

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 & Swingin¹ on best practice in assessment of programs, and Diamond² 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 growth³, 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

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

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

³ 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