Advancement of Student Learning Council
Minutes
Monday, November 8, 2021
2:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
Location: Page Conference Room

Members Present: Katie Dodds, co-chair, School of Law - via Zoom
Brad Dudley, co-chair, Student Affairs
Charla Griffy-Brown, Graziadio Business School
Lee Kats, Vice Provost, ex officio
Seta Khajarian, Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Kim Miller, Director of Online Learning
Jim Prieger, School of Public Policy
Jeremy Whitt, University Libraries
LaTonya Wood, Graduate School of Education and Psychology

I.   **Welcome and Opening Remarks**
   A. Brad Dudley opened the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

II. **Business**
   A. Approve October 11, 2021 Meeting Minutes
      1. The Advancement of Student Learning Council approved the October 11, 2021 meeting minutes.

III. **WSCUC Site Visit Debriefing**
   A. Session takeaways: Members share their experiences
   B. Reflections on 5 commendations and 5 recommendations: Seta/Lee
   C. Recommendation #4: Consider ASLC purview
      1. Seta explained that after the Exit Briefing event and waiting for the President to share a WSCUC Commendations and Recommendations summary, Lee suggested Seta draft a copy to share with ASLC. Physical copies of this confidential draft were shared with all members present at the meeting.
      2. Lee commented that of the 5 WSCUC Commendations and Recommendations, there were no surprises which speaks to the good work of ASLC and its leadership in Charla, Katie, and Brad, particularly noting the fifth being the University's strong financial situation which is always important. Assessment and Student Learning were an ASLC priority since the last WASC visit and the ASLC's leadership over those 8 years has changed the culture of the University. ASLC should feel good that the WASC Steering Committee recognized their good work as the Commendations speak directly to the work of this Committee.

Recommendation 1 and 2 were weaknesses 8 years ago and the University recognized them as areas for improvement; Rec. 1 became a large part of the 2030 Plan.

3. Lee commented that Com. 2 and 3 speak directly to the role of OIE, which is WASC saying OIE is doing good work and needs to do more good work. This can be leveraged to make a case that OIE needs more resources. Seta added that OIE rose from WASC accreditations. OIE had been careful not to overreach, but due to the Rec., OIE apparently needs clarity in its work to provide more official support.

4. Seta commented on trouble understanding Rec. 5; perhaps the Visiting Team missed the connection between Program Reviews and ASARs. Brad commented that he read Rec. 5 as not about OIE, but instead as observing the lack of connection where there should be one between program reviews and how funding is received; are proposals for funding backed up by program reviews or is there another driving mechanism? The operator of the sentence [Rec. 5] is strategic budgeting and resource planning.

5. Brad asked if there is an example University which is doing well in shared governance. Lee commented on attending the National AACU conference where this is a major topic. It is apparent there that shared governance looks different across campuses. Pepperdine still has a ways to go as WASC points out, especially as undergraduate and professional students almost never come up in shared governance conversations. Staff is getting better but among faculty there is no agreement as to where to head with shared governance. Charla asked and Lee agreed that this division is being seen in broader national university contexts. Seta shared that WASC has no standard for shared governance. Instead WASC encourages institutions to pursue what is best for the specific institution.

6. Charla commented that she read Rec. 5 differently: this might pose a reference to a systems integration problem calling for a unified view of Pepperdine's data, capturing how clunky the PeopleSoft systems are. Seta thinks the contrary as the Visiting Team saw videos, wanted information on the dashboards, and were impressed with the AI and data.

7. Brad noted that WASC asked funding allocation questions in relation to program reviews and that the respondents were well prepared with examples as this was a question for which they prepared. However there is not a strong relationship between these and the Program Reviews.

8. Seta proposed that the ASARs they are asking programs to do should be read by the Deans to build understanding and connection. Charla commented that the budgeting process is not like in business, but rather disconnected from actual costs: certain streams (merit and tuition increases, teaching costs, etc.) filter down to teaching and learning in ways not easily understood, so this could be why there is a question about it.

9. Seta commented that there seemed to be a disconnect in that WASC could see what the University is doing, but that not everything is fully connected yet, and then rather than focusing on the progress made in the past 5 or 8

years they focused on where Pepperdine is aiming to be and created their Recommendations based on that.

IV.   Introduction - New member: James Prieger

    A. All members introduced themselves and their role at the University.

    B. Brad provided a brief summary of the content discussed in the meeting before James' arrival. James arrived late due to his class.

V.   Program Reviews from PGBS

    A. Charla provided a demonstration of the Program Review process.

        1. All Program Review documents are shared with ASLC members via Google Drive. Charla reviewed the reports' components using BSM (10) as an example.

        2. Charla highlighted sections on:

            a) Program's Strategic Plan, because all programs ideally align with the University's Strategic Plan.

            b) New Core Competencies section addressing measurement for program outcomes for which Seta expressed gratitude.

            c) Action areas, goals, program learning outcomes, plans for future improvement responding to AACSB recommendations.

            d) Quality Improvement Plan: growth and sustainability and how what the program wants to do aligns with the budget.

        3. After reading through the Program Review, members will complete the Google Form rubric (link sent via email). Charla provided a demonstration of completing the form. Charla noted that the free response/comments section is where members will provide specific program feedback.

        4. Once all reviews are complete, the team will compile feedback, and Katie and Brad will draft a letter with Commendations and Recommendations for each program.

            a) Brad expressed appreciation for the form over the previous live text version.

        5. Brad reassured members that this review can be completed with little knowledge of the program as it assesses whether the program is connecting well to the mission and how well the analysis fits their evidence; members will be commenting on what is missing, and making recommendations on the programs' ideas. Katie recommended new members read through a few reviews first to learn and compare contents, and noting what initially stands out for commendations and recommendations. Charla added that not every section requires comments; since comments will be narrowed to 3 or 4 noting standout comments is beneficial. Seta added that new members will partner with seasoned ones so members can exchange ideas this way.

        6. Katie noted that the rubric and scoring have been revised to make this a more positive feedback experience for the programs.

7. Lee asked whether the templates are a combination of what came from ASLC and ACCSB requirements. Charla confirmed that the new program reviews eradicate previous documents' repetition and draw out individual needed pieces. Seta added that there is normally one template across reviewers but PGBS responded to the AACSB requirements within the same document. Therefore instead of two reports, there is one University template now (academic and nonacademic). ASLC has to standardize this as some schools will add certain components.
8. Charla continued that all members will review their notes in the ASLC meetings to finalize the feedback that will be in the ASLC's letters to the programs.
9. Petra will reshare the sign up sheet, Google Drive link which houses the Program Reviews, and the link to the Google Form for the rubric.

B. Charla shared a review of Flash Reports.
1. Petra will share the Flash Reports with members in a Google Drive folder.
2. Brad asked whether there were QIP parts in the larger report that were excluded on the Flash Report. Charla confirmed that all QIP elements except the timeline were present in condensed form.
3. Jeremy asked if there were external reviews for PGBS. Charla confirmed the AACSB reports are external and there is a section in the Program Reviews highlighting AACSB suggestions and how the program intends to address them.

C. Brad noted that ASLC usually can address 3 to 4 Program Reviews per meeting. The Full-Time MBA, MS in Human Resources, BS in Management, and DBA programs will be the 4 addressed next meeting.

D. Jim inquired whether Program Reviews are the main task for ASLC for the year. Charla noted that there are other programs in addition to Business School programs, but previous years have been working on revising guidelines and rubrics and putting together Flash Reports, so this year there are a lot of programs to review. Brad added that for some months of the year, a large part of the meeting discussion is bringing thoughts and notes on the programs so the Chairs are able to send the programs letters. Then ASLC covers a variety of other issues as well; Seta added the additional tasks that may be triggered for this specific Council once the official WSCUC Commendations and Recommendations arrive. Charla included that reporting out results has become a new task including Charla's November demonstration to UAC on Flash Reports.

VI.   2022 ASLC Retreat: Finalizing details
A. The previously suggested retreat date was June 13, 2022 between 9am and 2pm. Last year the retreat was hosted online as everything was online. This year the Chairs opt to plan for the retreat to take place in person with the option to switch to virtual as needed. Brad requested the members' thoughts and there was agreement. Historically the retreat has been hosted at a Santa Monica venue or the

Broad Beach House, with breakfast and lunch and work together on tasks related to assessment.

B. Brad asked whether the tentative date would work and discussion led to the decision that Petra will look into the Broad Beach House availability the first week of June, namely Monday, June 6; Friday, June 10; and Wednesday, June 8, in order of preference. Petra will reach out to the committee with more information in the weeks to come.

VII. **Adjournment**

A. The next ASLC meeting will be on December 13, 2021 via Zoom.