

09.102018 Advancement of Student Learning Council

Minutes

March 12, 2018

11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Page Conference Room, TAC 316

Members present: Charla Griffy-Brown, Chair; Graziadio School of Business and Management
Katie Dodds, School of Law
Brad Griffin, Seaver College
Mary Ann Naumann, University Libraries
Amy Tuttle Guerrero, Graduate School of Education and Psychology
Lisa Bortman, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, ex officio
Jared Price, Recorder

Members absent: Brad Dudley, Student Affairs
Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, ex officio
Michael Shires, School of Public Policy

I. Welcome and Call to Order

A. Lisa Bortman opened the meeting at 11:13 a.m. in the Page Conference Room.

II. Business

A. Approval of Minutes

1. The Council approved the February 12, 2018 minutes.

B. Faculty interviews on Program Review Process

1. As an opening sentiment, Charla and Lisa discussed the importance of program assessment. Education leaders in Washington, D.C. are reviewing the role of accrediting bodies like WASC and as a result WASC will likely behave more strictly. Since the last ASLC meeting, council members have interviewed faculty members involved in the program review process within their school. During this meeting, each ASLC member recounted their interview. Notes from these interviews can be found in this document: "[Program Review Faculty Interviews - March 2018.](#)" Concluding the interviews, Charla commented that ASLC should move forward by: 1) better communicating the role of ASLC to its constituents and 2) growing Pepperdine's culture of assessment.

2. Faculty Interview 1 - Interviewer: Brad Griffin

3. Faculty Interview 2 - Interviewer: Brad Griffin

4. Faculty Interview 3 - Interviewer: Lisa
5. Faculty Interview 4 - Interviewer: Lisa
6. Faculty Interview 5 - Interviewer: Charla
7. Faculty Interview 6 - Interviewer: Charla
8. Faculty Interview 7 - Interviewer: Amy
9. Faculty Interview 8 - Interviewer: Brad Dudley
10. Faculty Interview 9 - Interviewer: Brad Dudley

C. WSCUC Survey

1. Lisa discussed the university-wide survey that we will need to soon implement as part of the WSCUC visit in 2020. The purpose of this survey is to identify areas of weakness so that they can be addressed in the next round of reporting. These areas of weakness will need to be identified, resolved, and reported on before the WSCUC visit. Lisa presented this WSCUC survey to the President’s Steering Committee and found consistency amongst the administrators. All agreed that assessment, strategic planning, and diversity need to be addressed. Other areas of consistency included standards of performance established by faculty members and academic freedom. The President’s Steering Committee agrees that University strengths include finances, mission, diversity, faculty development, and senior leadership. They saw challenges ahead being that alumni are to absent from the university’s behavior, upcoming changes in higher education, and remaining focused on diversity hiring.

D. Fine Arts Program Review Readers Assignments

1. The ASLC agreed on the following program review reader assignments for Seaver’s Fine Arts Division.

	Reader 1	Reader 2
Art History	Mary Ann Naumann	Amy Tuttle Guerrero
Studio Art	Charla Griffy-Brown	Michael Shires
Theater	Brad Dudley	Katie Dodds
Music		
Library	Katie Dodds	Charla Griffy-Brown
Office of the Chaplain	Amy Tuttle Guerrero	Brad Griffin
Student Activities	Michael Shires	Brad Griffin

E. ASLC Retreat

1. The ASLC discussed the agenda for the ASLC retreat on May 14. This includes outlining and adding data to the WSCUC essays, discussing any pending program reviews, discussing how ASLC can improve its practices, and discussing how to improve assessment culture at

Pepperdine. Lisa suggested bringing in an external voice to add to the assessment culture conversation. She suggested David Chase from WSCUC.

III. How we can incorporate some of what we learned from K-12 as an educational tool.

IV. They sit down together and score writing and they give their feedback to students.

V. How to bring back personalization?

VI. Seta: it could work in undergraduate level, but not in the Masters level

VII. Seta: CTC has the mandates, 3-4 large mandates they need there are different types of big things due!

VIII. If you have an external body doing your accreditation they take priority. We try to we have the bulk of your work there what else you need to do to supplement that. At what point would it be best to submit that report. Usually you supplement it with an essay about quality and integrity or how you done your assessment.

IX. Charla: we have a big on ramp for programs but we don't have exit plan for programs.

X. Lisa: there are programs that do not worth keeping

XI. Charla: we have to figure out the financial viability.

XII. Lisa: Do any of us look at what programs will cost long term when we submit the programs to UAC?

XIII. There is a new financial model.

XIV. Seta: we are in the business of education, we should have a profit

XV. Charla: Every year we have the annual review process, we will review all of the concentrations, we will put a model together for distribution, we gave some concentrations back if we don't meet these targets, you should go back to your assessment data and figure out what would be meaningful, what is necessary in this environment