

# Pepperdine University: Institutional Proposal (Spring 2008)

## A. Setting the Institution's Context and Relating the Proposal to the Standards

### Pepperdine University - Institutional Context, Strengths and Challenges

#### Institutional Context

Pepperdine University looks forward to celebrating its 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary at the conclusion of its WASC reaccreditation experience in 2012. As the university approaches this milestone, the reaccreditation process allows the university community to reaffirm its desire to be a nationally known institution whose mission: *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* provides it with a unique opportunity to combine 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. Graduate and professional schools were added in 1970, allowing university status to be achieved. In 1972, the university opened its 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, the Graduate School of Education and Psychology, the Graziadio School of Business and Management, and the School of Public Policy are located on the university's main campus in Malibu and its two regional centers in Irvine and West Los Angeles. Courses are taught at each of these locations as well as six international campuses, four off-campus sites within 25 miles of the main campus or one of the regional centers, and four off-campus locations beyond the 25 mile radius our main and regional campuses. See **Appendix A** for further clarification of our campus classification.

Pepperdine University is fully accredited through the following organizations: American Bar Association, American Dietetic Association, American Psychological Association, Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, National Association of Schools of Music, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Pepperdine has recently received renewal of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I certification.

#### Strengths and Challenges

This is an important time for the WASC reaccreditation review. Since the last review, Pepperdine has received recognition in several national and international arenas:

- As the university seeks to maintain its position in the national higher education leadership conversation, Andrew K. Benton, President of Pepperdine University since 2000, was recently appointed Chairman of the Board of the American Council of Education (ACE).
- The Center for Faith and Learning continues to provide support to faculty in the integration of faith and learning in their courses and scholarly work by conducting workshops, hosting outside speakers, and convening reading and discussion groups on topics of faith integration.
- Because of our Christian mission and heritage, and because we recognize that there is a need for universities to understand student and faculty faith journeys more deeply, we are preparing to launch a new Center for Faith Research in Higher Education in the 2008-09 academic year. This center will partner with faith-based and secular universities around the country in gathering best practice research on faith and spirituality. In that conjunction, the center is partnering with Dr. Alexander Astin of the Higher Education Research Institute in developing measures of faith for faculty and students.
- Our work in developing service learning experiences for our students has been recognized by the Peace Corps, as we have earned a “Top 25” ranking on the list of “Top Peace Corps Volunteer Producing Colleges and Universities.”
- As we continue to understand the importance of international educational experiences in the academy, we seek to increase the number of international program offerings for our students, ensuring that even more of them can participate. Accordingly, we have newly-established programs in Buenos Aires, Argentina, Lausanne, Switzerland and Shanghai, China to complement the long-existing programs in Heidelberg, Germany, Florence, Italy and London, England, making it possible for over 60% of our undergraduates to spend at least one semester abroad, a percentage well above the national average.
- Cultural diversity continues to be a high priority across the university. Three generous grants from the James Irvine Foundation have made it possible to focus on cultural diversity in hiring, recruiting, programming, and curriculum. During the summer of 2008, the Seaver College Diversity Council and the University Diversity Council are both scheduled to participate in the Association of American Colleges & Universities Greater Expectations Institute in Snowbird, Utah. Their proposal focuses on ways to help faculty deepen the connections between curricula and issues of cultural diversity.
- Our Graduate School of Education and Psychology (GSEP) hosts a vocational speaker series that focuses on cultural diversity. This series has featured such speakers as Molefi Asante, of Temple University, internationally known for his work in African consciousness. GSEP holds panels on immigration and resettlement, Black-Brown issues facing society and our southern California Region.

- As with most universities, we recognize the challenges of maintaining robust access and support for technology for our students, faculty, and staff. Our technological advancements include phasing out the twenty-year old central administrative computer software system and replacing it with PeopleSoft, a project that nears completion but remains a challenge. The new system provides a web-based, state-of-the-art Enterprise Resource Platform to support human resources, student systems, and budgeting. Pepperdine currently uses a number of digital archives and repositories for maintaining university documents and enhancing course management, including Xythos, Blackboard, and Digital Measures. Pepperdine is also one of 200+ universities with access to Internet2.
- University libraries must also maintain an edge with respect to their offerings of content and services for students and faculty. Advancements in our libraries include a first ever professional collections librarian, the acquisition of the complete library of the American Arbitration Association, a new digital institutional repository with social computing elements (wikis, blogs) and iTunes U podcasting, a newly appointed director for advancement and public affairs, a director for digital initiatives, an associate university librarian for developing renovation plans for the main library and two graduate campus libraries, a digital literacy program for staff and students, sponsorship of scholarly lectures, readings, performances, and film screenings for diverse audiences, and implementation of a multi-year plan to improve the print collection. In order to maintain our libraries as being responsive to patron needs, Pepperdine relies on an industry standard protocol for assessing library support systems, making use of the tool: *LibQual*. Please see **Appendix B** for the most recent report on our findings from this instrument.
- In an effort to increase the engagement of our growing population of alumni with their alma mater, President Benton recently created the Alumni Leadership Council, whose tasks include gathering feedback from alumni groups, creating a broader national presence of alumni chapters, and increasing alumni financial support.
- Our last major fundraising campaign concluded in 2000. We are now in the silent phase of our next fundraising effort, with an estimated goal of \$500,000,000. Fund raising is an area of concern as the cost of operating an excellent private university with cutting edge programs continues to rise dramatically. A full account of all of these activities is summarized in our institutional portfolio, which we will present at both the Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Reviews.
- As we continue to develop external funding sources for research grants, we have had several successes:
  - The university received two generous grants from the Lilly Endowment's *Fund for the Theological Exploration of Vocation*. These grants have helped deepen our university conversation about and commitment to the integration of faith and learning.
  - Faculty members have received significant grants and awards from agencies which include the National Science Foundation, National Park Service,

Conrad Hilton Foundation, Social Science Research Council, Mathematics Association of America, National Geographic Society, Psi Chi, Wood-Claeyssens Foundation, Southern California Edison, the U.S. Department of Education, and the Open Society Institute.

- Not only is our work on assessment valuable to our community, but it has received accolades at the national level. The university's own *Program Review as Research* process, which is used to assess 75 programs across the university, was well received when it was presented in January 2008, in Washington, D.C., at the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U)/American Conference of Academic Deans.
- Because of our successful program review process – the AAC&U has invited us to become a network member institution in their new, innovative Valid Assessment of Learning in Higher Education (VALUE) project.
- The Center for Postsecondary Research, in conjunction with their National Survey for Student Engagement has identified five high-impact learning experiences for undergraduate students. We exceed the national average in participation in each one of these experiences. See **Appendix C**.
- General education is central to the undergraduate experience. As such, our GE program was carefully studied and revised in 2003 in order to incorporate best practices such as writing across the curriculum, more core content, and increasing attention to learning community experiences. We have introduced many innovative components, all of which are designed to link general education with students' major coursework, thereby helping them connect liberal learning to their major field of study. These include a junior writing portfolio requirement, writing intensive courses, oral presentation courses, research methods courses, and greater attention to diversity in the American political process and American history courses.
- Our twenty-three year old Great Books Colloquium, patterned after the pioneering work of Mortimer Adler and Robert Hutchins at the University of Chicago and the ongoing work of the Great Books Foundation, continues to attract top quality students, providing them with a shared inquiry experience in close readings of the great ideas of western thought. We recently added an eastern great books course to this program, incorporating works in Indian, Chinese, and Japanese literature and philosophy.
- In the tradition of the successful Great Books Colloquium, Seaver College introduced a Social Action and Justice Colloquium (SAJ) as another means of offering students an opportunity to participate in a focused learning community. In addition, we recently added a group of first-year seminar offerings focusing on a common theme – Faith & Reasoning – as a means of helping students connect their cognitive and spiritual worlds.
- As evidence of our emphasis on the highest quality teaching, our own Distinguished Professor of Biology, Dr. Steve Davis, recently received the Robert Foster Cherry Award for Great Teaching from Baylor University.
- Further evidence of the quality of our faculty is provided by a number of individuals from our Graduate School of Education and Psychology:

- Miguel Gallardo, Assistant Professor of Psychology, is the President of the California Psychological Association for 2008.
- Dr. Joy Asamen, Professor of Psychology was recently honored by the National Council of Schools of Professional Psychology with the Ethnic and Racial Diversity Award for 2008.
- The United States Distance Learning Association (USDLA) presented the 2007 Platinum Award for Online Distance Learning Programming to Pepperdine University's Graduate School of Education and Psychology at the USDLA 20th Anniversary Conference.
- Diana Hiatt-Michael, Professor of Education, received the American Educational Research Association's (AERA) prestigious Outstanding Contributions Relating Research to Practice Award in the interpretive scholarship category.
- David Foy, Adjunct Professor of Psychology, received the Robert S. Laufer Memorial Award for Outstanding Scientific Achievement, given to an individual or group that has made an outstanding contribution to research in the Post Traumatic Stress Disorder field.
- Shelly Prillerman Harrell, Professor of Psychology, received the Emerging Professional Award from Division 45 (Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority issues).
- Our Graziadio School of Business and Management (GSBM) continues to improve in both rankings and faculty recognition:
  - *Forbes* magazine ranks our Fully Employed MBA program among the Top 20 business schools for return on investment for an MBA degree.
  - *Forbes* magazine also ranks the Full-time MBA program among the Top 60 leading business schools in the nation. *The Wall Street Journal* ranks our Full-time MBA program among the Top 50 in the nation by regional recruiters. *U.S. News & World Report's* 2007 online edition of *America's Best Graduate Schools* lists our Full-time MBA program among the Top 100 in the nation. *The Aspen Institute's Center for Business Education* ranks our Full-time MBA program among the Top 50 in the world for dedication to ethics, social and environmental issues.
  - *Financial Times* ranks our Executive MBA program among the Top 50 worldwide.
  - *Leadership Excellence Magazine* ranks GSBM among the Top 20 in the nation for Leadership Development programs.
  - *QS TopMBA*, the world's leading information site for MBA applicants and students, ranked the Graziadio School among the Top 15 most diverse business schools in the nation.
  - The Association for Information Systems awarded "IS Publication of the Year" to GSBM Assistant Professor Nelson Granados, at the International Conference on Information Systems.
- Our school of law continues to increase in quality and reputation with the following notable accomplishments:

- It is now ranked 59<sup>th</sup> in the country, having moved from 66<sup>th</sup> last year and 99<sup>th</sup> four years ago.
- The school was granted membership in Order of the Coif in January 2008.
- The Dispute Resolution Program within the school of law continues to be ranked the best in the nation for the fourth consecutive year.
- Our School of Public Policy has begun efforts to establish the Jack F. Kemp Institute for Political Economy. At this point in his life and career, the time is right to honor Kemp's public service, perpetuate and advance his contribution to American political thought, and help educate the next generation of political leadership. The Pepperdine School of Public Policy's unique commitment to American democracy, free markets, and Judeo-Christian values makes it a fitting home for an important part of the Kemp legacy.
- In addition to trying to maintain best practices in our curriculum and faculty development, we recognize the importance of maintaining adequate, modern classroom and office space. Several facilities have been completed, including the construction of the Drescher Campus within our Malibu campus, providing classrooms, offices, and an administrative presence for the Schools of Business, Education and Psychology, and Public Policy. Pepperdine also recently purchased a facility close to the White House to serve as a residential facility and permanent home for the Washington D.C. Internship program.

## Pepperdine University - Responses to Last Accreditation Visit

### Responses to Last Accreditation Visit

In 2001, the WASC visiting team identified a number of important issues in its recommendations and suggestions. We address these next:

- **University Planning and Direction**  
The visiting team charged us *to develop 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.* The recently formed Office of Strategic Planning has worked to meet the WASC requirements for institutional strategic planning. As a result, Pepperdine's first university-wide strategic plan is scheduled to be completed during the 2008-09 academic year. In addition, the senior administration has developed a new office of Educational and Institutional Research, which is tasked with assessment and the inculcation of a culture of research and evidence across the university. This office developed the program review process which is being used university-wide.
- **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 integrating values into decision making and program development. In this regard, the provost has 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. This essay provides the language and the mechanisms for the faculty to think more deeply about what it means to be a Christian university. See **Appendix D**. In terms of service learning and the global experience, the Volunteer Center oversees service learning and conducts ongoing assessment of the effectiveness of service learning pedagogy. A full report may be found in **Appendix E**. Since the international program experience is central to Pepperdine’s undergraduate experience, we are currently reviewing this program within the five-year program review cycle. The program goals and a survey, which we are presently administering and analyzing, may be found in **Appendix F**.

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

The university has revised its bylaws and clarified its position on academic freedom. These changes address the past 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 **Appendix G**. The provost worked with faculty to ensure that academic freedom has been embedded in the Rank, Tenure, and Promotion process. **Appendix H** contains a copy of the recently-updated Tenure Policy, which contains Pepperdine’s statement on academic freedom.

- **Assessment**

The university has created the office of Educational and Institutional Research, whose task is to oversee all assessment, with a commitment to complex and on-going assessment across the university. This office is charged with responding to the previous 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.* 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 **Appendix I**. This assessment includes a benchmark dashboard instrument that assists senior leadership as they track Pepperdine’s standing with respect to other schools. This dashboard instrument will be featured during our 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 process culminates in a report to the senior administrative University Planning Committee. Please see **Appendix J** for details on the process.
- **Faculty Strength, Role and Influence in the Institution's Culture**  
The role of the faculty has been strengthened, thus influencing Pepperdine's overall culture. The WASC review gives the school an opportunity to strengthen faculty involvement in our culture of evidence by placing primary responsibility for program review with the faculty as "principal investigators". In particular, the previous 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.* President Benton formed the University Faculty Council in 2002 in order to create a closer collaboration among the senior administration and faculty leadership across all five schools. This group functions as a kind of faculty senate for the entire university. 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. Pepperdine relies on another standard assessment protocol for assessing its information technology support systems: *TechQual*. Please see **Appendix K** for the most recent report on this instrument.
  - **Off-Campus and Distance Learning Programs**  
The previous WASC Commission requested that the university work with Commission 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.* Pepperdine has done this by working closely with WASC's office of Substantive Change to establish a comprehensive account of our academic programs and their locations. **Appendix A**, above, provides an account of our campus classification scheme, while **Appendix L**, below, summarizes all of our programs and their locations.

## **Pepperdine University - Description of Expected Outcomes, Preliminary Self-Review under the Standards of Accreditation, Process for Proposal Development and Leadership Development**



## Description of Expected Outcomes

In the dozen years that span the time of our last reaccreditation experience in 2000 to our upcoming Educational Effectiveness visit in 2012, we continue to build a culture of evidence, central to which is our attention to the four WASC standards and two core commitments. Several important issues have emerged through the work of the university-wide strategic planning committee, the self-review audit process, and ongoing assessment projects, resulting in these proposed outcomes for this WASC review process:

**1) Identify and assess student learning outcomes across the institution using our own *Program Review as Research* process.** A comprehensive program review methodology (see **Appendix J**, above) based on academic research methodology has been generated to identify and assess student learning outcomes across the institution. Program review reports for each of the institution's 75 academic and co-curricular programs will be available during the Educational Effectiveness phase. We presented the program review model at the Annual Meeting of the AAC&U in Washington D.C., on January 24, 2008. The conference organizers were pleased by the presentation, as evidenced by this letter. See **Appendix M**.

At the center of the review process is the *Program Review as Research* model which is built on the premise that programs are best planned and reviewed when faculty organize these activities themselves. The main idea is to view the review of a degree program as a research project, for which the subject under study is student learning within a cohesive academic program. Thus, faculty within each discipline, serving as that discipline's content and pedagogy experts, serve as "principal investigators" in reviewing the extent to which their program of study is accomplishing its stated learning objectives.

Key components of this approach include the following aspects: Faculty serve as principal investigators in their respective projects. Faculty members frequently engage an outside consultant who meets with them at a program retreat to outline the goals and objectives for program planning and/or review. Faculty then develop measurable program goals and objectives, following which they construct a program matrix and a plan of action. This plan assists them in determining data collection protocols, including both primary and secondary evidence. Primary evidence typically includes student writing, coursework, projects, and pre/post exams, whereas secondary evidence usually includes alumni feedback, satisfaction surveys, and interviews. Faculty then carry out their plan, gather primary data in the form of student work which is embedded in their learning experiences, analyze the data, and plan/revise programs as a result of their findings. Finally, they write and submit their findings to the central administration who are a viable part of the dialogue and process. In subsequent years, the program review processes continue incrementally, with each program choosing a manageable number of objectives to evaluate and refine.

One way in which the program review process will prove effective is in assessing specific learning experiences. Pepperdine offers all five of the high impact learning experiences among undergraduates as reported by the National Survey on Student Engagement at Indiana University: 1) learning communities, 2) service learning, 3) study in an

international setting, 4) undergraduate research, and 5) senior capstone experiences. We provide all of these experiences in our undergraduate school, and at levels that exceed the national average. See **Appendix C**, above. The program review process will allow the university to demonstrate effectiveness in these programs, as well as in academic programs across all five schools, in a concise and thoughtful manner with results that are transparent to the WASC commission and to others.

**2) Assess the effectiveness of disciplinary curricula and the general education program using norm-referenced assessment tools.** In addition to being a part of our ongoing program review process, wherein five faculty are reviewing our new GE program in the current 2007-2008 academic year, Pepperdine began administering the Collegiate Learning Assessment exam to incoming first-year students and graduating seniors. By the end of this WASC reaccreditation cycle, Pepperdine will have data to help triangulate the effectiveness of the GE program and the disciplinary curricula.

**3) Define and develop research and practice around the terms “deep learning” and “common good.”** Central to Pepperdine’s mission is the belief that academic excellence and service to humankind go hand in hand. Many students who have experienced a Pepperdine education have long informally reported that their lives have been transformed in deep and meaningful ways. Their narratives often include anecdotes about how they have been nurtured as human beings who value life-long learning and service through one or more of the following: participation in an international program; conducting and sometimes publishing original research with professorial collaboration; participating in service integral to and required by a particular course; dining at a professor’s home; engaging in rigorous discussions or research about life’s big questions—in the classroom and connected to the course objectives and so on. The university now undertakes the challenging task of going beyond anecdote—as moving as they are—to a formal institutional proposal based on two themes: **deep learning** and the **common good**.

We will address the ways in which *deep learning* and the *common good* meet the four WASC standards: *Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives, Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions, Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability, and Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement*.

Our first theme, **deep learning**, refers to a lifetime of learning, rather than learning for the current project or class, or even for the completion of one’s university degree. It refers to aspects of reinforced learning that prepare and sustain one across an entire life. In particular, deep learning allows our graduates to take personal ownership of their ability to retain the things they learn and transfer these skills and knowledge areas to other domains. The concept of deep learning comes from an article by Diane F. Halpern and Milton D. Hakel: *Applying the Science of Learning to the University and Beyond*<sup>[1]</sup>. Halpern and Hakel define principles of teaching designed to facilitate a single “deep learning” goal: students’ long-term retention and application of their learning to all areas in life.

Making a natural connection to deep learning, our second theme, the **common good**, refers to the welfare of the community as shared by its members. Our institution is comprised of individuals and communities drawn together to serve God, to lead, and to fulfill a life-purpose. While individuals seek their own happiness through personal fulfillment, working toward their life-purpose becomes a common good when the happiness they seek bolsters the communal body. The theme of the common good is inspired by 1 Corinthians 12:7: “Now to each one the manifestation of the Spirit is given for the common good.” In other words, individuals are equipped with gifts and abilities in order to contribute to the vitality of something larger than themselves. Stressing the importance of the common good allows Pepperdine to uphold its Christian values as an ambassador to the community.

Our proposal themes, *deep learning* and *the common good*, directly correlate with the WASC Standards.

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

We are five schools forming one university, all following a single mission: ***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.***

The two institutional proposal themes for this WASC review represent a cause/effect binding of both *means* and *end*. *Deep learning* is the means toward the end of contributing to the *common good*. Pepperdine believes that the best way to achieve our mission is by first ensuring that students learn at a deep level, meaning that they learn how to learn and how to adapt to a rapidly-changing world where information multiplies exponentially. Our other chosen theme for the institutional proposal, the common good, speaks directly to Pepperdine’s commitment to service. Through service and leadership to others, students can transcend their own desires and live out lives of meaning, serving the common good.

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

The core function of the academic enterprise flows from the institution’s mission. Accordingly, Pepperdine posits that our primary responsibility is to nurture the lives of our students so that they learn how to learn while at the same time making a contribution to the common good. Pepperdine views the means to this end to be found at the program level, where students are provided learning through innovative teaching, scholarly work, creative activity, and ongoing inquiry. Our program review process is revealing the ways that we are both achieving these goals and ways that we can do better. It is also designed in such a way as to be distributed across the university, carried out by our faculty and staff through an attempt to demonstrate and inculcate deep learning in our students.

As we promote *deep learning* and the *common good*, we help fulfill the university’s mission: to prepare our students for lives of **purpose, service, and leadership**. Deep learning is

connected to the common good when individuals realize that their life-**purpose**, which evolves from the deep learning process, contributes to the common good as well. In the Christian domain, for example, personal faith grows stronger when individuals integrate faith and learning, and this convergence of faith and learning occurs when each person engages in the deep learning process, allowing information to build faith. Seeking knowledge, the faith bound individual then contributes to the faith community, which adds to the common good. To contribute to the common good ultimately requires one to embrace the “other,” and such an act demands humility, self-sacrifice, and **service**. In terms of the university’s mission, **leadership** occurs when individuals recognize—and act on—their calling. This personal self-actualization strengthens the community and ultimately glorifies God.

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

The university intends to use the program review process to examine the diverse pedagogies and curricular structures used to accomplish individual program goals, ensuring—and making adjustments where necessary—that all program objectives ultimately point to a culminating goal for our students: deep learning that carries them into their years beyond the university into lives of service. To accomplish this, Pepperdine plans program review activity across the university as well as a concurrent longitudinal project surveying alumni in order to determine the extent to which they retain and use deep learning from their student years at Pepperdine.

Because we view deep learning as the fundamental goal for our students, we view our learning environments and pedagogies as critical to accomplishing this result for our students. Our current strategic planning process is designed to achieve this fundamental goal by developing and maintaining the highest possible quality of human, physical and information resources. That process involves the entire university community, and accordingly, it promotes a university-wide ethos for achieving our mission.

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

To ensure that Pepperdine adheres to its purpose as a university and achieves educational effectiveness, the President has restructured the administration to include an office of Educational and Institutional Research. This office is responsible for promoting a research-based culture of evidence by providing a central research framework, including the comprehensive program review process and the resources to maintain all of the data and documentation for research activities. As a result of the efforts of this office, there are now approximately 100 faculty and staff who actively participate in educational and institutional research efforts ranging from alumni surveys to specialized accreditation.

Specifically, to further explore the terms “deep learning” and “common good,” the university plans the following:

- The annual faculty conference will examine the theme “How are we doing? How do we know?” The conference will feature assessment expert Peggy Maki who will provide a theoretical underpinning, as well as faculty from within the five schools who will showcase programs of teaching and learning best practices that students often cite as having been transformative or that influenced them to serve others.
- In 2007, the office of Educational and Institutional Research launched a comprehensive, university-wide student focus group project, designed to gather student feedback on aspects of their educational experience that provide the greatest value. This effort serves as both a formative and a summative means of assessment for our students' educational experiences. We will present results of this project during both our Capacity and Educational Effectiveness reviews.
- In collaboration with scientists at HRL Laboratories LLC (formerly known as the "Hughes Research Lab"), adjacent to our Malibu campus, the Office of Educational and Institutional Research makes use of data mining and academic analytics techniques in order to measure the effectiveness of its academic programs and to increase retention and student success. It makes these research findings available to faculty in order to enhance campus dialogue about the shared work of teaching and learning.

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

In order to conduct the self-review, the university employed survey research methodology, building a series of four online surveys (see **Appendix N**). These surveys contained the questions provided in the "Worksheet for Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards." The surveys were distributed to these constituencies: 1) Faculty members who have led or are leading program reviews, 2) all deans and associate deans, and 3) the university's central senior leadership during the fall 2007 and early spring 2008 semesters. Eighty-two key constituents received surveys, with a response rate of 80%. The complete survey results may be viewed in **Appendix O**. Many of the items that indicated a “need for attention” center around assessment (programs, skills, satisfaction); institutional planning; information gathering, processing, and dissemination; technology; leadership (faculty, administrative); and diversity. These findings helped frame the direction of this review cycle with its built in focus on assessment and meaning in the curriculum and programming. In particular, based on the majority (mode) response in our survey feedback, none of the CFR's were denoted as "needs significant development". A handful of the CFR's received a majority response stating that "aspects of this need our attention", and have subsequent follow-up action. Most of the CFR's were given a majority vote which indicates that they are "areas of strength". Thus, follow-up activities related to the CFR's which need attention, as reflected in our self-review audit, are highlighted in red in **Appendix P**.

### **Process for Proposal Development and Leadership Development**

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 sectored and distributed across the academy in the disciplines where it is tied to local needs.

Our reaccreditation leadership team consists of a growing number (approximately 100 at present) faculty and deans who work on the daily challenges associated with their programs. Each year, this network grows by approximately 10-15 colleagues and goes a long way toward fully addressing the previous WASC Commission's finding that faculty need to be more involved and influential in shaping the university's culture.

---

[1] CHANGE. July/August (2003): 37-41.

