PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY

Advancement of Student Learning Council
5 November 2024 | 12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. | Braun Conference Room & Zoom

Minutes

Members Present: Mark Roosa, Dean of Libraries (Chair)
Katie Dodds, Caruso School of Law
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
Seta Khajarian, Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Jaclyn Margolis, Graziadio Business School
Kelle Marshall, Seaver College
Lila McDowell Carlsen, Interim Vice Provost, ex officio
Kim Miller, Online Programs
Jim Prieger, School of Public Policy
Tonya Wood, Graduate School of Education and Psychology

I. **Welcome and Business**
   A. Mark Roosa, Chair opened the meeting with prayer at 12:30 p.m.
   B. The Advancement of Student Learning Council approved the 1 October 2024 meeting minutes.

II. **ASLC Summary Report**
   A. Mark Roosa read commendations and recommendations from the WSCUC Commission Action Letter, highlighting Recommendation Five's relationship to ASLC's work. The four action items developed in response were reviewed and identified as the Council's stead.

III. **ASLC Data Dashboard**
   A. Brad Dudley reviewed the context for the dashboard's creation. A sample dashboard and example entry were presented. Highlighted fields included the dean's decision to support, modify, or not support a QIP item, a checkbox indicating whether curriculum change is involved, and a notes section to elaborate on progress. Programs reviewed last year are beginning to use the dashboard, but members were reminded that it will be several iterations before enough data is accumulated to determine usefulness.
   B. It was clarified that Provost Brewster and OIE are the only entities with access to all dashboards. Deans are provided their school's dashboard, and they share access to their designee responsible for maintaining the data. As such, ASLC does not have access to confidential data potentially contained therein. Members discussed developing a summative dashboard to cumulate data valuable for the Council's support, including the proportion of QIPs supported. It was clarified that the

developing team discussed including multiple editors and viewers to the dashboard, but that it was decided less access was the safer route. Members discussed whether the dashboard hosts all or only QIP items outlined in the MOU, as the MOU is meant to be a comprehensive agreement between the program and dean outlining supported items.

C. It was suggested to add a column indicating final disposition of each entry to allow tracking through completion and time to completion. In ASLC's "Letter Regarding Program Review" sent once a program review is evaluated, it was suggested to include a line encouraging deans or their designee to update the dashboard.

IV. Program Review Schedule and Signup

A. Members were reminded to sign up to review a few programs. Most reports are slated to arrive in spring. It was reported that Title 9 should be received this fall.

V. Document Discussion

A. An example QIP and MOU were presented for educational purposes. Members were reminded the documents are confidential, and that the program review template's QIP section offers a variety of suggestions not limited to the format of this QIP.

B. Suggestions for improvement include encouraging authors to include specific budgetary information for items with budget implications, limiting the number of QIPs, and stating responsible parties for each deliverable. Members discussed that any proposed program improvements impacting student success should be included in the QIP, curricular and cocurricular items alike.

VI. Program Review Process Compliance Checklist

A. Members discussed efficiency in their process for recording program review evaluation feedback. A checklist method was proposed as an alternative to the Google Form. An example was provided for reference. Adding an item on whether specific budgetary information was included in the MOU was suggested. The option in the current iteration to include reasoning for each item meeting or not meeting expectations was commented as valuable. It was identified that this content was helpful for reference in writing ASLC's response Letters to the programs as well.

B. Concern was expressed in the time required to create such a checklist, as the current Google Form is aligned with the current rubric, and meets this need.

C. The process's history was reviewed, highlighting that the Council exists to provide meaningful support to programs as they self-evaluate, and as such elevate the quality of the programs' evaluation and ultimately the student experience. It was described that the current commendation and recommendation format was produced from an awareness to support programs rather than highlight deficiencies and to avoid commentary on the program's actual work which is not in the Council's

purview. It was commented that the program reviews have substantially elevated in quality since the process started.

D. Whether the cumulative feedback document should be shared with programs prior to their developing the program, and after the ASLC provided comment, was discussed. It was commented that these should remain internal as the Letter serves this purpose.

E. It was decided to develop a draft checklist. Tonya Wood and Katie Dodds volunteered to produce the document for member consideration.

VII.   **Upcoming Assessment Conferences**

A. Members were encouraged to attend ARC 2-4 April 2025 in Orange County or 8-10 April 2026 in San Francisco. Proposing to present the Data Dashboard at the 2026 iteration was suggested.

VIII.   **Adjournment**

A. The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m. ASLC will next convene on 3 December 2024 in the Braun Conference Room and via Zoom.