

Advancement of Student Learning Council

Minutes

June 10, 2019

9:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Retreat

Shutters on the Beach, Oceanside Meeting Room

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio Business School  
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio  
Katie Dodds, School of Law  
Brad Dudley, Student Affairs  
Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology  
Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio  
Seta Khajarian, Graduate School of Education and Psychology  
Michael Shires, School of Public Policy  
Ildiko Hazak, Recorder

Members absent: Heather Thomson-Bunn, Seaver College  
Jeremy Whitt, University Libraries

- I. Welcome and Call to Order
  - A. Charla Griffy-Brown opened the meeting at 9:02 a.m. in the Oceanside Room Room at Shutters on the Beach.
- II. Business
  - A. Approval of the Minutes
    1. The Advancement of Student Learning Council approved the May 13, 2019 minutes.
- III. Program Review Evaluation
  - A. Student Employment – Amy Tuttle Guerrero and Jeremy Whitt  
Student Employment was completed, but it needs a letter. Amy will review Student Employment one more time.
  - B. Registrar and Advising – Seta Khajarian and Brad Dudley  
Seta Khajarian and Brad Dudley reviewed Registrar and Advising. Charla updated the program review letter together with the ASLC members. Lisa asked Seta what did she think about the external review. Seta commented that the

external review was not useful. Registrar and Advising should have a survey to help them know what the student experience is. Brad commented that they generally have to review their learning outcomes. Lisa noted that maybe the growth areas should be looked at. Lisa said it should be included that the Committee was unable to establish standards of performance and best practices. Brad commented that they should provide an advising model and explain the roles of professional advisors and the relationship with faculty advisors. Lisa commented that under Meaning they should relook their program learning outcomes. They should reflect on best practices and standards of performance. The Committee would like to see them on a regular systemic assessment. Under overall recommendation, Lisa commented that their outcomes are not measurable and they should give more examples. Lisa noted that this is not a strong program review. Brad noted that their external reviewer did not help them either.

C. School of Public Policy – Katie Dodds and Brad Dudley

Brad commented that there is a new internship program, but no data on it yet. There is broad data supporting changes from the last review. Under areas of growth: the SPP campus partners need to be added. School of Public Policy needs to clarify who the campus partners are and how these campus partners interact to ensure the highest quality of student experience. Charla commented that under areas of growth, enrollment and sustainability need more context. The number of international students has decreased from 29% to 13%. Around 80% of the international students is Chinese. Charla asked if there is a plan for scalability or a plan to address the decrease of the number of international students. Brad commented that a section of the program talks about the enrollment targets for each year. More explanation should be provided for the demand. Mike Shires noted that online space is growing in professional education for the MBA program. There is a domestic growth in the external fully employed program. The infrastructure is unclear. Charla noted that past data collection process should be included in the report. Mike commented that school of public Policy has separate samples of capstone. SPP had 18 capstones last year. All 5 groups of capstones

were reviewed, so 12 out of 19 capstones were reviewed. Katie Dodds asked Mike Shires if it is just the capstone that they look at for assessment. Mike responded that they look at internships, 6-year employment data and focus groups. Lisa Bortman asked Mike if SPP is offering a program in D.C. Mike replied that they are offering a summer program in D.C. It is just a program, not a full degree. Charla commented that the following should be included under challenges: more explanation for the demand of the program, number of international students and what is the target enrollment. Charla noted that SPP should explain the process for data collection. On the alumni survey, the average score for some of the content areas was low. Further explanation of this would be helpful. The curriculum has been changed, but an annual assessment will be needed to measure the success of the implemented changes. Brad asked Mike if he can compare student success and employment data to Pepperdine's peers. Mike replied no. The accredited schools report that information but they don't record it publicly. They restrict access to that information. Lisa commented that there is a data table and scale of 7 points. One of the content areas was curriculum. One of the questions was: Does curriculum have content that can be used for employment? That score was 4.1. Another question was: Is our faculty aware of curriculum of other faculty's classes? That score was 4.6. Mike noted that the goal is a score of 6 or 7. The problem is that the adjuncts are not integrated into the core. Charla finished editing the School of Public Policy letter. Overall recommendations: major changes in the curriculum and the assessment of the changes. Recommendations: sustainability item and clarify campus partners. Quality: there is a new co-curricular program that need to be assessed. Lisa noted that feedback from internship sites would be valuable. Lisa commented that they should make the assessment more transparent.

#### D. GSEP Education – Heather Thompson-Bunn and Jeremy Whitt

Lisa commented that the program review was done. It was sent back to GSEP and the Committee asked them to develop an infrastructure for assessment. The quality of the program review is impressive. They developed strong infrastructure

for assessment. The Committee would like the dean to recognize that they still need the same level of support.

E. Counseling Center – Heather Thompson-Bunn and Michael Shires

The Counseling Center program review has been sent out.

F. Housing and Residential Life – Amy Tuttle Guerrero

Charla reviewed Housing and Residential Life with the ASLC group. Amy did not see an assessment plan. All programs should have an assessment plan. Amy commented on the area of growth. Strength: Use of integrated data from several sources including self-assessment. Amy commented that they should be more specific under Goals. Charla made edits to the letter. Amy noted that an assessment plan is needed. Under Meaning: the curriculum map was an issue. Amy added under recommendation: Revise curriculum map and assessment plan. Brad noted that housing operations deals with facilities, the residential life interacts more with students. Amy commented that communication and infrastructure connection with people needed some attention. Amy suggested that the Committee should recommend for their next cycle that Housing and Residential Life builds an infrastructure. Amy noted that the external reviewer was very thorough.

G. Political Science – Charla Griffy-Brown and Jeremy Whitt

The Political Science program review is done. Charla said it looks very good. The overall recommendations are missing. There is no action item for quality and there is nothing for integrity. Charla commented that action items and overall recommendations are still needed. Charla added the following under recommendations: connect the PLOs to the overall university mission, include the five core competencies, implement the external reviewer recommendations and continue to monitor growth rates.

#### H. Sociology – Katie Dodds and Mike Shires

The ASLC members added comments to the Sociology program review. A junior faculty member wrote the review. Lisa noted that it is important to revise the guide book and fill in the strengths.

#### IV. WSCUC Essay Requirements

A. Charla presented the ASLC's findings on what is working well in a review. There is a document that shows what the individual infrastructure is and what is the approach to assessment. The other document shows what type of things to keep and why is it important. For example, there is ASLC and the guidebook. Charla continued to discuss what is not working, what can be improved and what are the action steps. Charla noted that there are things in the guidebook that are no longer used. The goal would be to revise the guidebook, assign it to be reviewed and then present it to the group. The ASLC members went through the action steps for program review.

#### V. Process map for information sharing (specifics for proposal)

A. The ASLC members worked in groups to draw up the map for information sharing. Katie Dodds and Brad Dudley presented first. They recommended changing the timeline when reports are due. They suggested that there should be a more realistic timeline. Brad commented that the models of reporting should be changed so that it can feed into program review. For example, on the annual report, the reports on student learning outcomes from December feed into the next report in May. They don't have to redo the report. Brad asked if there is something similar we could do to program reviews. Katie commented that they also provided guidelines on how to do student focus groups. Katie said that she talked to Lisa about a school that has an annual assessment day. Maybe they could introduce a day as a university faculty conference. That would be a day when they could do all the student focus groups. Regarding information sharing,

Brad commented that the group could create a spreadsheet and the QIP information could be added to it. If the group creates this spreadsheet and add to it every year, then everybody could see the whole grid of what everyone else is doing. Data points need to be added into a common database. Katie Dodds commented that on the website of St. Olaf College, they have sample rubrics. Brad noted that there might be opportunities to facilitate conversations between different departments. It might be ASLC's role to help get those conversations started.

- B. Charla and Seta commented that an updated and streamlined guidebook is needed. The guidebook should be more integrated. The language of the guidebook also should be reviewed. Charla noted that there is no student participation at all. Seta said the guidebook should have a section for student input. Charla noted that cultural assessment needs to change. Charla added the following under Overall Improvement: putting quick links to resources into the guidebook and adding contact phone numbers of the respective schools if they have any questions. Charla said it is important to update the guidebook. Regarding information sharing, Seta commented that whatever comes out of QIP, it does not end up in the strategic plan. The question is how can the group facilitate the QIP to be in the strategic plan.
- C. Amy and Mike Shires presented next. Regarding information sharing, Mike commented that the missing piece is leadership. The mechanism for that supposed to be strategic planning. Mike commented that the strategic planning process has been dead at Pepperdine since the last accreditation. In the program review process there is no specific conversation about strategic planning. Mike noted that the last program review was very strategically focused, but this program review was not. Mike commented that the following should be added: How does this impact the strategic plan? Mike noted that the institutional structures are built around the deans' offices. He posed the following question: If you want the faculty to be partners, how do you engage them? He asked: Has anybody looked

at if MOUs have been executed? Mike commented that if we create these documents, what purpose do they serve.

VI. Adjournment

A. The ASLC was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.