Charter for the Advancement of Student Learning Council

Purpose
The Advancement of Student Learning Council (ASLC) was developed to meet two major needs of the University:
1. To inculcate and sustain a culture of systematic student learning assessment in all quarters of the University through the following functions: (a) training faculty and co-curricular professionals in their respective schools or major areas in effective and meaningful assessment practices, (b) facilitating annual and 5-year program reviews in their respective schools or major areas and channeling relevant evidence to make data-driven decisions for resource allocation recommendations, and (c) channeling aggregated data aligned to the University's Institutional Educational Objectives to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
2. To serve as the body tasked with offering programs undergoing 5-year program reviews with feedback on the quality of their critical inquiry process and use of evidence to support their program improvement plan (see Appendix A for the *ASLC Internal Review Report* template).

Other functions of the Council include: (a) when requested, offering advisement to the UAC on the quality of new program proposals and existing programs requesting substantial change; and (b) preparing the University for WASC reaffirmation reviews.

Rationale
Good practices for program review entail the ***integration*** of outcomes-based assessment and evidence-based decision-making.[1] This integration includes the following components: (a) program self-study, (b) external review of program, (c) internal review of program, (d) program quality improvement plan, (e) memorandum of understanding (MOU), (f) planning and budgeting, and (g) tracking improvements (see the *Program Review Guidebook* for more details). An evidence-based decision-making model allows for transparency among stakeholders (faculty, co-curricular professionals, and administration) as well as holds all stakeholders accountable for upholding their commitments. A process for outcomes-evidence integration within the University, and the ASLC's role within this process, is noted in the *Program Review Guidebook*.

When the ASLC started in 2010, the state of student learning assessment and program review at Pepperdine was uneven in its application and did not meet the standard of practice for higher education. The OIE issued guidelines for conducting program reviews and the ASLC has and will continue to serve as the body responsible for this diffusion. Moreover, the ASLC will offer programs undergoing self-study with recommendations for strengthening the quality of their program review efforts.

Membership
      Founding members. The founding members included faculty and co-curricular professionals appointed to the ASLC by the Office of the Provost in collaboration with the deans.

---

[1] Cyd Jenefsky, "Integrating Outcomes-based Assessment and Evidence-based Decision-making into Program Review (breakout session presented at the WASC Outcomes-Based Program Review Workshop, San Jose, California, November 11-12, 2010).

The appointments were based on the *formal* role for the assessment of student learning and program review that each of these members holds in their respective schools or major department areas. These appointments met the immediate need for addressing the recommendations by the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) Steering Committee and the WASC site visiting team in preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER). The Assistant Provost of Institutional Effectiveness is an ex officio member of the Council without voting rights.

The following are the founding members:
Joy Asamen, GSEP (Chair)
Charla Griffy-Brown, Graziadio
Michael Shires, SPP
Constance M. Fulmer, Seaver
Herb Cihak, School of Law
Connie Horton, Students Affairs
Lisa Bortman, OIE [previously Christopher Collins]

Future ASLC representation. Faculty, co-curricular professionals, and student engagement in the assessment of student learning and program review is essential for successfully sustaining the process. The following standing representation is suggested.
- Seaver College: 1 faculty representative
- GSEP: 1 faculty representative
- Graziadio: 1 faculty representative
- School of Law: 1 faculty representative
- SPP: 1 faculty representative
- Student Affairs: 1 representative
- Student Member: 1 representative
- Assistant Provost of Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio member

Faculty representatives. As the Council moves from a reactive mode (i.e., preparing for the EER) to one that is proactive, faculty representation should move from appointments to the Council to elected membership. In so doing, the governance for academic affairs selects representation that reflects the will of faculty.

The following recommendations and timeline are suggested for moving from faculty who are appointed to the ASLC to elected membership:
- For continuity and to address the immediate need of preparing for the EER, the appointed members, who are experienced with WASC's expectations and already offer leadership in their respective schools or major areas, should serve through the 2012-13 academic year, which is the year the EER site visit is scheduled.
- Beginning with the 2013-14 academic year, half of the faculty representatives to the Council will be replaced by election (GSEP and Seaver); the other half of the faculty representatives will be replaced by election during the 2014-15 academic year (Graziadio, School of Law, and SPP), preventing a year of entirely new members. The dean of each school will nominate potential candidates to serve on the Council and the faculty will elect their representative from among the nominations.
- Each faculty representative will serve a 2-year term.

Student Affairs representative. The Student Affairs representative to the Council will be appointed by the Dean of Student Affairs and will serve a 2-year term. For continuity and to address the immediate need of preparing for the EER, the current representative, who is experienced with WASC's expectations and already offers leadership in Student Affairs, should minimally serve through the 2012-13 academic year, which is the year the EER site visit is scheduled.

Student representative. The inclusion of a student representative to the Council will commence in the 2013-14 academic year. The student representative will serve a 1-year term. The student candidate for the Council must be nominated by her/his school and confirmed by the ASLC. The successful candidate must possess the following experiences, personal attributes and goals, and competencies:

1. Has engaged or is engaging in scholarship on the assessment of student learning or other relevant educational research area, or minimally has knowledge of the literature on the assessment of student learning or other relevant educational issues.
2. Has knowledge of the University's mission and its educational objectives.
3. Desires to eventually teach at the university level.
4. Has a documented history of strong organizational and time management skills.
5. Has a documented history of working successfully with others.

Election of ASLC chairperson. For continuity and to address the immediate need of preparing for the EER, the chairperson appointed by the Office of the Provost will serve in this capacity until the EER site visit is completed in the 2012-13 academic year. Commencing in the 2013-2014 academic year, a new chairperson will be elected annually by the voting members of the committee.

Voting rights of members. Faculty, student affairs, and student representatives have voting rights as members of the ASLC. The Assistant Provost of Institutional Effectiveness, as an ex officio member, will be a non-voting member of the Council.

Compensation for members. The members of the Council should be compensated for their time in their respective school or unit as a position on the ASLC will require an estimated 40 hours a month. To effectively serve on the ASLC, the University covers the expenses for members to participate in educational and training opportunities for student learning assessment.

Training of ASLC members. ASLC members will be required to participate in a University supported annual training session on good practices for program review and the assessment of student learning. An expert in these areas will be brought to campus to conduct the training. Furthermore, attendance at WASC sponsored workshops and the annual WASC Academic Resource Conference is strongly encouraged.

Budget for Program Review
As mentioned above, good practices for program review include an external review of the program. The typical remuneration to external reviewers for 5-year program reviews across many schools in the WASC region is $500-$2000 for the review, which includes the site visit

and associated costs as well as the external review report (although several schools require program review with no additional funding). Pepperdine funds the reviews at $5000, with additional funding provided by the school or program, as needed.

Collaboration with the University Academic Council (UAC)
Given the parallel responsibilities between the ASLC and UAC, minimally one joint meeting shall be conducted annually between these two councils. Furthermore, any training on the assessment of student learning and program review will be open to members of both councils.

Evaluation of the ASLC
In order to assess whether the ASLC is meeting its objectives, programs undergoing the 5-year program review will be invited to evaluate their experience with the ASLC and the internal review process.

Amendments to the Charter
Based on the process described under **Evaluation of the ASLC** above and discussions with the UAC, evidence may arise that requires amending elements of the ASLC charter. To adopt amendments to the charter, 5 of the 7 voting members of the Council must support the action.

Action Plan and Timeline

The plan of action is designed to advance a culture of assessment at Pepperdine and bring the state of assessment dramatically up by Spring 2012, in preparation for the EER. The cells shaded in gray are events/deadlines that recur each academic year on roughly the same schedule.

Action	Responsible Party	Other Required Participants	Completion Date
Establish members of ASLC	Deans, Provost, Vice Provost		August 2010
Advise programs undergoing 5-year review, discuss potential external reviewers, and provide assistance for self study, if needed	ASLC		Fall
WASC Program Review Workshop	ASLC & interested faculty		November 2010
ASLC Retreat	ASLC		December 2010
5-year program review self-study report	Program faculty/co-curricular professionals		December
Baseline state of assessment report, including plan of action	ASLC (consult with deans, faculty/co-curricular professionals, as needed)		January 2011
Establish a charter for ASLC	ASLC		January 2011
External review of 5-year program review	External reviewer(s) selected by program faculty/co-curricular professionals	Program faculty/co-curricular professionals	January
Revise program review report	Program faculty/co-curricular professionals		February
Establish a University-wide outcomes-evidence integration process	ASLC	UAC, UPC, President's Cabinet	February 2011
Internal review of 5-year program reviews	ASLC	Program faculty/administrators	March
Final copy of program review report and QIP	Program faculty/co-curricular professionals	OIE	April
Attend WASC Academic Resource Conference	ASLC, including newly elected members	All interested faculty & co-curricular professionals	April
5-year program review executive summary and memorandum of understanding (MOU)	Deans	Program faculty/administrators	May
Budgeting/planning	Deans	UPC, President's Cabinet	May
ASLC retreat	ASLC		June 2011
Annual program review report of student learning outcomes	Program faculty	ASLC	Spring/Summer
Inform programs undergoing 5-year program reviews in 2011-12 academic year	OIE		May/June

State of assessment update	ASLC		June
WASC Program Review Workshop	ASLC members who have not attended the workshop & other interested faculty/co-curricular professionals	UAC	Fall 2011
Inform schools/programs of impending effort to collect "deep dive" information in preparation for EER report	ASLC, Office of the Provost	Deans, faculty/co-curricular professionals	Fall 2011
Generate documents for EER report appendix; make sure OIE website is used to highlight development of learning outcomes assessment plans	ASLC, OIE staff	Deans, faculty/co-curricular professionals tasked with assessment responsibilities	October 2011-March 2012
State of assessment update	ASLC		January
Write EER essay on state of assessment at Pepperdine, focusing on empirical evidence of changes that have taken place since CPR	ASLC		January 2012-April 2012
Send draft of EER report to University constituencies for review/comment	Office of the Provost		May 2012-June 2012
Revise EER report based on feedback	ASLC		June 2012
EER report deadline	ASLC		July 5, 2012
Host EER site visit			September 26-28, 2012
Programs that underwent 5-year review in previous academic year submit a progress report to deans	Program faculty/co-curricular professionals	Deans	April
Present progress report for programs that underwent 5-year review in previous academic year	Deans	UPC, President's Cabinet	May
Respond to EER site visit report	Office of the Provost		November/December 2012
Commission letter			March 2013
Develop post-EER action plan in preparation for interim review	Office of the Provost	ASLC, UAC, UPC, UFC, UDC	March/April 2013

Appendix A

Internal Review Report			
Program:			
School/Major Area: _ *Seaver* _ *GSEP* _ *Graziadio* _ *School of Law* _ *SPP* _ *Student Affairs* _ *Student Services*			

Criteria	Yes	No	NA
Mission			
1. Does the program (or it could mean the department, division, or school) mission clearly link to the University's mission statement?			
Program Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Alignment			
1. Do the program SLOs align with the school's student learning outcomes?			
2. Do the program SLOs clearly link to the University's Institutional Educational Objectives?			
Student Learning Outcomes/Educational Effectiveness Indicators			
1. Does the program have a list of SLOs?			
2. Are the SLOs written as operational statement of how the program will know the knowledge, skills, and attitudes are met or mastered?			
3. Does a curriculum matrix exist?			
4. Does an assessment plan for the SLOs exist?			
5. Is there an Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators?			
Evaluation Methods and Implementation of Assessment			
1. Do the assessment methods include both direct and indirect measures of outcomes?			
2. Is each assessment method or tool appropriate to the outcome it is evaluating?			
3. Are comparison data (including from benchmark institutions) used, when possible?			
4. Are student success data (i.e., retention rates, graduation rates, etc.) included?			
5. Do the methods of assessment yield information that is suitable for making decisions about program improvement?			
6. Are the methods of assessment consistent with the best practices in the particular field, discipline, or profession?			
Results			
1. Is the manner described in which students were sampled?			
2. Is there enough detail to determine the extent to which the outcomes have been achieved?			
3. Do results of student success data analysis disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, SES, first generation college student status, etc. exist?			
Decisions and Recommendations			
1. Are the decisions and/or recommendations adequately explained?			
2. Do the decisions and/or recommendations clearly align with the SLOs assessed?			
3. Do the decisions and/or recommendations clearly align with the assessment results?			
4. Does an action plan exist for closing the loop, including the responsible party, timeline for completion, and method for tracking improvement?			
5. Have decisions and/or recommendations been prioritized for strategic planning and budgeting purposes?			

Comments: