

Charter for the Advancement of Student Learning Council

Last Revised and Amended: 8/15/2022

Purpose

The Advancement of Student Learning Council (ASLC) supports and sustains a university-wide culture of outcomes-based student learning assessment with the following functions:

- A. Facilitating a systematic process of program review in both academic and non-academic programs across all schools. The primary function of facilitation is internal review driving quality improvement.
- B. Providing feedback on program reviews on the use of evidence to support quality improvement plans.
- C. Sharing information with other university-wide committees to support data-driven decisions for resource allocation.
- D. Initiating and facilitating long-term university wide projects for assessment compliance and improvements.

Other functions of the Council include: (a) when requested, offering advice 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 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
Christopher Collins, OIE

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 to 2 faculty representatives
- Graduate School of Education and Psychology: 1 faculty representative
- Pepperdine Graziadio Business School: 1 faculty representative
- Caruso School of Law: 1 faculty representative
- School of Public Policy: 1 faculty representative
- University Libraries: 1 faculty representative
- Student Affairs: 1 representative
- Student Member: When a program is reviewed, students are engaged in the review process as well as the review of the ASLC
- Associate Provost of Institutional Effectiveness

Student engagement and involvement. Each school or designated area will seek ways to facilitate student participation in this process, where possible in the program reviews themselves. The schools and programs will seek clear authentic ways, aligned with the program outcomes, to seek and incorporate the student voice.

Faculty representatives. Representatives from each school will be nominated by the deans and selected in consultation with their respective faculties. When possible, elections are preferred. In some schools, the initial availability of faculty who are qualified may make elections difficult to implement.

- Each faculty representative will serve at least a 4-year term. We suggest representatives serve only 2 terms.

Student Affairs representative. The Student Affairs representative to the Council will be appointed by the Vice President of Student Affairs and will serve at least a 3-year term. We suggest representatives serve at least 2 terms. 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 year the EER site visit is scheduled.

Selection of ASLC chairperson. There will be a chair that serves a 2-year term or potentially co-chairs that are staggered with each serving at least a 2-year term. If required, a chair-person can stay longer to ensure continuity.

Voting rights of members. All members of the ASLC are voting members. Issues to be voted on include but are not limited to the chairperson of the committee, changes in the charter, and formal structural changes.

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.

Training of ASLC members. ASLC members will be trained in practice by members and the chairperson. Furthermore, attendance at WSCUC sponsored workshops and the annual WSCUC 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 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 through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness funds the reviews between \$3,000 to \$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, there will be cross-representation on ASLC and UAC as much as possible. In addition, the Associate Provost of Institutional Effectiveness will join all UAC meetings.

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. In addition, annually, the ASLC will reflect on processes, procedures, and lessons learned at their final meeting.

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, 6 of the 8 voting members of the Council must support the action.