

a.1

This key section of the Proposal lays the foundation for why a particular set of issues and approaches is being proposed by the institution for its accreditation review. Drawing upon institutional data, especially that provided in the Data Tables addressing financial capacity, diversity and retention, this section should briefly describe: i) the institution's background, ii) strengths and challenges, and iii) the current state of the institution's approaches to identifying and assessing student learning outcomes across the institution. The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (found embedded within the attached Data Exhibits for the Institutional Proposal) is to be submitted and is designed to be used developmentally across the CPR and the EER. In addition, the institution should identify how the Proposal responds to issues raised by the most recent Commission action letter and, where relevant, issues identified by the Substantive Change or Interim Report Committees.

## **Background**

Pepperdine University looks forward to celebrating its 75th anniversary at the conclusion of its WASC reaccreditation review in 2012. As the university approaches this anniversary milestone, the reaccreditation process provides the university community with the opportunity to reaffirm its desire to be a nationally recognized institution whose mission combines the best of the academy with the best of its Christian faith heritage. Pepperdine University pursues the very highest academic standards within a context that both celebrates and extends the spiritual and ethical ideals of the Christian faith and maintains ties with the churches of Christ.

The university was founded in 1937 by George Pepperdine, a businessman who established the Western Auto Supply Company and was a lifelong member of the churches of Christ. For its first 30 years, Pepperdine was a small, mostly undergraduate Christian college located in downtown Los Angeles. Graduate and professional schools were added in 1970, allowing university status to be achieved. In 1972, the university opened its newly constructed Malibu campus.

Pepperdine University is now an independent, medium-sized university enrolling approximately 7600 students in five colleges and schools. Seaver College, the School of Law, and the School of Public Policy are located on the university's main campus in Malibu. The Graduate School of Education and Psychology and the Graziadio School of Business and Management are headquartered off-campus at Pepperdine's West Los Angeles regional center. The graduate programs of these two schools are offered also at a second regional center in Irvine, four off-campus sites located within 25 miles of the main campus or regional center, and four off-campus sites located beyond the 25-mile radius. In addition to leasing these facilities in the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area, Pepperdine owns five facilities and rents one overseas, as well as owns a building in Washington, D.C. where Seaver College undergraduates take courses. A Campus Classification Scheme is attached.

In addition to regional accreditation through the Western Association of Schools and

Colleges, Pepperdine has received specialized accreditation through the following organizations: American Bar Association (which recently awarded our law school membership in the Order of the Coif), American Dietetic Association, American Psychological Association, Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and the National Association of Schools of Music. Pepperdine has recently received renewal of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I certification.

## Strengths

Pepperdine strengths related to capacity and educational effectiveness include university's mission, people, locations, and culture.

### *An Historically Strong Affiliation with the Churches of Christ*

Pepperdine's respect for its religious heritage is fundamental to the mission. First, the university draws from a Christian tradition that celebrates the life of the mind. The values of intellectual inquiry present in the Churches of Christ are lived out in the academic culture. Second, by maintaining and continually strengthening formal ties with the Churches of Christ, Pepperdine is able to maintain an institutional identity, uncharacteristic of many higher education institutions that have loosened their church affiliation. Finally, by celebrating its Christian commitment, Pepperdine is able to pursue the intellectual integration of faith and learning and the development of the students' spirituality. Given the increasing importance of higher education's role in helping students pursue their life purpose and their spiritual center - as evidenced by the work of the Spirituality in Higher Education initiative at UCLA and our own Lilly Endowment research and data collection on faith, identity, and life-purpose formation, dating back to 2002, we are more certain than ever that our mission is worthy. Evidence of our own interest in the integration of faith and learning is provided via a recent publication by two of our faculty: Thompson, D. & Miller-Perrin, C. (2008). Vocational discernment and action: An exploratory study of male and female university professors. *Review of Religious Research*, 50(1), 97-119, which is attached as "Vocational Discernment" at the end of this section. Thus, our church affiliation provides us with significant capacity to focus on a single, vibrant mission: ***"Pepperdine University is a Christian university committed to the highest standards of academic excellence and Christian values, where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership"***.

### *The Quality of our Students and Faculty*

Pepperdine's undergraduate program, for example, attracts approximately 7500 applications each year, vying for 750 spots in the entering class. This entering class brings an average SAT score of 1240 and a high school GPA of 3.65 with 45% of these students coming from the top 10% of their graduating class. Pepperdine is pleased to have faculty who are highly committed to both teaching and scholarly research. These faculty hail from such schools as Chicago, Notre Dame, UCLA, UC Berkeley, Penn, Harvard, RAND Graduate

School, Michigan State, Arizona, Washington State, USC, NYU, Claremont Graduate University, and Stanford. Current evidence of faculty commitment to both teaching and research can be seen in our own Dr. Stephen Davis, recipient of the Robert Foster Cherry Award from Baylor University. The attachment “Robert Foster Cherry Award” at the end of this section describes his work.

### *Location*

Pepperdine’s many campus locations provide the capacity for rich academic programming. The main campus located in Malibu is stunningly beautiful and attractive to students for residential study. The urban regional centers and off-campus sites in the greater metropolitan Los Angeles area provide access to Pepperdine professional programs for fully-employed students. In addition, because Pepperdine values study abroad, 60% of the undergraduate students study in international locations all over the world. Newly-established programs in Buenos Aires, Argentina, Lausanne, Switzerland and Shanghai, China complement the long-existing programs in Heidelberg, Germany, Florence, Italy and London, England. Finally, Pepperdine political science undergraduates enroll in internships in the Washington, D.C. area while residing in our newest location on Pennsylvania Avenue.

### *Strong Culture of Evidence*

Resulting from a five-year long effort of the office of Educational and Institutional Research, Pepperdine has a well-formed process for building a culture of research (our designation for culture of evidence) about our educational practices. See section A.2 for more details on this process, which has built-in qualities to measure and improve both our capacity and our educational effectiveness.

### *Financial Resources*

Pepperdine maintains a balanced budget of approximately \$250M, with an endowment of \$690M, which pays out approximately \$27M annually. With aspirations for a larger endowment of \$1billion, with a payout that would comprise 20% of the operating budget, Pepperdine is embarking on a campaign to raise \$500 million for capital projects and endowment.

## **Challenges**

The challenges identified below are based on data gathered from our program reviews and our institutional self-review of the 46 CFR’s, all of which attend to both capacity and educational effectiveness:

### *Addressing Critical Criteria for Review*

Based on our self-review assessment, we recognize that there are a number of CFR areas that require our attention. See section A.3 for details.

### *Faculty Recruiting and Retention*

While Pepperdine faculty salaries are at the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile compared to national averages reported by the AAUP, attracting excellent faculty to Southern California continues to be a challenge, given the high cost of living. In addition to the more than 120 faculty housing units available on the Malibu campus, as well as a contingent loan program for new faculty, additional measures for providing affordable housing are under investigation.

### *High Impact Educational Activities*

Seaver College engages in all five of the high impact activities for optimal learning identified recently by the The National Survey of Student Engagement: learning communities, study abroad, undergraduate research, service learning, and capstone experiences. Our challenge is to increase the percentage of our student body who are able to participate in some or all of these best practice activities. See the attachment entitled "High Impact Activities NSSE".

### *Alumni Engagement*

We recognize that we have much to learn about increasing the engagement of our roughly 35,000 alumni with their alma mater, evidenced by their low giving rate of 13%. Strategic plans are in place to strengthen ties with our alumni base in order to learn from them how their education has added value to their lives, involve them in ongoing improvement of our academic programs, include them in our strategies to strengthen our career placement network, and to increase their participation in financially supporting our future. The president has launched some aggressive initiatives to address this matter, including forming new chapters, initiating a major service project, and forming a new alumni council. We expect to experience greater involvement with the alumni in the coming years.

### *Financial Resources*

To reduce tuition rate increases to make private higher education more affordable, and to reduce enrollment in our professional programs to enhance quality, increased external funding through fund raising is desirable. A \$500M campaign is planned and has been approved by the Board of Regents.

## **Approach to Identifying and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes**

Pepperdine's program review framework, whose five-year historical development is described in section A.3, is our tool for a) identifying and refining student learning outcomes, b) assessing student learning, and c) bringing about curricular change and improvement in student learning. This review process is applied to all academic programs, co-curricular programs, the university libraries, and information technology. The institutional portfolio, which will be featured in both the capacity and educational effectiveness reviews, will demonstrate our progress in these areas. Each of these entities continually refines its student learning outcomes, gathers evidence of student work, and

analyzes this work to determine how to improve student learning, as well as to inform decision-making, planning, and budgeting. The results of our ongoing identification of outcomes and assessment of student learning, disseminated to the University Planning Committee, increasingly serve as foci for institutional improvement. Following are some illustrations program review content, typifying program reviews occurring across the university.

### *Identifying Student Learning Outcomes*

According to the most recent Educational Effectiveness Inventory (Data Exhibit 6), administered on February 7, 2008, 87% of Pepperdine academic programs have published student-learning outcomes. Many of these outcomes are identified initially more than 10 years, undergoing continuous quality improvement via the ongoing program review process. We are making incremental annual progress on the percent of programs that have published student-learning outcomes, with a goal of have 100% subscription by the time our CPR visit occurs in 2010.

Following is a typical set of student learning outcomes, the current set for the undergraduate psychology program, representing requirements outlined by the APA for writing in psychology:

Psychology students will demonstrate their ability to

1. Communicate in written form, adhering to the guidelines of the American Psychological Association Publication Manual.
2. Communicate through oral presentation.
3. Conduct literature searches to find publications relevant to a specific topic.
4. Evaluate the quality of published literature and research.
5. Understand graphical and statistical presentation of data.
6. Design an empirical study.

### *Gathering Direct Evidence of Student Learning*

Every program review gathers direct evidence of student learning in the form of student work. Following is an example, excerpted from a program review report, of the quality of data being collected—this again by the undergraduate psychology program. The faculty chose to focus on the students' writing competency in the American Psychological Association (APA) style:

*Two sets of papers were examined. The first set consisted of the first empirical writing assignment of the semester. The papers were first and only drafts of a lab report. Here, students were asked to complete a set of surveys (chosen by the professor) and to write an empirical paper based on the class data. A random sample of eight papers (out of twenty-three) was selected for review. The second set of papers consisted of the last written assignment of the semester. The papers were the final draft of a group project. Students were asked to work in groups of three to develop a hypothesis, conduct a study to test it, analyze*

*their results, and write an empirical paper using APA style. A sample of five group projects (out of seven) was selected for review. The sample contained papers written by each of the eight students whose lab reports were reviewed in the first set. The course instructor removed all names from the papers prior to the review.*

### *Evaluating Student Learning*

The program review is a research process led by faculty scholars, involving student work, driving toward the goal of bringing about long-term improvement in student learning by continually refining program content and pedagogy. Following is an example, from the same program review text, of some of the analyses of student work and recommendations for change that resulted from the psychology program review:

*The reviewers used an evaluation rubric to measure the quality of each of the following: Cover Page, Abstract, Introduction (states problem of interest, reviews past theory and research, states specific hypothesis), Method (participants, materials, design, procedure), Results (describes how the data were handled, states statistical tests used, provides appropriate statistical information, states findings, refers reader to Appendices, Tables, and/or Figures), Discussion (summarizes study, states whether hypothesis was supported, interprets findings, relates present findings to past findings, relates results to theory, states limitations, states practical implications and implications for future research), References (meets minimum number of scholarly references, APA format), Appendices, Tables, and Mechanics (coherence, grammar, spelling, APA format). The evaluation rubric was not created for this review; rather it was created to inform students of the grading system and was therefore included in the course syllabus. The quality of each paper was scored as either Unacceptable (most elements are lacking and/or poorly executed) or Acceptable (most elements are present and are adequately executed).*

*The faculty subcommittee agreed that additional changes in the teaching methodology could be made. For example, the subcommittee discussed that while the instructor provides feedback on all of the written assignments, that the instructor should have a first draft and a final draft of all assignments. In this way, the students would be encouraged to think about APA style while making appropriate changes to their papers. Additionally, it was suggested that the students serve as peer reviewers. It was also suggested that students provide a bit more information about their participants (e.g., age, biological sex, and race). Dr. Bui provided a way in which this could be done without enabling students to link a participant's demographic information to his/her data. Finally, it was suggested that while students work in groups to test a hypothesis, they could write individual papers to report the findings.*

*The subcommittee also discussed how students had a difficult time transferring their APA skills from one paper to another and from one class to another. The committee believes that conveying the importance of using APA style on all psychology papers could be improved upon by encouraging all psychology faculty members to consistently require students to write their papers using APA style. The committee believes that this would indicate the importance of using APA style.*

(The psychology program is implementing these very recommendations into their curriculum this fall, with a plan to continue to measure the effectiveness of these steps toward quality improvement.)

The full psychology program review is attached at the end of this section ("Psychology Program Review").

### **Responses to Last Accreditation Visit**

The WASC Commission letter sent to President Benton on March 6, 2001, identified a number of important issues in its recommendations and suggestions.

#### *University Planning and Direction*

The visiting team charged Pepperdine with developing an institutional plan that would serve to inform and guide school-level decisions and resource allocation in the context of mission and strategic priorities, and to have the senior administration play a leadership role in the strategic assessment of institutional performance and effectiveness. In response to this recommendation, and to improve the strategic planning process, strategic priorities are established annually by the president in conjunction with the University Planning Committee for the purpose of guiding resource allocation. Also, a university-wide strategic planning process comprising external scan, SWOT analysis, current state assessment, and priority setting began in 2005. The university-wide strategic plan completed by the University Planning Committee in May, 2008, is exhibited in the appendices at the end of this section: "Strategic Plan Draft 2007". Currently, this draft is in revision to reflect the content from president's recent envisioning sessions with donors, as well as the reality of the current financial climate.

#### *Integrating Values into Decision Making and Program Development*

The WASC Commission urged the university to articulate the values espoused in the mission statement in meaningful ways so that they can effectively inform decision-making, particularly at the school level. In particular, service learning and global experiences need to be assessed.

Progress has been made in defining and integrating values into decision-making and program development. Faculty candidate finalists for all of the schools are interviewed by the president and provost and hired, in part, because of their commitment to a faith community. Each year, the entering class of tenure-track faculty from all of the schools convenes for a week-long seminar on the integration of faith and learning at one of Pepperdine's overseas locations. The university's Center for Faith and Learning, initially funded by the Lilly Foundation, sponsors this event and also provides ongoing faculty development in this area. During this past academic year, a branding study was conducted to understand better the students' experience of Pepperdine's mission and values. Finally, the provost articulated a response and call to action for the faculty, in the form of a

presentation at the 2006 Faculty Conference: Scholars & Witnesses – Defining the Pepperdine Difference. See the attachments at the end of this section for a copy of the presentation. This essay provides the language and the mechanisms for the faculty to think more deeply about what it means to be a Christian university. While clarity regarding Pepperdine's mission and values continues to be a topic of discussion, substantial progress and greater consistency have been achieved since 2000 with the appointment of President, Andy Benton.

Regarding the assessment of service learning, the Volunteer Center oversees service learning and conducts ongoing assessment of the effectiveness of service learning pedagogy. A full report may be found in the attachments. Since the international program experience is central to Pepperdine's undergraduate experience, this program is currently being evaluated within the five-year program review cycle. The overseas program goals and a survey, which is presently being administered and analyzed, can also be found in the appendices at the end of this section.

#### *Review of University Bylaws and Statement on Academic Freedom*

The university has revised its bylaws as of June 13, 2006. The changes address the Commission's suggestion that the institution consider language in the bylaws that reflects appropriate distinctions between policy and administration, and that the Articles of Incorporation be examined with regard to institutional mission and purpose. The Board of Regents has changed its bylaws, as reflected in attachment, "University Bylaws".

The provost has worked with the faculty to ensure that academic freedom is embedded in the Rank, Tenure, and Promotion process. The attachment "Academic Freedom" contains a copy of the recently updated Rank, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, which contains Pepperdine's statement on academic freedom.

#### *Assessment*

In 2006, the university expanded its institutional research function into a newly created office of Educational and Institutional Research, whose task it is to support and monitor the program review process and the assessment of student learning, with a commitment to complex and on-going assessment across the university, and to produce data in a timely and effective manner for decision-making. This office is charged with responding to the WASC commission's urging that the university identify more clearly its goals in conducting assessments of educational effectiveness, to establish baseline data and, as appropriate, performance indicators, and to utilize its assessment results more systematically to improve learning and feed into institutional decision making, strategic planning, and budgeting.

As a part of the work of the office of Educational and Institutional Research, Pepperdine has developed a comprehensive list of peer and aspirational schools to monitor progress in such areas as faculty salaries, endowment, student selectivity, research budgeting, faculty



resources, grant awards, and retention and graduation rates in each of the five schools. See the attachments in this section for our 2008 listing of peer and aspirational schools. In connection with these lists, we use a benchmark dashboard instrument to assist senior leadership as they track Pepperdine's standing with respect to other schools. This dashboard instrument will be featured during the capacity review.

An important internal assessment tool, the Program Review as Research process, is both innovative and widely embraced by faculty. This process, based on a research model for program review, relies on benchmarks, performance indicators, and systematic assessment. Each program review culminates in a report to the senior administrative University Planning Committee. Our comprehensive program review process, which encompasses student learning outcomes, gathering of student work as evidence, analysis of these findings, and recommendations for improving student learning, is discussed fully in section 3 below, as well as throughout sections B and C.

Pepperdine's digital archiving tool, <https://xythos.pepperdine.edu>, provides a web-based means of facilitating collaboration among faculty on assessment projects as well as disseminating both aggregate and disaggregate findings to the university community.

#### *Faculty Strength, Role and Influence in the Institution's Culture*

The role of the faculty has been strengthened in several specific ways since 2000 for the purpose of influencing Pepperdine's overall culture, as recommended by the WASC commission. In 2002, President Benton formed the University Faculty Council (UFC) to create a closer collaboration among the senior administration and faculty leadership across all five schools. Elected faculty leaders from each of the schools meet regularly with the president and provost, functioning as a kind of faculty senate for the entire university. In addition to these face to face meetings, the provost has instituted a periodic of comment and review, in which all faculty members are invited to comment on new policies and procedures affecting them.

The WASC reaccreditation self-study process provides the university with an opportunity to strengthen faculty involvement in building the culture of evidence by placing primary responsibility for program review with the faculty as "principal investigators". In particular, the WASC Commission encouraged Pepperdine to seek better ways to involve faculty in the evaluation and assessment processes of student performance, learning goals, and educational technology. Pepperdine's educational environment across several physical and virtual learning sites calls for a unified faculty upon whom the institution can rely for analysis and perspective. There remains a need to examine the integration of technology across campus units in addition to identifying educational goals for the use of technology and to research the efficacy of technology as an educational practice. The Pepperdine program review process is largely faculty driven. Student performance is measured on many levels: through ongoing assessment in each class, through the university-wide program review process, and through continuous gathering of data from alumni. Since 2007, Pepperdine relies on a standard assessment protocol for assessing its information technology support systems: TechQual. Please see the attachment for the most recent

report on this instrument: "Information\_Technology\_Assessment".

### *Off-Campus and Distance Learning Programs*

The WASC Commission requested that the university work with the WASC staff to develop a system for classifying site-based and distance learning programs so that the substantive change review process, where appropriate, can be more clearly aligned with institutional planning. The WASC office of Substantive Change recently recognized Pepperdine's West Los Angeles and Irvine campuses as regional centers. The campus classification scheme attachment provides an account of Pepperdine's campus topology, while the Off-Campus and Distance Education attachment summarizes all of the programs and their locations.

#### a.2

Using the WASC "Worksheet for Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards" and the "What Really Matters on Your Campus?" exercise, or through other means, the institution is to identify key issues arising under the Standards, especially those relating to student learning results and organizational learning/quality assurance systems, and demonstrate that these issues are being addressed through the approach taken by the institution in its Proposal and plan of work. [The Self-Review Worksheet may be submitted as an appendix and is optional.]

### **Preliminary Self-Review under the Standards of Accreditation**

To conduct the self-review, the university employed survey research methodology, building a series of four online surveys using the tool "Survey Monkey". The attachment entitled "Self Review Surveys I-IV" contains the four surveys, which comprise all of the questions provided in the "Worksheet for Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards". In the fall of 2007, the office of Educational and Institutional Research distributed these four instruments to the following 82 constituents: 1) Faculty members who have led or are leading program reviews dating back to 2002, 2) all deans and associate deans, and 3) the university's senior leadership (president, provost, chief financial officer, ...). Overall, 80% of these constituents responded to the entire survey.

The complete survey results may be viewed in the attachment "Self Review Results I-IV" located at the end of this section. Based on the majority (mode) response, none of the CFR's was denoted "needs significant development". The majority of respondents identified most of the CFR's as "areas of strength". The remaining 37% of the CFR's were made by a majority of the respondents: "aspects of this need our attention". These topics needing attention center on assessment (programs, skills, satisfaction); institutional planning; information gathering, processing, and dissemination; technology; leadership (faculty, administrative); and diversity.. The findings of the self-review helped to frame the direction of this review cycle with its intentional focus on assessment and meaning in the curriculum and programming. Based on the collection of data for the self review and the and

discussion that ensued several key research questions have been formulated to guide both the CPR and EER reviews. These are discussed in section B.3.ii.

Follow-up activities and responsible individuals and groups related to the CFR's needing attention, as reflected in our self-review audit, are highlighted in red in the appendix entitled "CFR Action List". Following is a detailed account of the issues that emerged as needing attention and our proposed action plans to attend to these issues:

**1.2 Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives.**

Action: The stated purpose of the university as articulated in the mission statement is widely disseminated to the community and to the public, as evidenced by its prominent display on the university's website. Educational objectives are articulated at the program level through the program review mechanism and are disseminated in the program review documents. To achieve greater dissemination, these objectives could be published more consistently in school catalogs and course syllabi, as well as in program promotional materials. Educational objectives for departments, schools, and the university are typically published in strategic plans, but could be more widely disseminated through catalogs and by display on the website. In addition to the program level, evidence is gathered at the school and university levels using such assessment instruments as HERI, NSSE, and CLA. These results are disseminated to key constituents throughout the university by the office of Educational and Institutional Research. A more rigorous schedule for the dissemination of data and feedback from the units on how the information is used to make improvements is under construction.

Pepperdine's well-established and fully funded program review process is our mechanism for recognizing and evaluating the educational objectives within each program throughout the institution. These academic program reviews are owned primarily by the faculty, but also by the department chairs, deans, and the central university planning committee. As each program enters its second iteration of the five-year review cycle, a cycle which began in 2003, the focus is intentional--on clarifying educational objectives, establishing and tracking indicators, and continuing to gather direct evidence in order to ensure that student learning outcomes are being achieved across the institution. In particular, the comprehensive review of the newly minted GE program employs several scoring rubrics used by the review team and the faculty members who teach in the GE program to measure GE outcomes and to provide a means of establishing acceptable levels of performance in the GE program. An example of these rubrics is attached: "GE Writing Intensive Rubric".

**2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery, and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum**

**offered.**

Action: The institution's educational programs, including the content, standards, nomenclature, and mode of delivery, receive close scrutiny by the faculty of the university through departmental, school, and university-wide faculty governance processes. Program faculty initiate curriculum proposals to their departments and divisions. Before they can be implemented, these proposals must be approved also by the school level academic councils, as well as by the University Academic Council chaired by the provost. Many academic programs also achieve specialized accreditation.

A rigorous process is in place for hiring new tenure-track faculty, including a thorough vetting by the program faculty and ultimately, an interview with the president. Full-time non-tenure-track faculty members are interviewed by the program faculty and ultimately by their dean. The adjunct faculty are hired by program faculty and the department chair.

All faculty members undergo consistent evaluation by students through course evaluations and by supervisors. Tenure-track faculty members undergo periodic peer review, as well.

All academic programs have established their ideal ratio of full and part-time faculty. Many programs consistently achieve the balance they desire, but in some programs additional full time faculty have been requested. The deans are responsible for maintaining these standards, and for requesting additional funds for new faculty hires to the University Planning Committee during the annual budget hearings.

The program review mechanism has proven to be helpful in evaluating and addressing program standards (an educational effectiveness issue) and staffing (a capacity issue) already with a number of programs, e.g., English, Sociology, and Advertising. In particular, each of these program is intentionally focused on setting and meeting minimum standards of learning performance, as prescribed, wherever possible, by the discipline's professional organizations and associations. In addition, the external review component of the program review creates a benchmark comparison with other universities that the faculty admire and wish to emulate.

**2.4 The institution's expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution's faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.**

Action: The faculty sets expectations for student learning and attainment primarily through the rigor of its course syllabi, approved by the University Academic Council,

Other methods for establishing and communicating expectations for learning and attainment include discussion at academic clubs, standards for honor societies, emphasis on countering grade inflation, hosting distinguished speakers on discipline specific topics, achievement of academic awards such as Fulbright scholarships, and faculty/student research. The mission of the university articulates not only high academic expectations for students, but also high personal standards for character and service. These personal standards are supported by weekly convocation programs, standards for community living, opportunities to participate in service learning, and more in the co-curricular arena. At Pepperdine, a strong ethos prevails and is communicated initially in the admission process, that students are expected to achieve at high levels and to be committed to character development at a high standard.

The program review process is designed to be the primary mechanism whereby faculty obtain and review evidence of student learning. This process, which commenced formally in 2003, becomes more effective with each passing year of experience. To advance faculty knowledge on methods for obtaining evidence, the annual fall university-wide Faculty Conference for 2008 focused on assessment and student learning, featuring expert Peggy Maki and presentations from alumni on learning experiences that most affected them. See the attached description: "Faculty Conference Alumni Event".

Finally, in an effort to keep assessment activity at the forefront, our office of Educational and Institutional Research sends out a biweekly EIR report to all university faculty, staff, and administration on research trends in higher education and ongoing results of assessment activities within our academic community. In addition, the office of Educational and Institutional Research maintains a web presence that regularly broadcasts results from Pepperdine's participation in national surveys and studies.

**2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.**

Action: The institution-wide program review process is the primary system upon which Pepperdine relies to monitor and improve the ways in which students are challenged and provided with formative feedback. The program review data collected since 2003 confirms that Pepperdine has in place clearly articulated learning outcomes and high impact learning experiences (learning communities, international program study, service learning, research with faculty, off-campus internships, and capstone courses) that require high performance by our students. However, we do recognize the need to strengthen our feedback mechanisms to students in order to assist in their performance improvement. Thus, this area as a key research question in our upcoming CPR and EER as we continue to sharpen and deepen the ongoing program review work across the institution.

**2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are**

**embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.**

Action: The program review process, during its first-five year cycle, has accomplished significant foundational work by articulating learning objectives and assessing student learning. During the next five-year cycle, we will incorporate ongoing annual reviews in addition to the major five-year reviews. In addition we will assess the students upon their completion of their academic program and embed program objectives into the course syllabi. For example, GE learning outcomes currently are published in the Seaver College catalog and displayed on the website. Next steps will require greater intentionality to help students become familiar with the learning objectives, and to encourage the faculty to provide students with ongoing feedback on their attainment of these goals. These advances can be achieved by encouraging the inclusion of the desired learning outcomes for the program and for the course on course syllabi, and by greater awareness of faculty feedback to students during the faculty annual evaluation and rank, tenure, and promotion process.

The assessment of graduate's level of attainment occurs now in some programs through a capstone course, a standard Pepperdine exit interview, surveys to the alumni, and conversations with alumni such as the one that occurred at the recent faculty conference where representative alums were invited to share their lasting learning experiences. Greater deliberation in assessing the graduates' level of attainment will require additional capstone courses and measures of assessment, an area we hope to improve upon as we consider using such instruments as the CLA.

**2.8 The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, curricular and instructional innovations, and creative activity, as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution's purposes and character.**

Action: Pepperdine highly values faculty scholarship, especially as a critical component of excellent teaching. New tenure-track faculty candidates are hired for their potential as both teachers and researchers. Many of the new faculty arrives with an already established research program. Faculty researchers may apply for in-house funding to cover travel and subject costs, reduced teaching loads, sabbaticals, and receive staff assistance in applying for external grants. Recently, Seaver College enacted a new policy of giving junior faculty one less course to teach, in order to encourage their scholarly production. Also, the Seaver College Rank, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) committee is revising the RTP guidelines, to encourage scholarship.

Curricular innovation is also encouraged at the university. A Center for Teacher Excellence at Seaver College provides development and discussion within the faculty to stimulate shifts in pedagogy and support for teaching. Grants are available to the faculty from the Chief Information Officer to integrate the use of technology into learning.

In addition, a number of forums for promoting scholarship and instructional innovation are offered, including our Endowed Chair Program, University Library Lecture Series, W. David Baird Distinguished Lecture Series, Howard A. White Teaching Awards, Center for Teaching Excellence Workshops, Center for Faith and Learning workshops and study groups, various departmental/division level colloquia, Convocation Lecture Series, as well as several student honors societies who host distinguished guests.

Each year Pepperdine offers greater support for faculty research, however, the faculty appetite for scholarship is great and will require additional support as the university matures.

**3.2. The institution demonstrates that it employs a faculty with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve its educational objectives, to establish and oversee academic policies, and to ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever and however delivered.**

Action: Pepperdine's program review protocol addresses matters of faculty capacity at the program level, including the ongoing monitoring, evaluating and recommending of the number of faculty employed in each area and the diversity in each department. Recommendations to add to the full time faculty are generated by the program faculty, reviewed by the department or division chair and the dean of the school, and presented by the dean of the school to the University Planning Committee during the annual budget cycle. In addition to those requests generated by the faculty to teach specific academic content, the University Strategic Plan calls for the addition of several distinguished faculty members to stimulate scholarship and to enhance the intellectual dialogue.

The University and Seaver College Diversity Councils are engaged with the issues of faculty and curricular diversity. Their most recent participation in the AAC&U Greater Expectations Institute will bring about substantive progress in these areas in the coming years. In particular, their plan includes the attached scope of work – see "Diversity Initiative".

**3.4. The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with its educational objectives and institutional purposes.**

Action: Currently, several support systems undergird faculty professional development activities at Pepperdine. The university hosts an annual university-wide two-day Faculty Conference on topics related to teaching and scholarship. The most recent conference addressed the topic of the assessment of student learning. In addition to the university-wide conference, each of the schools sponsors a beginning of the year retreat for its faculty. The university's Center for Faith and Learning offers seminars for faculty and staff,

including a week-long annual seminar for new full-time faculty at one of Pepperdine's overseas locations. Seaver College sponsors a Center for Teaching Excellence that engages its faculty in discussion about teaching and offers seminars and classroom feedback. See the attachment "Center for Teaching Excellence Events". Each of the schools provides some form of peer participation in the evaluation of teaching, and the benefit of student evaluations of teaching. Finally, Information Technology offers support for teaching using technology through a technology liaison program at Seaver College, and through similar means at the other schools. Additional opportunities to learn new pedagogies, especially those using technology, is necessary for the Pepperdine faculty.

**3.5. Fiscal and physical resources are effectively aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives, and are sufficiently developed to support and maintain the level and kinds of educational programs offered both now and for the foreseeable future.**

Action: The University Planning Committee (UPC) is charged with aligning the fiscal, physical, and human resources of the university with its mission, purposes, and objectives. Composed of 19 administrators and three representative faculty members, including the president, provost, and the deans of the schools, the UPC conducts the strategic planning and the budgeting activities for the university. The UPC produces the five-year strategic plan, sets annual university-wide priorities, and allocates resources for strategic priorities. The University Planning Committee could become more effective if it were to achieve better consistency, greater transparency, and improved communication with the university community. Efforts to that effect are underway.

During the past eight years, the university has been committed to growing quality rather than enrollment. To that end, a campaign has been approved by the Board of Regents to raise funds to support the university's growing appetite for quality. While Pepperdine's current resources are sufficient to maintain the current undergraduate and professional programs, increased quality through distinguished faculty, improved facilities, winning athletic teams, engaged alumni, and additional student financial aid, will require fund raising.

**3.6. The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. For on-campus students and students enrolled at a distance, physical and information resources, services, and information technology facilities are sufficient in scope and kinds to support and maintain the level and kind of education offered. These resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution's purposes, and are appropriate, sufficient, and sustainable.**

Action: Since 2005 Pepperdine University has made significant investments in technology infrastructure, Web-based administrative and learning management systems, and tools designed to assist faculty more fully integrate technology into their teaching, learning, and service activities. The University network has been re-architected and now provides service that meets or exceeds service available at peer and aspirational institutions. Total bandwidth has been increased 6x; internal bandwidth to graduate campuses has been



increased up to 10x; and 200 additional wireless access points have been install University-wide. The institutions' work in this area has been recognized through the granting of member in Internet2. In terms of Web-based services, a PeopleSoft finance, human resources, and student implementation has just been completed providing real-time access to information and processes on a 24/7 basis. The University-wide Learning Management System (Blackboard) was also upgraded and now includes additional features such as content sharing and virtual classrooms. The University also, on an annual basis, invests significant resources for digital library content to support both teaching and learning.

To properly assess the quality of services and to insure that trends in faculty and student expectations are considered proactively the University administers an annual Web-based survey through the Higher Education TechQual+ Project. This instrument provides substantial insight into faculty and student perceptions and provide data crucial to the establishment of priorities through an annual planning process. A new position was created in 2008, Assistant CIO for Strategic Planning, who is responsible for conducting these assessments, analyzing the data, and leading the IT division through an annual process of assessment, planning, and execution.

**3.7. The institution's information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and to provide key academic and administrative functions.**

Action: Annual assessments conducted through the Higher Education TechQual+ Project, administered beginning in 2007, provide the detailed information necessary to ensure that the delivery and operation of technology services are consistent with faculty and student needs and expectations. In 2008, the CIO completed the development of a comprehensive strategic plan for technology and learning that focuses on the twin topics of faculty development and faculty support. The plan links together the need to support faculty and students with the wide array of technology services provided by the IT division. This plan is currently being finalized through consultation with the University faculty and will be revised annually as a part of the CIO's IT strategic planning process.

**3.8. The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear, consistent with its purposes, and sufficient to support effective decision making.**

Action: The president is advised by a steering committee that convenes weekly, comprising the provost, executive vice president, and three vice-presidents all together who represent the operational areas of the university, as well as the chief financial officer, and the president's chief of staff. The University Planning Committee, chaired by a senior vice president, makes recommends on strategy and budget to the president. The Dean's Council, chaired by the provost, makes recommendations on academic administration. The Chief's Council, chaired by the executive vice president, makes recommendation on facilities, security, and finance. While most tactical decisions are make by these respective

areas, strategic and policy decisions are ultimately made by the president and approved by the Board of Regents.

The president communicates regularly with the entire university community through monthly briefings webcast for broad participation and memos when specific issues impacting the campus arise. In addition to improving effective communication, discussion with each of the committees on how and where decisions are made is in order to improve the decision making process.

**3.10. The institution has a chief executive whose full-time responsibility is to the institution, together with a cadre of administrators qualified and able to provide effective educational leadership and management at all levels.**

Action: The president is a full-time employee who divides his time between external fund raising and internal operational activities. The Board of Regents evaluates his work annually. The president is supported by a provost, executive vice president for finance and administration, a vice president for advancement, a senior vice president for investments, and a senior vice president for planning, information, and technology, as well as a chief of staff. The deans of the five schools are vetted by the faculty and appointed by the provost and president. The faculty evaluates the deans on a five-year cycle. Our senior leadership team is addressing this CFR, through close collaboration with the University Faculty Council. That group is using the UCLA Triennial Faculty Survey data, most recently gathered in spring 2008, in order to examine the ways that our institution manages itself and brings about educational effectiveness.

**3.11. The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution's educational purposes and character.**

Action: The faculty exercises leadership through the faculty organizations at each of the schools and through the University Faculty Council which functions much like a faculty senate. In addition, each school maintains an academic council that reviews proposals for curriculum change. The University Academic Council reviewed proposals approved by the school councils. In addition, every academic unit is undergoing continuous program review of all of its academic programs, with quality being at the forefront of every assessment protocol.

**4.2. Planning processes at the institution define and, to the extent possible, align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution.**

Action: The University Planning Committee is charged with overseeing the alignment of academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with university priorities.. The emerging university strategic plan will help to unify these processes. Furthermore, the information technology department is in the process of developing a plan that aligns with the priorities stated in the strategic plan.

**4.3. Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.**

Action: The office of Educational and Institutional Research provides both quantitative and qualitative data to the University Planning Committee in a timely fashion for effective decision-making. Appropriate data are also provided to faculty program review committees. The newly constituted office of Educational and Institutional Research is developing a consistent schedule for the analysis, production, and dissemination of data that will no doubt improve the effectiveness of routine decision-making at Pepperdine.

**4.5. Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included among the priorities of institutional research function is the identification of indicators and the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning consistent with the institution's purposes and educational objectives.**

Action: The office of Institutional Research has recently been transformed into a group that is able to more fully address the matters raised by this CFR. See the attachment entitled "Evolution of EIR" at the end of section C.1. Every program review includes a set of student learning metrics that it continuously monitors in order to measure program quality. In addition, the office of Educational and Institutional Research (EIR) maintains a set of dashboard indicators on the health of the institution, providing both longitudinal measures as well as comparisons with peer and aspirational institutions. Our Board of Regents reviews these dashboards annually.

**4.7. The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.**

Action: Pepperdine's comprehensive, university wide program review process is the methodology used to address these areas of concern. These reviews occur in two forms: a) annual reviews, and b) five-year reviews, which work together to create a seamless, continuous, sustainable process of assessment for all programs. See the attached "Annual Review Guide" and "Program Review Ingredients" for more details on these two protocols

**a.3**

In this section, the institution should describe how it went about developing the Proposal design and generated broad institutional support for it. Key institutional leaders, especially the chief executive officer, chief academic officer, and faculty leadership, should be significantly involved in the design and implementation of the Proposal and be demonstrably committed to its implementation and success.

--

The development of this proposal and of our culture of evidence leadership base are both a function of the history of the development and implementation of our *program review as research* process. Our leadership development has followed the same trajectory as our program review development, which in turn defines the development of our *culture of research*.

Because a respect for research has grown to be an integral part of the university culture, the leadership structure for this reaccreditation process is fashioned after the distributed model found in academic disciplines--as a network where centers of activity reside in disciplinary areas or nodes. Program review principal investigators form a network of university leadership for the reaccreditation process. The university relies on the members of this network to fulfill many important tasks in the reaccreditation process: a) conduct program reviews, b) report and incorporate findings to the local community of disciplinary colleagues, c) report findings to the central administration, d) report research work to WASC during the upcoming Capacity and Educational Effectiveness visits, e) provide feedback to for the section "Self-Review under the Standards of Accreditation", and f) provide feedback on drafts of this Institutional Proposal, which was prepared and disseminated by the Office of Educational and Institutional Research.

We have adopted the distributive model, rather than a representative committee or task force, in order to accomplish one fundamental outcome: sustained growth of our university-wide culture of research. The current infrastructure, shared across program review leadership, is built to maintain and sustain a culture of research where knowledge is sectorized and distributed across the academy in the disciplines where it is tied to local needs.

In response to our last reaccreditation visit and the visiting team's call for more intentional use of assessment, the vice president of planning, information formed a new team of faculty and staff in 2003 to lead the university assessment efforts. This team made it a priority to learn from WASC, through its annual meetings and assessment workshops, how to build a culture of research, beginning with the 2003-04 academic year.

That year was a watershed period for the development of our leadership base. This base began with the formation of the university assessment committee, comprised of faculty representatives from our five schools, tasked with formulating a vision for university-wide assessment, and, in particular, developing a model of program review. To get things going, this team, along with ten other faculty members from the five schools, who were slated to conduct program reviews in subsequent years, attended an AAHE-WASC workshop in Honolulu, during the third week of March, 2004. This event proved to be extremely valuable, largely because of our opportunity to meet and learn from Mary Allen, who served as one of the workshop facilitators. Through our dialogue with Mary, we began to craft a vision for conducting program review, based on three guiding principles:

- Faculty members must design and conduct all reviews, with flexibility built in that honors the differences between various academic programs

- Faculty must view each review as a research project, gathering student work as direct evidence
- All reviews should culminate in presentations to the senior administration, as a means of affirming their value and importance.

We also decided that it would be invaluable for Mary to come to Pepperdine in the fall of 2004 to conduct assessment workshops for faculty. She spent two days with us, meeting with fifty faculty members, helping them understand the assessment process. Word of her value as a facilitator spread across campus, so that several of our faculty arranged for her to meet with their program review groups in subsequent months. Mary was the spark for all of our assessment work. She will join us for another two-day workshop in the fall of 2009, providing introductory and advanced training on assessing student learning for our program review faculty.

As a result of Mary's work and the university assessment committee's reading of seminal research by Wergin & Swingin<sup>1</sup> on best practice in assessment of programs, and Diamond<sup>2</sup> on ways to engage faculty in meaningful assessment activities that connect their disciplinary knowledge to program review, as well as inspiration drawn from an article on the way that nature self-organizes in order to optimize growth<sup>3</sup>, our program review as research model was formed. This latter work on natural self-organization, by Biebracher, Nicolis, & Schuster, proved to be most valuable, as it was born IN the disciplines and not as assessment literature. Accordingly, it had and still has higher credibility as a guide for our work. This brought about our program review principle: *"The maintenance of organization in nature is not – and cannot be – achieved by central management; order can only be maintained by self-organization. Self-organizing systems allow adaptation to the prevailing environment, i.e. they react to changes in the environment with a thermodynamic response which makes the systems extraordinarily flexible and robust against perturbations from outside conditions."* This statement continues to serve to inspire the most important element of our program review as research model – namely that each academic discipline, being a local instantiation of an international culture that defines that discipline – MUST rely on the culture behind that discipline to organize its own student learning outcomes and define a meaningful assessment protocol. Assessment will only work if it is owned by the faculty, driven by the faculty, and respectful of the cultural mores of their academic discipline. For a full, detailed account of the way each program review works, see the appendix "Program Review Ingredients" at the end of section B.1.

Thus, by the midpoint of the 2004-05 academic year, the program review model was in place and the leadership base, which started with the university assessment council and

---

<sup>1</sup> Departmental Assessment - How Some Campuses are Effectively Evaluating the Collective Work of Faculty, Jon F. Wergin and Judi N. Swingen, AAHE, 2000.

<sup>2</sup> Field Guide To Academic Leadership, Robert M. Diamond, Ed., Jossey-Bass, 2002.

<sup>3</sup> Self-Organization in the Physico-Chemical and Life Sciences, C.K. Biebracher, G. Nicolis, and P. Schuster, Report EUR 16546, European Commission, 1995.

those who traveled to Hawaii in the spring of 2004, grew each year, as 12-15 new faculty joined the ranks of those conducting program reviews, thereby forming what is now an approximately 100 member faculty assessment culture of key institutional leaders. The model of leadership is therefore distributed, with leaders positioned in every discipline, across the academy. This is, in our view, the best way for Pepperdine to maintain and cultivate a culture of evidence.

With each new academic year, from 2003-04 to the present, our culture of evidence has grown from the addition of new members who have conducted significant program reviews of student learning, and this culture has stayed in touch and been informed by participation in ongoing assessment conferences and workshops. From 2003 forward, our faculty have become increasingly participatory in WASC meetings as well as other assessment conferences. What follows is a partial list of some of the most critical presentations and workshops that the faculty has attended, which have greatly contributed to the ongoing maturation of our culture of evidence:

- Every CPR and EER workshop which has been conducted at every annual meeting of WASC
- The plenary addresses by Sandy Astin and Jon Wergin at the 2003 WASC annual meeting, calling for our attention to spirituality in our student as well as reflections on the importance of each institution “owning” its measurement of student learning.
- Diane Halpern’s plenary address on deep learning, at the 2004 WASC annual meeting.
- John Seely Brown’s comments on the *atelier* approach to learning found in schools of architecture, during his 2005 WASC annual meeting plenary address.
- Pat Wolfe’s comments in the same annual meeting about how the brain learns. We invited Pat to kick off our faculty conference in the following academic year.
- The presentations by Tom Ehrlich and Derek Bok at the 2006 WASC annual meeting, providing valuable reinforcement of our program review as research/inquiry model
- Milt Hakel’s presentation at the 2007 WASC annual meeting on deep learning, a theme that resonates universally on our campus
- Assessment presentations at every AAC&U annual meeting – See attached summary of our 2008 AAC&U/ACAD presentation: “Program Planning and Review Process with Presentation” & “Conference Response”.
- The highly valuable annual assessment conference hosted by Texas A&M University
- Annual AACSB assessment conferences, one of which we hosted on our campus in 2006.
- Every annual forum of the Association of Institutional Research
- Participation in the annual Indiana University sponsored workshops on how to use the National Survey of Student Engagement to measure student learning
- Participation in the annual HERI sponsored workshops on effective use of the CIRP, CSS, and Faculty Surveys to measure student learning
- A team of 15 faculty will be attending the WASC Assessment workshop in Hawaii, scheduled for January 2009.

In addition to our culture of evidence increasing its membership each year and a number of the members participating in all of the above-mentioned activities, we also gathered valuable traction for our ongoing assessment efforts through three critical events:

- The purchase of Xythos in 2005 – our digital repository for all WASC data
- The reinvention of EIR – See the appendix “Evolution of EIR” at the end of section C.1
- The purchase of Clementine in 2008 – enabling us to build predictive analytics models for retention, diversity, and rankings data

## b.1

The institution should describe in this overview section a coherent vision and specific outcomes for the entire accrediting review as a single connected process, specifying what it intends to accomplish, and how the CPR and EER are connected and aligned to achieve these outcomes. The institution should also consider the outcomes intended for the accreditation review process as identified on page 36 of the Handbook.

### **Coherent Vision for the Accrediting Review**

The academy is a coherent whole whose purpose is to pursue truth through scholarly inquiry. Its coherency comes from its singular goal: to create a space where faculty and student learners can form a community that practices obedience to truth, thereby developing wisdom for the faculty, for the students, and for the academic community. Our vision for the accreditation review is based on this coherent academic vision, namely, that we celebrate inquiry, the asking of questions and the pursuit of and obedience to truth through the research process. We view capacity and educational effectiveness, respectively, as the space and the teaching/learning practices that provide means and end to the goal of scholarly inquiry.

The coherency of our accrediting review is delivered by the single element – our five year old process of the *program review as research*, whose evolution is described in section A.3, and whose ingredients are described by attachment to this section as “Program Review Ingredients”. We have seen how this approach to accreditation and to pursuing the goals of the academy at the program level builds community and conversation. Furthermore it has wide faculty buy-in, is sustainable, and it is teachable and transferable. The program review incorporates elements to both capacity and educational effectiveness: a) capacity is incorporated in our taking stock of our “space”: intellectual – faculty & students, curricular, co-curricular, staffing, domestic and international campus locations, physical plant, fiscal position, spiritual state, and our human demographics; whereas b) our educational effectiveness is each found in each curricular and co-curricular program’s pursuit of its student learning outcomes via its engagement with the disciplines of the academy. Out of this entire process grows our set of research questions, as enumerated in see section B.3.ii below.

Pepperdine's research-based culture of evidence lies within the academic community itself, where students and faculty seek the truths offered through research and are transformed by those truths. The subject under inquiry in this research model is the academic process itself, where students and faculty are both mentors and protégés of the discipline in which they engage. Faculty teach in order to prepare students for a life of the mind, based on the ability to critically navigate their worlds—asking questions, formulating approaches to answering these questions, and reflecting on what they learn. In other words, the purpose is to teach so students learn deeply how to learn for their entire lives. And in turn, students assist faculty in becoming students of the teaching/learning process.

In the academic world, perhaps most especially in a school in which there is a focused mission and a sincere effort to maintain ties with the spiritual roots of the founder-- autonomy and individuality have traditionally been highly prized. Assessment serves the valuable role of bringing all of the players together around the same table of inquiry, thereby creating community. Faculty members discuss student learning and course structure in order to make adjustments to curricula and syllabi. In the safety of focused discourse, both effective and ineffective approaches to pedagogy are identified. To capture faculty imagination and turn it into an intellectual inquiry, research questions are posed about the academic program, such as how well students are meeting the goals established for each discipline. Using a research model to investigate courses allows us to rely on actual student learning and performance as evidence for the quality of our academic programs.

The purpose of building a culture of evidence is not the mere accumulation of data, but rather the honing of fruitful inquiry and ongoing dialogue about our academic community. Although we are accumulating many data-rich artifacts in our Institutional Portfolio (see the attachment entitled "Institutional Portfolio Table of Contents"), the most important part of this process is our ability to ask good questions and draw solid conclusions. A research-based culture of evidence has begun to flourish at Pepperdine University among students, faculty, staff, administration, and the Board of Regents who anticipate the WASC process as important in assisting the institution in increasingly becoming a reflective group of learners who rely on and utilize meaningful data.

### **Specific outcomes for the entire accrediting review**

Our fundamental desired outcome for this accreditation review process is to build our reflective, academic research-based culture of evidence in order to enhance student learning. Specifically, we desire to achieve the following:

1. The development of and more effective use of indicators of institutional performance and educational effectiveness to support institutional planning and decision making;
2. Greater clarity about the institution's educational objectives and criteria for defining and evaluating those objectives;
3. Improvement of the institution's capacity for self review and of its systems of quality assurance;



4. A deeper understanding of student learning, the development of more varied and effective methods of assessing learning, and the use of the results of this process to improve programs and institutional practices;
5. Systematic engagement of the faculty with issues of assessing and improving teaching and learning processes within the institution, and with aligning support systems for faculty more effectively toward this end.

### b.2.i

Discuss the institution's self-assessment of its capacity (resources, structures and processes), especially under Standards 1, 3 and 4. The institution should identify key issues and strategic themes it intends to address in the CPR and the intended outcomes for the CPR. For each issue and/or theme, the institution should identify what key indicators will be developed or relied on, who will be involved, and the specific organization of activities to achieve the outcomes identified. This section should reference, where appropriate, the institution's self-review under the Standards and key Standards and Criteria for Review (CFRs) that will be emphasized in the CPR.

We begin by restating our intended CPR outcomes:

1. The development of and more effective use of indicators of institutional performance and educational effectiveness to support institutional planning and decision making;
2. Greater clarity about the institution's educational objectives and criteria and standards of judgment for defining and evaluating those objectives;
3. Improvement of the institution's capacity for self review and of its systems of quality assurance;

We see each of standards 1, 3, & 4 contributing significantly toward these results, as described below.

### **Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives**

Our Self-Review has helped us measure a number of key issues that relate to capacity from standard 1. These all flow from CFR 1.2 and represent elaboration on our analysis of the Self-Review in section A.2:

- Educational Objective (EO) Indicators – calling for our need to develop indicators for a number of educational program objectives and standards and criteria of judgment.
- Educational Objective Recognition – stating that educational objectives are not clear throughout the institution, but that this recognition is uneven.
- Evidence of Educational Objective Fulfillment – telling us that we need to work toward developing minimum thresholds of achievement of our educational objectives, so that we can mark progress toward fulfilling these objectives.

As a means of monitoring these key issues, several groups regularly review the following key indicators and employ organized activities to achieve the desired outcome for these themes, as described below:

Issue	Key Indicator	Groups responsible	Desired outcomes	Activities to achieve outcomes
EO Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WASC Self-Review</li> <li>• Program Review Student Learning Outcome Indicators</li> <li>• Educational Effectiveness Inventory</li> <li>• Data Exhibit 7 Indicators</li> <li>• NSSE High Impact Activity Participation Rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Review Leaders, Deans, Senior Administration</li> <li>• Program Review Leaders</li> <li>• Program Review Leaders</li> <li>• Program Review Leaders of accredited programs</li> <li>• Seaver Dean's Cabinet</li> </ul>	CPR OUTCOME 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct and Report Self-Review</li> <li>• Program Reviews</li> <li>• Annual EEI</li> <li>• Specialized Accreditation</li> <li>• Curriculum Reform</li> </ul>
EO Recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WASC Self-Review</li> <li>• Program Reviews</li> <li>• Educational Effectiveness Inventory (EEI)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Review Leaders, Deans, Senior Administration</li> <li>• Program Review Leaders</li> <li>• Program Review Leaders</li> </ul>	CPR OUTCOME 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct and Report Self-Review</li> <li>• Program Reviews</li> <li>• Annual EEI</li> </ul>
EO Fulfillment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WASC Self-Review</li> <li>• Program Reviews</li> <li>• Educational Effectiveness Inventory</li> <li>• Data Exhibit 7</li> <li>• NSSE High Impact Activity Participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Review Leaders, Deans, Senior Administration</li> <li>• Program Review Leaders</li> <li>• Program Review Leaders</li> <li>• Program Review Leaders of</li> </ul>	CPR OUTCOME 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct and Report Self-Review</li> <li>• Program Reviews</li> <li>• Annual EEI</li> <li>• Specialized Accreditation</li> <li>• Curriculum Reform</li> </ul>

		accredited programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seaver Dean's Cabinet</li> </ul>		
--	--	---	--	--

**Standard III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability**

Our Self-Review has helped us measure a number of key issues that relate to capacity, from standard 3, and represent elaboration on our analysis of the Self-Review in section A.2:

- 3.2 – Faculty Distribution – indicating our need to maintain sufficient numbers of qualified and diversity.
- 3.4 – Faculty Development – calling for appropriate faculty development to improve teaching and learning as they relate to assessment findings.
- 3.5 – Alignment – calling for alignment between purposes and resources.
- 3.6 – IT Resources: Scope – calling for sufficient scope of IT offerings.
- 3.7- IT Resources: Coordination – suggesting that IT coordination done well.
- 3.8 – Decision Making – indicating the need to clarify decision making processes.
- 3.10 – President – calling for the president and his leadership to be fully devoted to leading the institution.
- 3.11 – Faculty Governance – calling for enhanced academic leadership from the faculty.

As a means of monitoring these key issues, several groups regularly review the following key indicators and employ organized activities to achieve the desired outcome for these themes, as described below:

Issue	Key Indicator	Groups responsible	Desired outcomes	Activities to achieve outcomes
Faculty Distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WASC Self-Review</li> <li>• Fact Book</li> <li>• Program Review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Review Leaders, Deans, Senior Administration</li> <li>• EIR Office</li> <li>• Program Review Leaders</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct and Report Self-Review</li> <li>• EIR annual dissemination</li> <li>• Program Reviews</li> </ul>

Faculty Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Center for Teaching Excellence</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 2,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CTE Faculty Development Events</li> </ul>
Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program Review</li> <li>Board of Regents Annual Dashboard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty</li> <li>Board of Regents</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program Reviews</li> </ul>
IT Resources – Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tech Qual</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CIO</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Tech Qual and its follow up</li> </ul>
IT Resources - Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tech Qual</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CIO</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Tech Qual and its follow up</li> </ul>
Decision Making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academic and Administrative Leadership, University Planning Committee, University Faculty Committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academic and Administrative Leadership, University Planning Committee, University Faculty Committee</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Periodic Meetings of these groups</li> </ul>
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>President, Senior Administrative Team, School Deans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>President, Senior Administrative Team, School Deans</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 1,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Day to Day activities of these groups</li> </ul>
Faculty Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University Faculty Council, School Faculty Senates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University Faculty Council, School Faculty Senates</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 1,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Periodic Meetings of these groups</li> </ul>

**Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement**

Our Self-Review has helped us measure a number of key issues that relate to capacity from standard 4, and represent elaboration on our analysis of the Self-Review in section A.2. These are:

- 4.2 – Planning aligns academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs
- 4.3 – Planning relies on data, evidence of student learning
- 4.5 – Institutional Research addresses and reviews strategic data needs and processes
- 4.7 – Best practice in teaching and learning is in use and undergoes continual improvement

As a means of monitoring these key issues, several groups regularly review the following key indicators and employ organized activities to achieve the desired outcome for these themes, as described below:

Issues	Key Indicator	Groups responsible	Desired outcomes	Activities to achieve outcomes
Planning Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WASC Self-Review</li> <li>• Program Review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Review Leaders, Deans, Senior Administration</li> <li>• Program Review Leaders</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct and Report Self-Review</li> <li>• Program Reviews</li> </ul>
Planning Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Review Leaders</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 1,2,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Review</li> </ul>
Institutional Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EIR Support &amp; Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EIR</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 1,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing Activity of the office of EIR</li> </ul>
Teaching and Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE)</li> <li>• Faculty RTP Data</li> <li>• Course Evaluation Indicators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Center for Teaching Excellence</li> <li>• Faculty</li> <li>• Faculty, Chairs, and Deans</li> </ul>	CPR Outcome 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CTE Faculty Development Events</li> <li>• RTP Processes</li> <li>• Course Evaluation Collection and Analysis</li> </ul>

b.2.ii

Discuss the institution's infrastructure to support educational effectiveness, especially under the Standards 2 and 4.

Our fundamental infrastructure for supporting educational effectiveness resides in two forms – a process and an office, both of which produce measurable evidence or products.

Our model of *program review as research*, as described in detail in “Program Review Ingredients” at the end of section B.1, provides a uniform, effective process for our gathering of evidence of student learning, analyzing it, and then bringing about continuous improvements in our programs in order to achieve educational effectiveness. Thus, program review process is more than process. It is also product or content, because it generates an institutional archive of educational effectiveness data and its attendant analysis, providing a dynamic institutional account of our educational effectiveness achievement. Because program reviews are carried out by many faculty members and staff each year, the institution provides a support system, in the form of the office of Educational and Institutional Research (EIR), to oversee all educational effectiveness efforts at the institution.

The office of EIR, provides a number of resources for educational effectiveness assessment efforts. These include support in the form of a dedicated staff of EIR professionals, consulting and training for faculty & staff, connections to best practices in higher education, oversight of NSSE & HERI, data mining and analytics, EIR reports, and an annual budget, provided by the university president, to support faculty and staff who conduct program reviews, in the amount of over \$100,000 (not including the salaries of the EIR staff). This annual outlay of monies is provided to program review leaders to pay for stipends, release time, outside consultants, and conference attendance, all of which are available to every program under review each year, both for the five year reviews and the annual review updates.

Thus, the two elements – the process and the office, with its complement of staff and budgetary resources – work well together to provide ample, visible infrastructure for our ongoing – annual and five-year - emphasis on educational effectiveness. More importantly, these two elements produce tangible artifacts or products of educational effectiveness. These are reflected, in detail, in standards 2 and 4, as discussed below.

**Standard II: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions**

The core functions for achieving our educational objectives are our program reviews, which are maintained and executed by our faculty. Program reviews are supported by another important core function – our office of Educational and Institutional Research.

These reviews analyze and encompass both capacity and educational effectiveness elements, producing measurable artifacts of their work in the form of faculty headcounts, student headcounts, student credit hours, student learning outcomes, student learning evidence, and curricular change.

For example, the program review conducted by the Sociology Department was supported by the office of EIR, and resulted in the following report – which was presented to our University Planning Committee in May 2008 – see attached “Sociology Program Review”.

#### **Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement**

In addition to focusing extensive effort on improving educational objectives via our program review process, our entire university community is dedicated to learning and improvement. Primarily, then, we rely on continuous critical self-reflection of the research questions we are asking, the data we are collecting, the metrics we are formulating and updating, the analysis of our processes, and the recommendations we have for improving every aspect of the institution. However, we also see the need to stay in touch with the larger higher education community, to seek best practices as well as share our reflective experiences with these organizations. We feel that the best way to accomplish this is by ensuring that our community membership is connected externally to the higher education world. Accordingly, the university financially supports travel to conferences and annual memberships in these organizations, as well as occasionally hosting consultants and speakers from these organizations on our campus. This provides evidence of the infrastructure for every member of community to practice ongoing self-reflection on their own goal achievement and use established higher education organizations and networks to stay in touch with best practice. These include the following groups and the attending national organizations with which they maintain active membership in order to locally employ methods of assessment and improvement of the organization:

Office of Educational & Institutional Research – [www.airweb.org](http://www.airweb.org), [www.ashe.ws](http://www.ashe.ws),  
[www.nsse.edu](http://www.nsse.edu), [www.heri.ucla.edu](http://www.heri.ucla.edu)

Steering Committee – [www.acenet.edu](http://www.acenet.edu)

Deans Council – [www.chronicle.com](http://www.chronicle.com)

University Planning Committee – [www.aacu.org](http://www.aacu.org)

Facilities Management & Planning - [www.scup.org](http://www.scup.org)

University Faculty Committee – [www.aaup.org](http://www.aaup.org)

University Tenure Committee - [www.aaup.org](http://www.aaup.org)

75 Discipline Curriculum Committees – All of the discipline based national organizations, such as the American Psychological Association, National Association of Schools of Music, American Bar Association, National Communication Association, ...

Student Affairs – [www.case.org](http://www.case.org) , [www.naspa.org](http://www.naspa.org)

Libraries – [www.ala.org](http://www.ala.org)  
Information Technology – [www.educause.edu](http://www.educause.edu)  
Office of Financial Planning – [www.ca.edu](http://www.ca.edu)  
Office of International Programs – [www.iie.org](http://www.iie.org)  
Office of Human Resources – [www.cupahr.org](http://www.cupahr.org)  
General Counsel – [www.abanet.org](http://www.abanet.org)

**b.2.iii**

**Discuss the institution's level of preparation for and progress toward the EER at the time of the CPR.**

Our preparation for the EER is driven by the maturity of our program review process, which in turn is tied to the maturity of our leadership base. When the CPR occurs in 2010, we will have been conducting program reviews for seven years. When the EER occurs in 2012, it will have been 9 years of experience conducting program reviews, in academic and co-curricular areas across the university. Thus, by the time EER occurs, we will have nearly completed two full cycles of our program review period. We are confident, then, that this longitudinal experience will prepare us in terms of leadership development and our expertise with a) defining learning outcomes, b) collecting evidence of learning, c) analyzing this evidence, and d) interpreting and using results to improve student learning as well as informing institutional decision-making, planning, and budgeting for program improvement for our EER.

**b.3.i**

**Discuss the institution's intended specific outcomes for this stage of review, rather than a list of activities the institution plans to undertake. As with the CPR, these outcomes may be related to key issues and/or strategic themes.**

Our intended EER outcomes are:

1. A deeper understanding of student learning, the development of more varied and effective methods of assessing learning, and the use of the results of this process to improve programs and institutional practices;
2. Systematic engagement of the faculty with issues of assessing and improving teaching and learning processes within the institution, and with aligning support systems for faculty more effectively.

These two outcomes are driven by WASC Standards 2 & 4, as follows:

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Our educational objectives are distributed across three major areas: our degree programs, our general education program, and our mission of preparing students for lives of purpose, service, and leadership. Thus, we want to ensure that we are effectively achieving these three major objectives through existing core systems and processes. Thus, we want to understand student learning more deeply and engage our faculty with this learning process.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement



The main way to ensure that our educational objectives are being achieved is through our university culture of evidence, which is fostered by our faculty and staff. These groups form our support organization, dedicated to bringing about student learning, with an eye toward the evidence that supports the achievement of this learning. Thus, we want to enhance these community groups, assisting them in learning about themselves as well as about student learning. The way we have been successful in bringing about these reflective processes is by our ongoing attention to the teaching and learning process.

Thus, our EER outcomes tie directly to the WASC standards. Specifically, these outcomes both tie to three key issues, each with their own unique history:

### **Disciplinary Culture**

The heart of our academy is our distributed connection to some 60+ academic disciplines, each of which exists on our campus as a local copy of an international academic culture. In order to be true to each culture, we recognize that we must continually assist faculty within these cultures in gaining a deeper understanding of student learning. This recognition has come about because of our program review process, which is now entering its second full five-year cycle of activity. Furthermore, as reflected in our WASC Self-Review Audit, CFR's 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, & 4.7 demand that we intentionally focus on the work within each discipline.

### **General Education**

Seaver College serves as Pepperdine's College of Arts and Sciences. As such, it takes a great interest in general education (GE), as it serves as the common touchstone for all undergraduate student experience. Our GE program underwent a major revision during the 1998-2002 timeframe, culminating in a new program that began in the fall of 2003. Thus, we are keenly interested in measuring the effectiveness of this program. Furthermore, CFR's 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.8, & 4.7, as reflected in our WASC Self-Review Audit, remind us of the importance of ongoing improvement of this critical program.

### **Mission**

Our university mission is: Pepperdine is a Christian university committed to the highest standards of academic excellence and Christian values, where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership. Our board of regents adopted this mission in 1999, and it serves to inform all that we do. We are particularly interested in using our culture of evidence to measure the degree to which we are fulfilling our mission. This key issue is also driven by our WASC Self-Review and the following CFR's 1.2 & 4.7.

#### **b.3.ii**

Indicate for each issue/theme, the institution's intended specific research questions, methods of inquiry, key indicators, and the specific groups that will be involved in the review process.

For each key issue outlined in the previous section, we have identified specific research questions, methods of inquiry, key indicators, and responsible groups that will help us address this issue:

### **Disciplinary Culture**

#### Research Questions

How effectively are our students achieving the student learning outcomes of their chosen degree program?

#### Methods of Inquiry

Each program is undergoing an ongoing program review that involves annual, incremental attention to measuring that program's achievement of its student learning outcomes. For each program, this involves direct evidence of student learning in the form of student work drawn from core classes within their degree program. The faculty develops and uses rubrics to evaluate student work and draw conclusions about student learning.

#### Key Indicators

Our key indicators include the following:

Specialized accreditation indicators (see Data Exhibit 7)

Program Review Reports – each of which contains key indicators and measures of student learning outcome achievement.

#### Responsible Groups

Faculty from the programs in question conducts all program reviews. The Office of Educational and Institutional Research also serves as an infrastructural resource for their work.

### **General Education**

Our GE program is described in the attachment “GE Requirements” at the conclusion of this section.

#### Research Questions

How well is each of the GE courses achieving their stated student learning outcomes?

How well are the following “across the curriculum” GE requirements: a) Writing Intensive, b) Research Methods, c) Presentation Skills, each of which is embedded within each of the majors, achieving their student learning outcomes?

How well is our Junior Writing Portfolio (JWP) requirement ensuring that our students can write well before they graduate?

How well is our First-Year Seminar requirement achieving its student learning outcomes?

### Methods of Inquiry

Each research question is being investigated by examination of direct evidence of student learning in the form of student work drawn from core classes within the GE courses and the majors courses that satisfy GE “across the curriculum” requirements. For the JWP requirement, every student portfolio constitutes a rich source of data for review of this writing requirement. The faculty develops and uses rubrics to evaluate student work and draw conclusions about student learning.

### Key Indicators

Our key indicators belong to the collection of program review reports that accompany each of these research questions – each of which contain key indicators and measures of student learning outcome achievement.

### Responsible Groups

There are two faculty groups charged with reviewing GE over the long haul: our GE program review committee, and our Academic Affairs Committee.

### **Mission**

#### Research Questions

To what extent are we effectively strengthening our students for lives of a) Purpose, b) Service, and c) Leadership.

#### Methods of Inquiry

We are using several methods of inquiry, including the following:

A university wide student focus group project which asks students to reflect on their unfolding sense of purpose, service, and leadership.

Longitudinal surveys that measure faith development, identity development, and life-purpose development.

Numerous surveys, interviews, and focus groups conducted by our office of Student Affairs

Regular participation in the CIRP, CSS, and Spirituality Surveys of HERI and the NSSE Surveys from Indiana University

#### Key Indicators

Reports from our comprehensive student focus group project

Faith Measures, Identity Measures, Service Measures, Life Purpose Measures, and Leadership Measures that belong to our longitudinal surveys

Numerous CAS standard benchmarks

Key HERI and NSSE question results, measured over student undergraduate career

#### Responsible Groups

Office of Educational and Institutional Research

Office of Student Affairs

Center for Faith and Learning

Board of Regents

#### b.3.iii

Identify areas where institutional systems of quality assurance are to be reviewed and improved (e.g., program review processes, capstone courses, portfolio reviews) and incorporating into the Proposal.

We have two university wide systems of quality assurance in place - our institution wide Program Review Process, and our Institutional Dashboard system.

The reviews of these institutional systems of quality assurance occur on two levels – internally and externally. We will discuss these review processes during our CPR and EER phases.

#### Internal Review

Program Review

The program review process, by design and definition, is made to be completely customizable and flexible, which makes it manageable, sustainable, and fluid. Therefore, the faculty and staff who execute each program review enjoy and take the opportunity to continuously refine the review process, thereby keeping it in optimal condition.

#### Institutional Dashboard

The office of Educational and Institutional Research (EIR) continually refines the content and navigability of the set of indicators of the institutional dashboard. This office, by virtue of its membership in AIR, ASHE, AAC&U, and SCUP, has access to the best practices of construction and implementation of dashboards, a source of knowledge they rely upon to make this instrument useful and meaningful.

#### **External Review**

##### Program Review

The University Planning Committee, which serves as the accountability committee for all program reviews, reviews the review process itself on an annual basis, thereby serving as a measure of continuous improvement of the program review process.

##### Institutional Dashboard

Our Board of Regents reviews our dashboard contents and thresholds for performance on an annual basis, providing feedback to the office of EIR, so that the dashboard is of maximum value for monitoring the standing of the institution both longitudinally and in comparison to its peer and aspirational schools.

#### **b.3.iv**

**Explain why it has proposed this particular approach to the EER; this rationale should flow from the institution's self-review under the Standards and analysis of the current state of its student learning outcomes assessment.**

#### Rationale for our approach to the EER

As with any research process, the desired outcomes and research questions must drive the process. This is another way of saying that content should drive or at least be considered as one selects pedagogy. With respect to the EER, we are using this very principle. The desired outcomes of our EER are:

#### EER Outcomes

- 1. A deeper understanding of student learning, the development of more varied and effective methods of assessing learning, and the use of the results of this process to improve programs and institutional practices;**
- 2. Systematic engagement of the faculty with issues of assessing and improving teaching and learning processes within the institution, and with aligning support systems for faculty more effectively toward this end.**

These outcomes are directly tied to three key issues

EER Key issues

- 1. Disciplinary Culture**
- 2. General Education**
- 3. Mission**

In order, therefore, to investigate and pursue these issues, we must carry out the EER to honor and support the methods of inquiry that we are using on these issues themselves. That means that we will pay close attention to what we are able to learn from our program review process, which in turn sends the strong, affirming signal to our community that we respect the culture of evidence and desire to nourish it. Each of the key issues has been driven by our self-review under the standards, the ongoing discovery of student learning achievement that our 5+ year old program review process has uncovered, and events of our institutional history – GE reform and institutional mission statement recasting. Finally, this approach to the EER follows consistently from our coherent vision for the overall accrediting review, as outlined in section B.1.

#### **b.3.v**

**Reference, where appropriate, the institution's self-review under the Standards and key Standards and Criteria for Review (CFRs) that will be emphasized in the EER.**

The standards of concern to us for the EER are standards 2 & 4, as mentioned in section B.3.i, because they tie most closely to educational effectiveness, rather than capacity. From these standards, as measured through our Self-Review, we plan to pay particular attention to the following CFR's, because they reflect community feedback that indicates that we must pay closer scrutiny to our achievement of these review criteria.

These CFR's are: 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, and 2.8 from Standard 2; and 4.7 from Standard 4.

#### **b.3.vi**

**Address specific plans for how it will review and improve student and organizational learning across the institution. The institution will also need to identify how it will review and evaluate actual student work and learning.**

Student Learning

The goal of reviewing student learning is to ensure that students are achieving our educational objectives, namely our institutionally defined student learning outcomes. Given that these outcomes are spread across some 70+ disciplinary and co-curricular areas, we are currently reviewing all of these outcomes via our continuous, ongoing, five-year based program review process cycle. See the “Program Review Ingredients” attachment in section B.1 for more information on how this review process works. Improvements to student learning, as determined by the program review faculty and staff in question, come in the form of program content changes, pedagogy or delivery changes, staffing changes, and budgetary reallocations. Every program review incorporates these program improvement elements into their ingredients and work.

### Organizational Learning

Our organizational learning outcomes are our accreditation review outcomes as delineated in section B.1:

1. The development of and more effective use of indicators of institutional performance and educational effectiveness to support institutional planning and decision making;
2. Greater clarity about the institution’s educational objectives and criteria for defining and evaluating those objectives;
3. Improvement of the institution’s capacity for self review and of its systems of quality assurance;
4. A deeper understanding of student learning, the development of more varied and effective methods of assessing learning, and the use of the results of this process to improve programs and institutional practices;
5. Systematic engagement of the faculty with issues of assessing and improving teaching and learning processes within the institution, and with aligning support systems for faculty more effectively toward this end.

We plan to review the learning of our organization through the reaccreditation process, using the CPR and EER events to inform us, as a community, on how we learn and how we can improve as learners. The CPR and EER task forces, as described in section C.1, will take responsibility for the overseeing the review and improvement processes with respect to the organizational learning that we, as a culture of evidence, are now and will continue to be experiencing.

#### c.1

Either in this section or as part of the sections above, the Proposal should indicate for each stage how the work will be conducted, the organizational structures and processes to be used, and the key indicators that are likely to be included in the Institutional Presentation. Milestones and a statement of what will be accomplished by the time of the CPR and the EER should be provided. It is expected that the workplan for the EER will occur simultaneously with the preparation for the CPR rather than sequentially. This will

allow for evidence, especially student learning results, and student portfolios and other work, to be reviewed, analyzed, discussed, and acted upon.

### **How the work will be conducted**

CPR – The office of Educational and Institutional Research (EIR) will oversee the process of preparing for both the CPR and EER. This office is specially equipped for this effort, as the description of its function within the university enumerates – see “Evolution of EIR” attachment at the end of this section. In conjunction with the office of EIR, we have assembled a task force of key stakeholders to carry this out, including the following individuals: members of our university planning committee (UPC), faculty and staff from academic disciplines, library, and student affairs who have conducted program reviews, information technology leaders, university diversity officer, dean of student affairs, chief business officer, chief financial officer, board of regents members, provost, general counsel, advancement officers, and the deans of the five schools.

### **The organizational structures and processes to be used**

Relying on the above named task force and the five-year program review cycle, we will assemble institutional materials for our institutional portfolio, review pertinent metrics (see below) and monitor our progress with respect to the milestones noted below. These reviews and preparations for the CPR and EER occur on a quarterly basis.

Our task force of key stakeholders uses the following metrics, updated annually, to serve as indicators of our achievement of our CPR and EER outcomes:

- Criteria for Review – Annually updated WASC self-review surveys. See “Self\_Review\_Results\_I-IV” for the results of these surveys in 2007-08.
- Program profiles embedded within all program reviews
  - Headcount
  - Credit hours
  - Degrees awarded
  - Incoming student academic profile
  - GPA at graduation
- Program review student learning outcome indicators
  - Varies by program
  - AAC&U VALUE project indicators (We are a member of this consortium.)
- Peer & Aspirational School Indicators
  - Percentage of classes under 20
  - Percentage of classes over 50
  - Percentage of incoming students who come from the top 10% of their class
  - Alumni Giving
  - Faculty Resources
- IPEDS indicators
  - Enrollment by gender & ethnicity
  - Graduation Rate



- Tuition Rate
  - Endowment
- WASC indicators – from Data Exhibits 1-7
- Off campus program indicators
  - Headcount
  - Job placement rates
  - Incoming student test scores
- Data mining indicators
  - We have invested in the Clementine data mining tool from SPSS, hoping to use this instrument to develop predictive analytics for retention, student success, and alumni giving. As we become mature users of this product, we hope to develop key performance indicators that will help us predict successes in a number of institutional areas.
- Board of Regents Dashboard Indicators
  - Net Tuition, Endowment Market Value, Endowment Payout, Gift Revenue, Student FTE, Faculty FTE, Student/Faculty Ratio, Ethnic Minority Percentage – Students & Faculty, Church of Christ Membership Percentage – Students & Faculty, Graduation Rates, Faculty & Staff Retention
- Library metrics
  - Volume Count
  - Database Count
- Information Technology
  - Bandwidth
  - Desktop machine specs (refreshed every 3 years, university-wide)
  - Software availability
  - Web Presence
- Faculty scholarship publication count
- Job and graduate/professional school placement of our alumni
- Educational Effectiveness Inventory
- Spiritual growth indicators – from our Lilly Endowment Research
  - Faith Behaviors & Application
  - Life Purpose Discernment & Action
- NSSE High Impact Activity Participation
  - Learning Communities
  - Research with Faculty Member
  - Service Learning
  - Study Abroad
  - Capstone Course
- Staff Climate Survey Indicators
  - Job Satisfaction
  - Staff Retention
  - Mission Clarity
- Faculty Course Evaluation Indicators
  - Good Class
  - Good Instructor

- Contribution to Moral & Ethical Development

## **Milestones**

In addition to our CPR and EER task force, our UPC, school deans, and senior vice presidential steering committee evaluate institutional progress annually with respect to the above-mentioned key indicators. These evaluations are an integral part of all decision-making and result in ongoing resource allocation, strategic planning, as well as academic and co-curricular program decisions.

## **Accomplishments by the time of the CPR and the EER**

By the time the CPR and EER events occur, we hope to see significant development of and more effective use of indicators of institutional performance. We hope to have increased clarity about the institution's educational objectives and criteria for defining and evaluating. In addition, we aspire to improve the institution's capacity for self-review and of its systems of quality assurance. We are learning many things about student learning and we hope to see that rise as we continue to develop more varied and effective methods of assessing learning, and the use of the results of this process to improve programs and institutional practices and inform institutional decision making, planning and budgeting. We fully understand the importance of systematic engagement of the faculty with issues of assessing and improving teaching and learning processes within the institution, and with aligning support systems for faculty more effectively toward this end.

## **c.2**

This section should review the effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and analysis systems for both undergraduate and graduate programs, especially those relating to the collection, dissemination and use of disaggregated retention data, student learning results, licensure examination results, job placement rates, graduate school acceptance rates, and other key outcomes data.

The institution should indicate how these data gathering and analysis systems will be used, and as necessary, improved, to support internal institutional dialogue and a "culture of evidence" throughout the accreditation review process and beyond.

## **Effectiveness of our data gathering and analysis**

The university is committed to maintaining a vast infrastructure of human and digital resources in order to sustain a highly integrated and state of the art culture of evidence. Accordingly, we rely on enterprise-wide systems to gather and analyze data. They are effective because they are collected and collaboratively employed at a global community level that provides 24/7 web access to all members of our university community. We follow institutional research industry standard best practices to select appropriate data and manage its currency, and we employ state of the art statistical and scientific innovation in embracing emerging data analysis techniques, including Bayesian and neural network systems. Finally, and most importantly, we engage all university stakeholders and decision-makers in employing data as part of our culture of evidence. See the next section for more detail about our digital data gathering protocols.

### **Data Gathering Systems**

We have been gathering data on all of the key indicators enumerated in section C.1 through several enterprise level systems for over two decades. These include electronic repositories and collaborative systems, survey administration tools, and state of the art academic analytics and data mining tools. We are a charter user of the product “Xythos” (<http://www.xythos.com>) as our digital repository, housed on one of our university servers, maintained by EIR staff. It contains all of the institutional data for the EIR office, all program review data, and all WASC related materials, including our institutional portfolio, whose table of contents is attached. Our Xythos installation also serves as our digital collaboration tool, allowing committees to share data and maintain the integrity of tracking the various versions of their work. We also employ three other tools – Blackboard – for course management and syllabus collection; Digital Measures – archiving faculty scholarly publication inventories and course evaluation results; and Survey Monkey - for constructing, analyzing, and disseminating internal survey results .

### **Analysis**

Our EIR office is constantly analyzing and disseminating data to the community. Among the institutional reports that we produce on both internal data and higher education trends are the University Fact Book, University Enrollment Profile, and EIR reports. Exemplars of each report include a number of cyclic data elements for decision, including: Seventy-five different Program Profiles, University Fact Book, University Enrollment Profile, Program Review Reports and Executive Summaries, Specialized Accreditation Reports, NSSE Reports, and HERI Reports. In addition to using SPSS and Stata to carry out sophisticated statistical analysis for these reports, we use the SPSS product “Clementine”, a data mining and predictive analytics tool, allowing us to move beyond metrics and a posteriori measurements of institutional success. We have developed a number of disaggregated and global predictive models for retention, alumni involvement, graduation rates, job placement, and student engagement in both the curricular and co-curricular areas.

### **Administrative decision making structures – how we use data**

Administrative decisions are made in three areas within our institution: university level, school level, and program level. The data enumerated above are used in evaluating performance, rendering budgetary decisions, and formulating long term strategy. These three groups who use these data elements include:

University Level: University Academic Council, University Management committee, University Planning Committee, University Tenure Committee, President's Steering Committee, Provost's Deans Council, University Faculty Counsel, Library Committee, Information Technology Steering Committee.

School Level: Rank, Tenure, and Promotion Committees, Academic Curriculum Councils, Faculty Councils, Curriculum Committees, Student Affairs Staff

Program/Department Level: Program Review Committees

### c.3

This section should describe how the institution will organize, oversee, and support the review process during its several stages. What human, technological and physical resources will be relied upon to support the accrediting review process? To what extent will the process be linked to ongoing institutional structures and priorities to increase value and reduce unnecessary work? Is there a budget for the process?

The office of EIR will serve as the main resource to WASC for our entire reaccreditation experience. Our staff will be available to field all requests. We will rely primarily on our digital repository – <http://xythos.pepperdine.edu> to provide electronic access to all WASC documents. The visiting team can expect to stay at our fully equipped, full-service Drescher Campus Executive Center during both the CPR and EER site visits, with our ALO serving as host to the visiting team. Furthermore, we have a workroom set aside in our main administrative center – near the president's office – fully at the disposal of the visiting team. All members of our university planning committee, all program review faculty principal investigators, all school deans and associate deans, all senior vice presidents, and the president himself will be available for dialogue, individually or in select subgroups. The EIR budget has set aside sufficient funds in its operating budget to accommodate all activities associated with the reaccreditation process, spanning from now through the final reaccreditation action letter.

### d.1

Include the set of Data Exhibits and the Summary Data Form for the Proposal. All data should be presented in the form of five-year historical trends. Throughout the Proposal, references to the institution's analysis of these data, especially the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators and other appendices, should be made as appropriate.

d.2

List all degree programs where 50 percent or more of the program is offered off-site (more than 25 miles from the home campus) or by distance learning. Describe how evaluation of these programs will be incorporated into the review process. Under Commission policy the accrediting process will need to include a review of distance education degree and off-campus programs. The body of the Proposal should indicate how these programs will be included in the institution's self review.

If not applicable, please indicate NA. If more space is required, attach an Excel spreadsheet with all required information.

**List of Off-Campus and Distance Education (OCDE) Programs**

Program name and degree level	Modality*	Address, City, State, Zip, Country	FTE enrollment	Contact Person (if applicable)

*\*for example: off-campus, blended/hybrid, distance education*

d.3

Provide an Institutional Stipulation Statement signed by the Chief Executive Officer that establishes:

1. That the institution is using the review process to demonstrate its fulfillment of the two Core Commitments, that it will engage in the process with seriousness and candor, that data presented are accurate and that the Institutional Presentation will fairly present the institution.
2. That the institution has published and publicly available policies in force as identified by the Commission (See Appendix 1, p. 126). Such policies will be available for review on request throughout the period of accreditation. Special attention will be paid to the institution's policies and recordkeeping regarding complaints and appeals.
3. That the institution will abide by procedures adopted by the Commission to meet United States Department of Education (USDE) procedural requirements (See Section VI).
4. That the institution will submit all regularly required data, and any data specifically requested by the Commission during the period of Accreditation (or Candidacy).
5. That the institution has reviewed its off-campus programs and distance education degree programs to ensure that they have been approved as required by the WASC Substantive Change process.