracking as well. Also need additional form of data than surveys during new student orientation and integrative reflective essays.
 - f. Closing the Loop and Analysis: Need a discussion of whether or not resources are adequate to accomplish goals given federal and state regulation. Also need to present same data in terms of student need - and to incorporate physical space. Finally, need data on follow-up when students indicate family or culture or lack of religion are connected to a violation.
 - g. Reflection: Need QIP timeline as well as to know who will implement it.
- 2. Health Center: The report fully described and carefully delineated the internal contexts for all of the branches of the Health Center. Although the "mission" section of the report did not directly address the question of alignment between program goals and ILOs, various sections of the report consistently reinforced the alignment between the LOs and the ILOs.

The report was filled with data and anecdotal evidence and lists of services offered in each of the branches of the Health Center. The report as a whole reinforces the variety of ways in which the Health Center strives to make students aware of its services. The section on outreach speaks to this question directly. Outreach efforts are targeted toward aligning with the LOs, the institutional ILOs and the mission of the University.

The report contained great benchmarking in terms of how Pepperdine compares to other universities. Collecting and handling data, as well as getting student feedback were done well. The organization of the report and the granular detail was fantastic.

Suggestions for fine-tuning included:

- a. The takeaway that demand is far greater than supply needs to be corroborated with budget information.
- b. Need curriculum map - its existence is clear from the report.
- c. Need benchmarking for some of the specialized programs - might be helpful in terms of future decision-making.
- d. The indirect evidence is weaker than the direct evidence, but not for lack of trying. One of the best sources of indirect data is the SHAB, which seems to provide avenues for students to respond more freely and honestly in a peer-to-peer context.
- e. If there is a way to capture more student feedback about the variety of services offered by the Health Center, that would strengthen an already strong report.
- f. Need a comprehensive list of everyone who works in/for the Health Center.

- D. Lisa Bortman led the committee in a discussion regarding core competencies.
1. Lisa reported that WASC now assesses all five core competencies. The University needs five strong reports – the first one on oral communication. Information literacy (second) and critical thinking (third) are also coming up quickly. She noted that most schools are using an instrument to measure these.
 2. Charla discussed the national conversation on mathematical literacy, potentially influenced by politics, and its intersection with information literacy.
 3. Lisa offered that while we define these, we still have to meet the standard. She offered guidance on the organization and process around them. She noted that while the committee has worked through most core competencies on its own, it may need an additional committee overseen by

the Provost's Office to continue to move this forward.

- E. The committee discussed student workshops/lunches around meaning, quality, and integrity, as well as their role in the assessment process.
1. Amy reported that at the GSEP students feel there is a lot student/faculty interaction via townhalls, etc. Students enjoy this type of involvement. Students brought up the quantity versus the quality of assignments in regard to rigor, and mentioned the importance of self-learning.
 2. Lisa reported on three oral communication focus groups in which students did not know program outcomes. Students did not think academics were as difficult as they anticipated, nor did they equate earning an "A" with rigor. Students reported spending 6-8 hours studying each week, and reflected on thinking versus memorizing in capstone courses. Internships, service, international programs and co-curriculars such as orientation set Pepperdine apart for them.
 3. Charla reported on the Graziadio School's lunches - one lunch in Malibu, one in West LA. Students did not know program outcomes and interpreted rigor in a variety of ways. Students chose Pepperdine for the personal attention they receive from faculty and its market focus. Their goals were personal fulfillment and growing as people both personally and professionally. Full-time students noted too much theory in the coursework. Overall, students appreciated being asked for their involvement in this conversation, but were not interested in anything further/deeper.
 4. Mike reported that at SPP, gatherings were framed as regarding potential program redesign. Students did not know PLOs, and felt that there was too much rigor, which prohibited their involvement elsewhere. SPP's location added to this difficulty. However, they find their experience unique, appreciating the many perspectives offered and the political balance. Student appreciated being consulted, but were not interested in any additional work.
 5. Finally, the committee agreed to continue these discussions with students. Further discussion followed around more systematic consistency, various options for packaging the data and the importance of picking up trends moving forward and incorporating feedback into goals. There was also agreement on further breakdown by meaning, quality and integrity to make this exercise less overwhelming and more meaningful.

III. Adjournment

1. The ASLC adjourned at 1:17 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for June 19, 2017, at noon in the Page Conference Room, TAC 316.