

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.

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