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INTRODUCTION

1. INTERNAL CONTEXT

The Humanities/Teacher Education Division is one of eight academic divisions in Seaver College. Although some of the disciplinary programs date back to the first formation of George Pepperdine College in 1937, the division itself dates back to 1972 and the school’s migration to the Malibu campus when the divisional structure currently in place was first devised. At that time, the division consisted of five undergraduate majors (English, History, Literature, American Studies, and Humanities), a program without a major (Philosophy), and a significant part of the general education program (a three-course Humanities sequence that consisted of Western Heritage I and II plus an elective Humanities course). English composition (another GE requirement) was then housed in the Communication Division (as Communication 106), along with Creative Writing (Communication 304) and Advanced Grammar and Composition (Communication 404).

By the early 1990s, English composition and also Teacher Education (formerly in Social Science) had moved to Humanities (resulting in its renaming); Philosophy became a major; American Studies, having once been a summer program, had been discontinued as an undergraduate major but had been created as a master’s program; both History and English had developed master’s level graduate programs; and Great Books (an alternative sequence in the general education program) had been created, along with an Asian Studies program. The English M.A., however, was phased out by 1995.

In the 2000s: the Writing and Rhetoric emphasis in English was developed; Social Action and Justice (another general education alternative track, modeled on Great Books) was created; and Film Studies was developed as a major. Asian Studies moved to the recently formed International Studies and Languages Division. The History M.A. was phased out, as was the Humanities major, while the MFA in Writing for Screen and Television was created in 2008. Creative Writing moved from Communication to HuTE; in 2015, the Philosophy program moved to the Religion Division.

To give some sense of growth: the 1972-73 catalog listed 12 tenure-line faculty members in the Humanities Division; for 2015-16, the Humanities/Teacher Education Division had 30 tenure-line faculty members – between double and triple the earlier size.

Through these various changes, HuTE’s contribution to the general education program continued to grow and develop. For example, by 1990 the Humanities sequence had become a team-taught three-course sequence (at 4 units each); with the revision of general education in the early 2000s, it became a single-instructor course, with each course reduced to 3 units each. HUM 112/212 and 113/313 became staples of International Programs curriculum. HIST 204 became a GE requirement, as did Literature. Currently, as described in more detail below, HuTE semi-exclusively supplies 6 GE requirements (ENG 101, the three-course HUM sequence, except for HUM 111, HIST 204, and Junior Writing Portfolio) and indirectly supplies 6 others; it contributes significantly to staffing First Year Seminar; and it houses two GE-alternative tracks, Great Books and SAAJ.

Its programs, curriculum, pedagogy, scholarship, service, and events all reflect the division’s leadership in, and deep commitment to, the humanistic learning values at the very core of liberal arts education, past, present, and future – to paraphrase classical author Terence, nothing human is alien to this division, despite its size and complexities. But more: in the spirit of brotherly love and Paul’s account to the Corinthian church of his radical commission, while we find humanistic study and knowledge – the broadest and deepest reflection of human desires and experience – inherently pleasuring and rewarding, we don’t find humanistic pursuit an end in itself. Instead, such study provides a lifelong gateway to engaging humanity in
resistance and redemption – whether in literary expression, historical experience, the education of youth, the aesthetic construction of cinematic media, or creative verbal expression. HuTE contains:

- **5 major program areas** (Liberal Arts, Film Studies, Creative Writing, English, and History – and, until Fall 2015, Philosophy; except for Liberal Arts, all also offer a minor)
- **2 graduate degrees** (M.A. in American Studies, M.F.A. in Screen and Television Writing), and
- **2 general education alternative tracks** (Great Books and Social Action and Justice [SAAJ])

HuTE has an exceptionally large footprint in **general education** by exclusively servicing a variety of general education requirements for all Seaver students:

- the Western Culture (or Humanities) sequence [HUM 111, 212, 313]
- HIST 204 (part of the American Experience)
- English Composition [ENG 100, ENG 101]
- Junior Writing Portfolio program (including the Writing Center)

HuTE provides courses that meet (or can meet) **various other general education requirements**:

- Literature [ENG 325, 326, 370, 380]
- Fine Arts [FILM 111/311]
- World Civilizations [FILM 365, GSHU 425, HIST 320, HIST 390, HIST 409]
- REL 301 (part of Christianity and Culture) [by Great Books and SAAJ]
- SOC 200 (part of Human Institutions and Behaviors), POSC 104 (part of American Experience) [through Great Books]
- COM 180 (Speech and Rhetoric) [through Great Books]

Additionally, HuTE faculty comprise a large proportion of **First-Year Seminar** instructors: in Fall 2015, HuTE instructors (including those in Great Books and SAAJ) accounted for 50% of all FYS courses (19 of 38). Again, in Spring 2016, HuTE instructors accounted for 50% of FYS offerings for deferred admittance students.

HuTE courses and faculty also contribute to courses and leadership in a variety of **interdisciplinary minors**:

- African-American Studies
- Ethnic Studies
- Intercultural Studies
- Sustainability
- Women’s Studies.

Finally, these descriptions concern only academic year Malibu offerings. Because of its exceptionally large general education footprint, HuTE is also heavily involved in course offerings in the three Malibu summer sessions and in all seven AY International Programs campuses/programs, as well as its summer and special course offerings.

Some sense of the division’s curriculum offering, divided between GE and majors classes, may be gained from the chart below, which lists for the last five years (AY + summer + IP) the total, duplicated enrollments for HuTE GE courses and HuTE majors courses, followed by the percentage of the latter of the former. Although the percentages reflect a small decline, they have held at around 16%.
By and large, such figures don’t tell us anything we don’t already know, but they do serve to illustrate generally HuTE faculty’s dual but somewhat imbalanced pedagogical commitments. While some HuTE teach GE courses exclusively and others teach majors courses exclusively, most teach a mixture of both, with a common 3/3 teaching load of 5 GE courses and 1 majors course a year (or sometimes 4 and 2).

Physically, the HuTE main office and most of its faculty offices and classrooms are located in Cultural Arts Center (CAC) on the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd floors, the classrooms of which it shares with the Fine Arts, Natural Science, and Religion and Philosophy Divisions. The large lecture HUM classes are taught either in Elkins Auditorium or in Pendleton Learning Center (PLC) 125. Some Great Books courses are taught in a pedagogically designed classroom in Payson Library 313C (20 seats), and the Writing Center is located in the Academic Center for Excellence (ACE) also the Payson Library (3rd floor). Those FILM students who select the production emphasis take those classes in CCB. HuTE periodically uses offices in PLC for contingent appointments.

The layout and dimensions of CAC classrooms have remained unchanged since the building was erected in 1990 (dedicated, 1991; although some classrooms and hallway areas are named, the building itself never has been). The current seating capacity is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115 (computer lab for composition)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 (Teacher Education)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 122 (conference room)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 (film)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Although CAC 122 was designed solely as a conference room, usually for small committee and other meetings, due to classroom scarcity and scheduling, it has increasingly been used routinely as a classroom.

The classrooms are technologically outfitted with PC computers, DVD/Blu-Ray players, wi-fi connectivity, projectors/screens, and sound, in addition to dimmable lighting and chalk or white boards.

HuTE does not maintain designated student study spaces.
Additionally, the main division office is located in CAC 300, where faculty can: interact with division staff; send/receive campus and outside mail; get water, coffee, or tea; use a fax machine or shredder; and can access a multipurpose photocopier/scanner (which can also be accessed through faculty computer access, on and off campus). Except for staff and mail, the same services are available in CAC 106. Each full-time faculty member is supplied with a computer (either desktop or laptop, PC or Apple).

During AY, HuTE courses are scheduled M, T, and R, 8 am-10 pm, and F, 8 am-4 pm, with Wednesday mornings set aside for faculty meetings (8:30-10 am) and chapel (10-11 am) with W classes scheduled 11 am-10 pm. Courses are scheduled almost entirely in two-hour blocks.

Except for variable unit courses (such as internships or special topics courses), the majority of HuTE course offerings listed in the catalog are 4 units, but several (all GE) are 3 units (FYS, ENG 101, and the HUM sequence). Given that most HuTE faculty teach both major and GE courses, most wind up with a workload mix of 3- and 4-unit courses. It is possible for a full-time visiting faculty member to have an academic year workload of 24 (8 courses X 3 units each; e.g., 8 sections of ENG 101) or 32 (8 courses X 4 units; e.g., 8 sections of HIST 204) with identical compensation, despite the 8 unit discrepancy in contact hours, the equivalent of 2 classes. This can happen in part because Seaver determines workload in terms of number of 3- or 4-unit courses taught rather than solely in terms of overall number of units. As Seaver College considers modifying its classroom schedule times for maximum efficiency, this mixture of 3- and 4-unit courses may present special, difficult challenges for HuTE faculty.

HuTE faculty are also given the option of teaching summer classes in Malibu. The schedule for Summer 2016 may be taken as typical: Of 30 courses offered, only 4 are not GE classes; of the 30 instructors, 6 are tenure-line, 7 are full-time, 5 teach in Pepperdine IP campuses, and the remaining 12 are none of the above. (One full-time is teaching two classes; one none of the above is teaching two classes.)

One other oddity bears mentioning: GSGS. Each division is given a division specific general studies course designation (e.g., GSNS for Natural Science, GSBA for Business Administration), which are used mostly for First Year Seminar courses staffed by that division. For HuTE, that designation is GSHU. But additionally, there is a GSGS (General Studies General Studies) designation that is also housed in the HuTE catalog; it is used for the rare course in preparation that doesn’t yet fit elsewhere. However, GSGS 595 is an internship course that is used for instructors across all Seaver divisions.

2. EXTERNAL CONTEXT
A. One of HuTE’s major external contributions, as described above, is to the General Education program at Seaver College: First Year Seminar, English composition, upper-division literature, HIST 204, and the HUM sequence; it also contributes to Fine Arts, World Civilizations, REL 301, SOC 200, and COM 180 – and it houses two alternative GE tracks, Great Books and SAAJ.

B. HuTE faculty and programs contribute to the intellectual, spiritual, and administrative affairs of the Seaver community in many, many, many ways. Its faculty lead “club convos” and either attend or contribute to many events and activities across campus. For instance, when scholar-novelist Deborah Harkness spoke in the W. David Baird Dean’s Lecture series in Fall 2012, she introduced by Cyndia Clegg; when Dr. Karla Holloway spoke in Spring 2013, she was introduced by Michael Ditmore. Multi-Cultural Theatre, directed by Joi Carr, has been an annual contribution for 15 years now. HuTE faculty engage in public book reviews, and also bring in outside speakers/presenters. The Creative Writing program under John Struloeff has been especially active in bringing in poets and fiction writers, both for readings and meeting with students. The division’s monthly Symposium, where a faculty member delivers a paper or presentation, although small, is open to the Seaver community. The Creative Writing program annual publishes Expressionists, a student creative arts magazine, while the Great Books program publishes Athena’s Gate , a similar publication of student work. HuTE faculty direct both Summer Undergraduate Research Programs (SURP) and Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiatives (AYURI); in addition to sponsoring academic honors societies (Sigma Tau Delta for English, Kappa Delta Pi for Teacher Education, Phi Alpha Theta for History, and – until 2015 –
Division Introduction

Phi Sigma Tau for Philosophy), faculty accompany students to undergraduate and other conferences. These are only some of many examples of HuTE faculty contributions.

C. For communities and audiences outside of Pepperdine, HuTE faculty contribute largely through professional and scholarly activity in the various disciplines: national conference presentations and public lectures, professional leadership, refereed journal and university press publication, journal editing, and critical review. Additionally, HuTE prepares undergraduates for California teaching credentialization; its two graduate programs have special missions (AMST provides continued professional development for high school teachers in the immediate region; STW develops the formation of screenwriters as cultural leaders).

To give a rough idea of HuTE professional activities, the chart below gives a simple (and probably undercounted) numerical breakdown over the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOOKS</th>
<th>REFEREED ARTICLES/CHAPTERS</th>
<th>PRESENTATIONS</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That census does not take account a variety of creative products and other professional activities (editing, co-editing etc.) – 5 films have been made or produced, plus another 16 creative publications. (Also not taken into account are book reviews and other acts of professional services.) Additionally, over the past five years, *Christianity and Literature* was published quarterly each year (co-edited by Paul Contino and Maire Mullins). Finally, many scholarly and professional projects are still at various stages of progress. Moreover, this tabulation may not adequately reflect the diversity of professional activities in HuTE. While many HuTE faculty follow a fairly traditional scholarly pattern (either books from academic publishers or refereed journal articles/invited chapters), others are pursuing less traditional or emergent venues/media.

3. MISSION, PURPOSE, GOALS, OUTCOMES

Below, and slightly abridged, is the description of the division’s mission, purpose, goals, and outcomes contained in the Seaver College catalog:

The Humanities and Teacher Education Division believes that undergraduate education is the special place where students can refine their values and learn the ideas and methods of thinking that will enrich their lives and vocations. Its programs develop the excellence of mind and qualities of soul that foster intellectual independence: spirited inquiry and disciplined imagination; intelligent interpretation and persistent questioning of texts; reverence for language and rigorous exposition, argumentation, logic, and problem solving; attentiveness to the phenomena of time and the ordering of history; and aesthetic and ethical understanding. These programs of study are morally inscribed, mobilizing the virtues that go hand-in-hand with academic inquiry—courage and confidence in one’s undertakings, charity and civility, honesty and humility—all of which sustain communities of learning. This education aims to develop the whole person, whose habits of reflection and sound judgment strengthen students for lives of thoughtfulness, service, and responsible influence.

* * * * *
The course offerings in the Humanities and Teacher Education Division are designed to:

- Develop the skills that underpin meaningful learning experience, including critical thinking, research acumen, and effective oral and written communication.
- Inculcate spiritually grounded habits of thought, supporting the ideal of a dignified and fully integrated self.
- Develop an appreciation of the breadth and richness of world cultures.
- Encourage integration of learning from various disciplines.
- Convey sophisticated, discipline-specific knowledge and theoretical comprehension in degree areas.
- Orient students toward lives of purposeful action on the basis of intellectual depth, cultural competence, and keen social awareness.

4. CREDIT HOURS

PROCEDURE FOR CHECKING CREDIT HOURS

- Credit hours will be examined for compliance by Department, by School, and by the Registrar prior to the start of each term.
- Official credit hour approval occurs via UAC during new program proposals, changes to programs, changes to courses, and during program review (via UAC and ASLC).
- Exceptions such as Independent Studies and Internships are checked on an ongoing basis by faculty, Division Chair and/or Associate Dean, and Registrar.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad Group</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Class Nbr</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Meet Days</th>
<th>Meet Starts</th>
<th>Meet Stops</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 203 02</td>
<td>CRW R 3679</td>
<td>Introduction To Creative Writing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>5:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 303 01</td>
<td>Intermediate Creative Writing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 405 01</td>
<td>Advanced Fiction Writing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 410 01</td>
<td>Advanced Writing Screen and TV</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 510 01</td>
<td>Writing for Screen/Television</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/2013-12/12/2013</td>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 203 01</td>
<td>Introduction To Creative Writing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T-F</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1/6/14-4/24/14</td>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 203 02</td>
<td>Composition for ELL Students</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>5:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 303 01</td>
<td>Intermediate Creative Writing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 405 01</td>
<td>Advanced Fiction Writing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>5:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 410 01</td>
<td>Advanced Writing Screen and TV</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 CRW R 510 01</td>
<td>Writing for Screen/Television</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENGLISH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad Group</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Class Nbr</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Meet Days</th>
<th>Meet Starts</th>
<th>Meet Stops</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 ENG 100 01</td>
<td>ENG 3832</td>
<td>Composition for ELL Students</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 ENG 101 01</td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>9:30 am</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 ENG 207 01</td>
<td>Writing for Business</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAV R UGRD 1 ENG 215 01</td>
<td>English Studies</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Class Section</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Meet Days</td>
<td>Meet Starts</td>
<td>Meet Stops</td>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 305</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Style and Editing Workshop</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1:50 pm</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 315</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Literary Study</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 325</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>British Literature</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>9:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 326</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>American Literature</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>9:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 395</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Writing Center Practicum</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1:50 pm</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 420</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 200</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Introduction to Film Studies</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 210</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Intro to Screen/TV Writing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 250</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Film Production &amp; Editing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 421</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Topics in Film Studies</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,W</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>5:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Class Nbr</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Meet Days</td>
<td>Meet Starts</td>
<td>Meet Stops</td>
<td>TOTAL HOURS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>3643</td>
<td>History of the American People</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>5:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>4698</td>
<td>Europe In Nineteenth Cen</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>4954</td>
<td>Europe in Twentieth Cent</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>5:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>4697</td>
<td>History of Mexico &amp; Borderland</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>A History of Modern Japan</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>Ancient Civilizations</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2555</td>
<td>Renaissance &amp; Reformation</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2556</td>
<td>Colonial America, 1492-1763</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>Foreign Relatns of US Since 18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2553</td>
<td>Senior Project</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2538</td>
<td>Topics in Global History</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>Early Modern Europe</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>Amer. Rev, New Natn-1763-18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2527</td>
<td>Tpcs:Intelctl &amp; Ctrl Hstry-U</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad Group</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Class Nbr</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Meet Days</th>
<th>Meet Starts</th>
<th>Meet Stops</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>9:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>Instructional Design</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>Educational Foundations</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>Literacy in the 21st Century--SS</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | EDUC    | 461           | 01      | 1083      | Instructional Design | 4.00  | M,R       | 2:00 pm     | 3:50 pm    | 60          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | EDUC    | 462           | 01      | 1084      | Educational Foundations | 4.00  | M,R       | 12:00 pm    | 1:50 pm    | 60          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | EDUC    | 463           | 01      | 1085      | Literacy in 21st Century-MS | 4.00  | M,R       | 2:00 pm     | 3:50 pm    | 60          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | EDUC    | 465           | 01      | 1615      | Teaching English Learners | 4.00  | M         | 6:00 pm     | 9:50 pm    | 60          |

| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | ART      | 103           | 01      | 2575      | Observational Drawing | 4.00  | M,R       | 8:00 am     | 9:50 am    | 60          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | MUS      | 101           | 01      | 1209      | Fundamentals of Music | 2.00  | T,F       | 1:00 pm     | 1:50 pm    | 30          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | MATH     | 120           | 01      | 1133      | Nature of Mathematics | 3.00  | M,T,R     | 11:00 am    | 11:50 am   | 45          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | MATH     | 150           | 01      | 1150      | Calculus I           | 4.00  | M,T,R,F   | 9:00 am     | 9:50 am    | 60          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | MATH     | 270           | 01      | 1163      | Foundations of Elem Math I | 4.00  | M,R       | 10:00 am    | 11:50 am   | 60          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | THEA     | 226           | 01      | 1453      | Dance for Music Theatre | 2.00  | T         | 10:00 am    | 11:50 am   | 30          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | BIOL     | 106           | 01      | 1411      | Principles of Biology | 3.00  | T,W,F     | 11:00 am    | 11:50 am   | 45          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | BIOL     | 106           | 02      | 2532      | Principles of Biology (Lab) | 1.00  | R         | 4:00 pm     | 5:50 pm    | 30          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | HUM      | 313           | 01      | 1290      | Western Culture III  | 3.00  | T,F       | 2:00 pm     | 3:30 pm    | 45          |
| SEAVR      | UGRD   | 1       | EDUC    | 461           | 01      | 1083      | Instructional Design | 4.00  | M,R       | 2:00 pm     | 3:50 pm    | 60          |

## LIBERAL ARTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad Group</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Class Nbr</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Meet Days</th>
<th>Meet Starts</th>
<th>Meet Stops</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>Observational Drawing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>9:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Music</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>1:50 pm</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>Nature of Mathematics</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>M,T,R</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>Calculus I</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,T,R,F</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>9:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>Foundations of Elem Math I</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>THEA</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>Dance for Music Theatre</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Principles of Biology</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>T,W,F</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>11:50 am</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>Principles of Biology (Lab)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>5:50 pm</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>Western Culture III</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>Instructional Design</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad Group</td>
<td>Career</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Meet Days</td>
<td>Meet Starts</td>
<td>Meet Stops</td>
<td>TOTAL HOURS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POSC</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>American People and Politics</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>7:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 31, 2015-Dec 17, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NASC</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Earth Science: A Way of Knowing</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>M,T,R</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>10:50 AM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NASC</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Earth Science: A Way of Knowing Lab</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>7:50 PM</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>History of the American People</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M, R</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>9:50 AM</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Western Culture II</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>M, R</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>11:30AM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Race and Ethnic Relations</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M, R</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>3:50pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Adv Grammar and Composition</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M, R</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>3:50pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Span Phonetics &amp; Conversation</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>8:00am</td>
<td>9:50am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Surv of Span Cul &amp; Civilization</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>1:50pm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHILOSOPHY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad Group</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Meet Days</th>
<th>Meet Starts</th>
<th>Meet Stops</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Intro to Philosophy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>3:50pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Modern Philosophy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>11:50am</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Foundations of Political Theory</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Ancient Philosophy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Business Ethics</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M,R</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>UGRD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Philosophy of Religion</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T,F</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMERICAN STUDIES**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad Group</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Class Nbr</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Meet Days</th>
<th>Meet Starts</th>
<th>Meet Stops</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMST</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2493</td>
<td>Orientation to Amer. Studies</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMST</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2292</td>
<td>Orientation to Amer. Studies</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMST</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>Directed Readings/Amer Studies</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCREENWRITING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acad Group</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Class Nbr</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Meet Days</th>
<th>Meet Starts</th>
<th>Meet Stops</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Storyteller as Cultural Leader</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Great Books and Film</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>Topics Writing for the Market: Screenwriting</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Topics Writing for the Market: Writ. For Market: One Hour Spec</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>4030</td>
<td>Topics Writing for the Market: Sketch Comedy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>Topics Writing for the Market: Screenwriting I</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Topics Writing for the Market: ANIMATION</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAVR</td>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Topics Writing for the Market: One Hour Pilot</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>9:50 pm</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

FACULTY

The 42 full-time, tenured, or tenure-track HuTE faculty (with terminal degree) include:

UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR

*Dr. Ed Larson (PhD, University of Wisconsin; J.D., Harvard University)

DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR

Dr. Cyndia Clegg (PhD, UCLA)

PROFESSOR

Dr. Paul Contino (PhD, University of Notre Dame)
Dr. Michael Ditmore (PhD, University of Texas-Austin)
** Dr. Constance Fulmer (PhD, Vanderbilt)
Dr. Michael Gose (PhD, Stanford)
Dr. David Holmes (PhD, University of Southern California)
Dr. Maire Mullins (PhD, University of Notre Dame)
Dr. Frank Novak (PhD, University of Tennessee)
Dr. Darlene Rivas (PhD, Vanderbilt)
Dr. Jane Rodeheffer (PhD, Vanderbilt)
Dr. Julianne Smith (PhD, Texas Christian University)
Dr. James Thomas (PhD, University of Tennessee)

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Dr. Carrie Birmingham (University of California, Santa Barbara)
Dr. Stewart Davenport (PhD, Yale)
Dr. Joi Carr (PhD, Claremont)
Dr. Stella Erbes (PhD, University of California, Santa Barbara)
Dr. Bryan Givens (PhD, UCLA)
Dr. Lorie Goodman (PhD, University of Texas, Arlington)
Dr. Loretta Hunnicutt (PhD, Georgetown)
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*** Dr. Mason Marshall (PhD, Vanderbilt)
Dr. Steve Parmelee (PhD, Claremont)
Dr. John Struloeff (PhD, University of Nebraska-Lincoln)

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

*** Dr. Tomas Bogardus (PhD, University of Texas-Austin)
Dr. Heather Thomson Bunn (PhD, University of Michigan)
Dr. Sharyl Corrado (PhD, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign)
Dr. Theresa Flynn (EdD, Pepperdine)
Dr. Tanya Hart (PhD, Yale)
Dr. Tuan Hoang (PhD, University of Notre Dame)
Dr. Leslie Kreiner Wilson (PhD, Claremont)
*** Dr. Garrett Pendergraft (University of California, Riverside)
Dr. John Peterson (PhD, Claremont)
Dr. Jennifer Smith (PhD, UCLA)
Dr. Carrie Wall (PhD, University of California, Santa Barbara)

FULL-TIME

Dr. Jeff Banks (PhD, California Graduate Institute)
Dr. Jacqueline Dillion (PhD, University of St. Andrews)
Dr. Betty Dillon (PhD, Florida State University)
Dr. Katie Frye (PhD, University of California, Santa Barbara)
Dr. Monica Osborne (PhD, Purdue)
Mr. Jeffrey Schultz (MFA, University of Oregon)
Dr. Lisa Smith (PhD, University of Delaware)
Dr. Todd Wahlstrom (PhD, University of California, Santa Barbara)

* As University Professor, Dr. Larson teaches courses both in the School of Law and in the Seaver College History and American Studies programs.

** Dr. Fulmer has served as Associate Dean since 2009, with limited teaching responsibilities.

*** Drs. Marshall, Bogardus, and Pendergraft – the Philosophy program – migrated from HuTE to the Religion (now Religion and Philosophy) Division, starting Fall 2015.
Dr. Dana Dudley (PhD, Claremont) serves as Assistant Dean of Special Academic Programs and also directs and teaches in the American Studies program in HuTE.

Since 2011, there has been one tenure-line retirement, Dr. Victoria Myers in English in 2013; she has since been designated emerita.

The above list does not include AY adjuncts in Malibu, summer school in Malibu, or at the various International Programs (Florence, Heidelberg, London, Buenos Aires, Shanghai, and Washington, DC). It also does not include tenured/tenure-track, full-time, and/or visiting faculty from other divisions teaching in either the Great Books, Social Action and Justice, or American Studies programs.

To give a picture of the HuTE involvement in IP can can look like: In Fall 2014, the various IP campuses offered 19 classes that are in the HuTE catalog (e.g., HUM 212, HIST 204, etc.), with 16 different instructors. In Spring 2015, IP offered 26 HuTE classes with 21 instructors (most of whom had taught in the fall).

For Summer 2015, HuTE in Malibu offered 40 classes, 23 of which were staffed by non-full-time, non-tenured/tenure-track instructors.

To complicate matters, some HIST courses (e.g., 310 History of Modern Japan and 331 History of Modern China) are in the HuTE catalog but are actually taught by ISL faculty.

**STAFF**

HuTE has two dedicated full-time staff members, plus one half-time IT liaison; their names, with duties, are listed below. Both the Office Manager and Administrative Assistant maintain desks in the main office, CAC 300, while the IT Liaison maintains an office in the CAC 106 office complex (he also services Fine Arts). It is to be noted that HuTE staff is expected to support 42 full-time faculty (5 majors, 2 GE alternative programs, and the HUM sequence, among other things.). The staff are scheduled to work Monday through Friday, 8 am-5 pm, even though classes are scheduled Monday-Thursday evenings until 10 pm.

**Ms. Geneva (Genny) Moore, Office Manager**

DUTIES: “Assist the Division Chairperson in creating, planning, initiating, and implementing short and long-term goals for the Division, including the planning of meetings, seminars, events, and graduation; assist the chairperson in planning and scheduling Division course for upcoming semesters; maintain the classroom matrix; prepare, maintain, and monitor financial files, including monthly budget reports, expense reports, purchase and check requisitions, and travel arrangements; assist the Division Chairperson in the prioritizing/analyzing of operating expenses; create, manage, and process faculty workloads, overloads, salary contracts, W-4 and I-9 forms, curriculum vitae, course syllabi, examinations, and other classroom materials while exercising sensitivity to the confidential nature of these matters; in coordination with the chairperson, interview, hire, discipline and discharge Administrative Clerk, graduate assistants, and student workers; represent the Division Chairperson and Division at various meetings and campus-wide events; prepare letters of recommendation for students planning to attend graduate schools; create, maintain, and update alumni mailing lists; compose, analyze, and approve various public and confidential materials to students, parents, staff, and faculty; oversee the use and security of specialized rooms and laboratories; coordinate programs for Academic Advising Office, including assigning advisors to all new and transfer students; review and analyze course offerings using historical data and current enrollment numbers to recommend number of course sections offered in the schedule of classes; analyze and evaluate course load during registration and make independent decisions to close course section(s) and redirect students to alternative courses during registration; coordinate faculty evaluations and reports; assist the chairperson in overseeing respective undergraduate and graduate academic programs and majors within the Division, including the distribution of
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general information, major changes, orientation sessions, meetings, and updates to the Seaver College Academic Council and for the Seaver College Catalog; design and ensure maintenance of division bulletin boards, which increases Division visibility within the University and actively promotes respective academic programs for prospective students and families; plan and schedule interviews/visits for new prospective faculty; publish Division newsletter and develop major/program brochures, mailings, and summarize respective academic programs; serve in public relations capacity by acting as a facilitator and liaison for and between faculty, staff, students (prospective, current, and alumni), parents, University, and the general public by providing information (tours, correspondence, demonstrations), recruiting, and promoting the respective undergraduate and graduate programs; create and review respective undergraduate and graduate confidential student files; process advisor/major changes, advise students, clear students to register, and register them; administer placement exams/proctor exams; uphold the University mission through work performed; and perform other duties as assigned” (from posted job description).

Ms. Chiconia Anderson, Administrative Assistant:

“Supervise, train assistants, and assign tasks; answer telephone calls and answer questions; give general information regarding appointments, faculty schedules, etc.; oversee front line office to greet visitors, direct students appropriately; assist faculty with preparation of class materials, copy requests, coordinate faculty book orders, student problems and special projects; assist in coordinating and staffing special events, including graduation, banquets, and receptions; stock and maintain supplies and other equipment for the Humanities and Teacher Education Division office; maintain Humanities and Teacher Education webpages; Answer student questions concerning transfer credits, academic counseling, advisers, and courses; assist Division Chair and Office Manager as needed; uphold University mission through work performed; and other duties as assigned” (from posted job description).

Mr. Terence Anderson, IT Liaison/Lead Client Technologies Analyst:

The general purposes are “to help students, faculty, and staff effectively apply technology to achieve academic goals … work directly with constituents and academic divisions to prove technology-related project consultation, coordination and production; management of technology resources; provision of just-in-time training and support; and assistance with technology research, planning, acquisition, and implementation with an academic context” (from posted job description). Anderson took over from Jason Eggleston in Fall 2015, at which time Information Technologies changed the position from full-time for HuTE to split time with HuTE and Fine Arts.

Additionally, HuTE employs 5-6 student workers per semester, for light office duties.

LIBRARY SERVICES

While HuTE faculty have access to all Pepperdine library facilities and services, its main library is Payson Library. Ms. Elizabeth Parang serves as general Payson liaison for HuTE (she attends division meetings and other functions); she also serves as subject liaison for African-American Studies, American Studies, History, and Literature; Marc Vineyard serves for History; Sally Bryant for Screenwriting & Film Studies; Jamie Beth Colvin for Women’s Studies; and Paul Stenis for Writing & Creative Writing. Each of the library liaisons has developed an InfoGuide in these particular areas.
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SUSTAINABILITY

BUDGET

HuTE oversees a complex budget that supports the Writing Center and includes both endowed professorships, a teaching award, and student scholarships. The following chart shows total revenues and expenses for the previous five years (FY10-14). It should be noted that the MFA program was added to the base in FY13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>(236,177)</td>
<td>(244,022)</td>
<td>(258,418)</td>
<td>(47,849)</td>
<td>(43,260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td>123,049</td>
<td>124,280</td>
<td>130,522</td>
<td>184,455</td>
<td>185,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>3,864,483</td>
<td>4,034,167</td>
<td>4,034,698</td>
<td>4,470,645</td>
<td>4,887,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without more data and tools for financial analysis/comparison, it is difficult to point toward patterns or trends. Obviously, the total expenses have increased annually; equally obvious is that adding the MFA program to the base in 2013 affected total revenue.

In terms of faculty professional development, through 2013-14, full-time faculty members were allowed $1000 each per year for professional travel; the amount was increased to $1500 in 2014-15. In addition to funds used for instructional purposes and office maintenance, HuTE also funds visiting speakers/lecturers, particularly in Creative Writing; Multicultural Theatre (now in its 15th year); Expressionists, the student creative arts annual magazine; student-led coffeehouse readings; and Athena’s Gate (a peer-reviewed undergraduate annual journal for Great Books). Each spring, HuTE hosts an Honors Banquet, following induction ceremonies for the various division’s honor societies (Sigma Tau Delta for English, Kappa Delta Pi for Teacher Education, Phi Alpha Theta for History, and – until 2015 – Phi Sigma Tau for Philosophy). However, this funding – as well as funding for CAC building maintenance/enhancement, for special requests and minor emergencies – comes out of general HuTE funding and can vary annually.

WASC CORE COMPETENCIES

The reviews from the individual programs will address how their students demonstrate mastery in the five core competencies: written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, and information literacy. In general terms, all HuTE programs strongly emphasize written communication, critical thinking, and information literacy as fundamental, key components. In fact, a 2014-15 assessment of written communication competency demonstrated, unsurprisingly, that HuTE majors as a group lead the way at Seaver College. Given the humanities-based focus of the division, it is to be expected that quantitative reasoning is well developed, but the various HuTE programs do require varying levels of oral communication. Of the five competencies, oral communication is the one that could be better developed in the future.
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FACULTY GE LOAD

As noted above, HuTE has a very large footprint in Seaver College’s general education program. The paradigm load is 3/3 for tenured/tenure-track faculty, whether the courses are 3 units (e.g., First Year Seminar, ENG 100/101, HUM 111/212/313) or 4 units; for full-time faculty, the load is 4/4 (with the same provision for units). But tenure-track faculty are annually given a course release to develop scholarship, and tenured faculty can apply for a course release annually as well; some faculty have received course releases for administrative or other service; and there are also scheduled opportunities for sabbatical.

As a general rule, a tenured/tenure-track faculty member on a 3/3 load would teach two-three majors courses and three-four general education courses per year, although that can vary from instructor to instructor, depending on the program. (For example, neither Philosophy nor Liberal Arts/Teacher Education have GE courses, while Great Books and SAAJ are GE-only.) Faculty are not required to teach summer school, although some periodically do so. However, in the cases of Great Books and Social Action and Justice, some faculty members teach those general education courses exclusively. Full-time faculty members predominantly teach general education courses only.

For various reasons, faculty members teach Directed Studies only in exceptional circumstances. But one area for future development concerns internship courses. We have oscillated between a single internship class directed by one instructor and individual instructors overseeing various internships. If we are going to develop a stronger internship program, however, we will most likely need to settle on the former (a single internship class).

HuTE is just now beginning to explore the possibilities of Digital Humanities. Currently, there are no HuTE online/hybrid courses.

To give one idea of HuTE’s GE load, I totaled the number of HuTE courses offered and taught by tenure-track/full-time faculty in AY 2014-15 in Malibu (192), broken down by the number of GE courses (114) and majors courses (78). The result, then, is 59.375 GE versus 40.625% majors courses. That is, I did not include the number of courses taught by adjuncts (11 sections of ENG 101). Doing that increases the total number to 203 courses, 125 GE, and 78 majors courses, with a different proportion: 61.576% GE v. 38.423%. But those numbers don’t account for overall enrollments, since GE courses almost always have much larger enrollments than majors courses. It also doesn’t account for summer or International Programs HuTE enrollments (almost exclusively GE). It is also worth noting that of 19 faculty scheduled for a 3/3 load, 12 actually taught a 3/3 load.

MARKETING/INFORMATION/DEVELOPMENT

Aside from Pepperdine University/Seaver College websites/pages (see https://seaver.pepperdine.edu/humanities/), HuTE as a division does not maintain a separate social media presence (i.e., Facebook, Twitter, etc.), although particular programs do so. Each major has a short student-centered video produced by Integrated Marketing and Communications and available on YouTube and other venues. Before 2012, the division published a news/info brochure, Interlocutor, but with the departure of its editor, no one has picked up the task. Division-wide information is distributed periodically in email blasts from the chair/divisional dean and office manager, and through monthly, scheduled division meetings. For several years now, HuTE also has held a separate Symposium at 11 am on days of division meetings, for faculty to present research and other topics of interests to the community. HuTE does participate in Malibu Reception and other activities to recruit students, but this is clearly an area for improvement.

Prepared by Michael Ditmore, with assistance from the entire HuTE Division (faculty and staff), Lisa Bortman, Nicole Marrs, Dana Papenhausen, and Bryan Reeder.
Creative Writing Program Review

Fall 2010–Spring 2015

Prepared by:

Dr. John Struloeff
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1. INTERNAL CONTEXT

The Creative Writing program is situated in Pepperdine’s undergraduate Seaver College, more specifically within the Humanities and Teacher Education Division. The program has equal status with the other programs in the Division, which include History, Film Studies, English, and Teacher Education. The program offers both a major and a minor in Creative Writing. The related degree granted is a Bachelor of Arts in Creative Writing.

(Note: This program is distinct and separate from Pepperdine’s Master of Fine Arts program in Screen and Television Writing.)

History: In Fall 2006, the program migrated from the Communication Division (where it had been a specialization under the Communications major) and entered the academic catalog as offering both the major and minor. While the major and minor weren’t formed until 2006, individual courses with a focus in Creative Writing have been offered at Pepperdine for more than thirty years.

Prior reviews: Although smaller annual studies have been conducted for this program since 2008-09, this is the first 5-Year Review for this program, so the creation of the program and all subsequent changes have occurred prior to this initial review.

Program revisions: In Fall 2007, with the hiring of Pepperdine’s first Director of Creative Writing, John Struloeff, the curricula of the Creative Writing major and minor were revised to be more in line with the standards in the discipline. The basis for the changes came from the Director’s experience in the discipline, as well as a review of the Association of Writers and Writing Programs’s “Hallmarks of an Effective BA Major in Creative Writing” and an examination of the curricula of highly regarded Creative Writing programs around the country. These changes included removing Journalism from the required list of courses for the major and minor, expanding the literature requirements, adding a new required literature course in line with the university’s mission (ENG 301: Spiritual Writing), and narrowing the outside emphases options in the major from “open” down to three: Literature, Film Studies, and Journalism. The total required credit hours for both the major and the minor did not change. These revisions went into effect at the beginning of the Fall 2008 semester. In Fall 2009, the Outside Emphasis was dropped from the major, in order to keep the major focused (the students would all take outside electives anyway), which changed the total required units from 48 to 36; the minor requirements stayed the same. In Fall 2010, a new course was added, CRWR 210: Introduction to Screenwriting, because of the strong demand for screenwriting at Pepperdine.

2. THE EXTERNAL CONTEXT

The response to the discipline by Pepperdine’s Creative Writing program is to a) offer a strong, three-tiered, multi-genre core of classes in both writing (in creative forms) and literature, b) utilize faculty who have terminal degrees and deep experience as published, award-winning writers, and c) include spiritual and moral lenses as a central part of the program experience.
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3. MISSION, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES

Mission:
The mission of the Creative Writing program is to deepen our students’ skills and understanding of writing in creative forms, to develop their abilities in critical and creative thinking, and to help them build a moral and ethical sense of both the written word and the writer’s life. The program pursues these objectives through courses focusing on craft, process, writing habits, and the major traditions within fiction, poetry, and screenwriting. Our professors engage students with a variety of writing experiences: classes, workshops, readings, internships, independent projects, and a literary arts magazine.

Goals:
1) To establish a firm foundation for our students in preparation for a professional writing life in screen and television, the novel, poetry, and/or the short story.
2) To prepare students for advanced graduate degrees in creative writing and literature.
3) To develop each students’ sense of the traditions in their chosen literary genres.
4) To deepen each students’ awareness of the spiritual, moral, and ethical aspects of writing.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):
1) Demonstrate a moral, ethical, or spiritual consciousness in their own writing.
2) Think critically and communicate clearly in analyzing Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and screen/television writing;
3) Demonstrate proficiency in writing each of Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and screen/television writing;
4) Demonstrate expertise in writing and analysis of at least one of Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and/or screen/television writing.

Alignment of PLOs with Institutional Learning Outcomes
Place a check mark to indicate alignment between PLOs and ILOs. Only one or two ILOs need apply to each PLO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>PLO #1</th>
<th>PLO #2</th>
<th>PLO #3</th>
<th>PLO #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILO #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ILO #3
Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.

ILO #4
Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.

ILO #5
Respond to the call to serve others.

ILO #6
Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.

ILO #7
Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.

ILO #8
Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.

ILO #9
Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.

Curriculum Map

For each course, indicate whether students will be Introduced to the PLO (I), Develop their skills related to the PLO (D), or demonstrate Mastery of the PLO (M) by entering I, D, or M under the appropriate PLO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRWR 203</td>
<td>Intro to CRWR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWR 203</td>
<td>Intro to CRWR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWR 303</td>
<td>Intermd CRWR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWR 404</td>
<td>CRWR Pro Mkt</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWR 405</td>
<td>Adv Fiction Wr</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWR 406</td>
<td>Adv Poetry Wr</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWR 410</td>
<td>Adv Screen Wr</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 301</td>
<td>Spiritual Wr</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEANING

Creative Writing Major Requirements:

In addition to the general education requirements, students will complete a 36-unit sequence, which includes a course in spiritual writing and foundational courses in English literature.

**Lower-Division Course: 4 units**

Choose one of the following: 4 units
CRWR 203 Introduction to Creative Writing (WI) .......................... (4)
CRWR 210 Introduction to Screen and Television Writing (WI) ........ (4)

**Upper-Division Courses: 32 units**

CRWR 303 Intermediate Creative Writing (PS, RM) ......................... (4)
ENG 301 Spiritual Writing ......................................................... (4)
ENG 315 Literary Study ............................................................ (4)

Choose one of the following: 4 units
ENG 325 British Literature .......................................................... (4)
ENG 326 American Literature ..................................................... (4)
ENG 370 World Literature .......................................................... (4)

Choose three of the following: 12 units
CRWR 404 Creative Writing for the Professional Market ................. (4)
CRWR 405 Advanced Fiction Writing ........................................... (4)
CRWR 406 Advanced Poetry Writing .......................................... (4)
CRWR 410 Advanced Writing for Screen and Television ................. (4)
CRWR 440 Topics in Creative Writing ......................................... (4)

Choose one of the following: 4 units
ENG 420 Shakespeare .............................................................. (4)
ENG 425 Topics in British Literature (pre-1800) ............................ (4)
ENG 426 Topics in American Literature ....................................... (4)
ENG 430 Anglophone Literature/Literatures in Translation ............ (4)
ENG 435 Topics in British Literature (post-1800) ........................... (4)
ENG 436 Topics in Multicultural American Literature ................. (4)

4. How does the degree support the institutional mission and institutional learning outcomes?

The Creative Writing PLOs support three of Pepperdine’s Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs):

1) ILO 1 (Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.) is supported by PLOs 3 and 4.

2) ILO 2 (Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.) is supported by PLO 1.

3) ILO 7 (Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.) is supported by PLO 2 and 4.
5. How does the degree embody the distinct values, basic commitment, and traditions of the institution?

The Creative Writing degree instills a keener awareness of the complexities and truth of our lives through the study and practice of literary writing. This deepened awareness enhances their abilities to pursue lives of creativity, leadership, and service.

6. Is there a coherent, aligned sequence of learning opportunities?

Yes. With the required CRWR courses, the program utilizes a three-tiered curriculum, which must be taken in sequence: Introductory (CRWR 203: Introduction to Creative Writing or CRWR 210: Introduction to Screen and Television Writing), Intermediate (CRWR 303: Intermediate Creative Writing), and Advanced (CRWR 404: Creative Writing for the Professional Market, CRWR 405: Advanced Fiction Writing, CRWR 406: Advanced Poetry Writing, CRWR 410: Advanced Writing for Screen and Television, and CRWR 440: Topics in Creative Writing). With the required ENG courses, students begin with ENG 301: Spiritual Writing and ENG 315: Literary Study, as preparation for the remaining literature courses, and then finish with at least two additional 300-level and 400-level literature courses.

7. Does the degree offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular major or program?

Yes. The three-tiered, multi-genre study, in addition to the program’s dedication to the study of literature, provides a strong foundation for the subsequent deeper study of individual genres of interest. As illustrated in the chart (below), Pepperdine’s degree program in Creative Writing has more in-class hours in both Creative Writing courses and total required courses than the four other randomly selected peer institutions.

8. Please present a curriculum comparison with at least three peer institutions and with national disciplinary or professional standards if available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pepperdine University</th>
<th>Valparaiso University</th>
<th>Macalester College</th>
<th>University of Southern California</th>
<th>Loyola Marymount University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of required courses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit size of courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class hours per unit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required capstone</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Internship</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of required courses</td>
<td>5 courses / 20 class hours</td>
<td>5 courses / 15 class hours</td>
<td>4 courses / 12 class hours</td>
<td>3 courses / 7.5 class hours</td>
<td>4 courses / 12 class hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing courses/class hours</td>
<td>4 courses / 16 class hours</td>
<td>6 courses / 18 class hours</td>
<td>5 courses / 15 class hours</td>
<td>6 courses / 15 class hours</td>
<td>7 courses / 21 class hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of literature courses required</td>
<td>36 units / 36 class hours</td>
<td>33 units / 33 class hours</td>
<td>40 units / 27 class hours</td>
<td>40 units / 22.5 class hours</td>
<td>44 units / 33 class hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of required units/class hours</td>
<td>BA in</td>
<td>BA in</td>
<td>BA in English</td>
<td>BA in English</td>
<td>BA in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>BA in</td>
<td>BA in</td>
<td>BA in English</td>
<td>BA in English</td>
<td>BA in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmarks of an Effective BA Major in Creative Writing (Association of Writers and Writing Programs)</td>
<td>Pepperdine’s Curriculum for the BA in Creative Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three tiered workshops</strong></td>
<td>Yes – Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced workshop classes are required for all majors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one craft-of-a-genre course in their chosen genre</td>
<td>No – genre “craft” is instead incorporated into each workshop course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one tiered workshop in supplementary genre</td>
<td>Yes – two workshops in supplementary genres are required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of a creative thesis or portfolio in the senior year</td>
<td>Yes – while a senior capstone course is not offered, portfolios are required in all three of the advanced courses each student is required to take</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least three upper division literature courses offered by the English department</td>
<td>Yes – four literature courses are required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A distribution of literature courses that ideally demonstrate a study of literature of three different centuries or literary periods</td>
<td>No – there are no period specific requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two sequenced courses in a foreign language</td>
<td>Yes – two years of a foreign language are required for all undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one and preferably two courses in the analysis or practice of an art form other than writing</td>
<td>Yes – one Fine Arts class is required for all undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9. How current is the program curriculum?**

The program curriculum is in line with all but two of the hallmarks recommended from the primary professional organization in the field, the Association of Writers and Writing Programs (AWP). The first – a recommended “craft of a genre” course – is not offered as an individual class, but the craft is instead taught within the individual workshop classes through intensive discussions of craft and the study of master works in the given genre, along with required craft papers. The second – literature courses in three different centuries or literary periods – is challenging due to the way the English literature courses are defined at Seaver College. Most literature classes are either focused on 20th century works, have topics that vary by semester, or are historical surveys that span centuries, so designating a definable set of classes that would cover three different periods is unusually challenging.

**10. How has the curriculum changed (if at all) over the last five years including the reasons for the change (e.g., the result of a learning outcome assessment) and evidence used as a basis for change.**
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Most curriculum changes occurred prior to 2011-12. In Fall 2014, CRWR 210: Introduction to Screen and Television Writing was added as an option (next to the already established, multi-genre CRWR 203: Introduction to Creative Writing) to fulfill the lower division “introductory” course for both the major and minor. This change was made due to the unusually strong demand for screenwriting courses at Pepperdine. The advanced course in Screenwriting, CRWR 410, consistently has enrollments above 20, sometimes as high as 25, far above the other advanced courses which average 12-16 and double AWP’s recommended maximum class size for advanced courses, 12. Because of this strong interest, as well as the university’s unusual proximity to Hollywood and the growth of our robust MFA program in Screenwriting, the addition of a screenwriting “track” within the major is being considered.

11. Pedagogy: Please present measures of teaching effectiveness

Our primary measure of teaching effectiveness are student course evaluations. Here are the averages for the past four years by semester, including average course enrollment, with quantitative measures isolated for “course” and “instructor” (5 being highest, 1 being lowest).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Enrollment Avg.</th>
<th>Evaluations for “Instructor”</th>
<th>Evaluations for “Course”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluations from both the full-time and adjunct faculty are consistently strong, which is in line with the alumni survey of the students’ experience in the program (see #15 below).

QUALITY

12. Describe the practices which enrich the learning experiences such as co-curricular experiences

There are no required Creative Writing co-curricular experiences, but a variety of opportunities are made available, and many of the Creative Writing students participate in these activities.

a. Service learning: Pepperdine is a service-oriented community, so opportunities for service abound. For example, students have been writing tutors at Camp David Gonzales, which is a high-security juvenile detention facility in Los Angeles County, or have participated in Social Action and Justice courses, which requires service projects in the Los Angeles area.

b. Research opportunities: While less common than in the sciences, Creative Writing students occasionally participate in a Summer Undergraduate Research Project (working individually with a professor on a project for 12 weeks) or the Academic Year
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Undergraduate Research Initiative (working individually with a professor for either Fall or Spring semester). Both of these research programs are funded by the Seaver Dean’s office. Creative Writing students have presented their work at both the Southern California Undergraduate Research Conference and the Sigma Tau Delta National Conference.

c. Internships: Participation in internships is extremely common among the Creative Writing students, as many of them see this as an avenue to employment after graduation. In 2014, the most recent survey year, 71% had held at least one internship. Recent examples include The Malibu Times, Lionsgate Films, Fox Searchlight, Interscope Records, ICM (film, talent agency), Country Music Association (CMA), and Sage Publishing, among others.

13. **Co-Curricular**: How intentional are the co-curricular experiences which are provided and how are they integrated into the curricular plan?

Seaver College has a robust array of co-curricular experiences and services. At the college level, these are very intentional, meant to offer support and vivid learning experiences for all students.

Experiences and support aimed at our Creative Writing students include:

1) An author reading series – the program brings an average of four to five authors to campus for readings, lectures, and discussions with our undergraduate students. Visiting authors during the past five years have included Billy Collins, Dana Gioia, Jeanne Murray Walker, Eavan Boland, Peter Cooley, Christian Wiman, Garrett Hongo, Gwyneth Lewis, Alan Heathcock, Maxine Hong Kingston, Shann Ray, and Kiersten White.

2) An undergraduate literary magazine, Expressionists – published annually each Spring semester, the magazine features all undergraduate student staff and writing. While not exclusive to the Creative Writing students, they make up the majority of the students involved.

3) Douglas Scholarship in Creative Writing – an annual scholarship awarded through a competitive application process to currently enrolled students. Approximately 12-15 scholarships are awarded each year, with annual payouts of approximately $55,000.

4) Graduate studies information meetings during the Fall semesters, in order to help prepare the students for their graduate school applications.

Additional experiences and support that are offered to all undergraduate students include:

-- Career services center – has a large staff that helps students find internships, prepare resumes, search for jobs, practice interviews, and network.
-- Academic Center for Excellence – offers tutoring for writing, speech, research, and other class oriented activities.
-- New Student Orientation and First Year Seminar – these are community building experiences for our first year students
-- Student Counseling Center – fully accredited staff that provides emotional and psychological support.
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-- Convocation Series – each semester, students must attend 14 of the dozens of convocation events, which are aimed at spiritual, moral, and ethical issues.
-- Multicultural Theater Project – offers theatrical productions each year to impact the community by creating dialogue about different issues such as race, class and gender.
-- Arts and Lectures – dozens of plays, musicals, art exhibits, and lectures are offered each semester, including both student and professional productions.

-- The Sophomore Experience – since most students attend an international program during their sophomore year, excursions are offered each semester for sophomores who have stayed in Malibu
-- Study Abroad – more than 60% of the students attend at least one international program, either semester or year-long stays. Pepperdine has permanent campuses in Florence, Italy; Heidelberg, Germany; London, England; Lausanne, Switzerland; Buenos Aires, Argentina; Shanghai, China; and Washington, DC. Summer and temporary programs have been offered in Fiji, Kenya, Russia, the Galapagos Islands, and other locations.

14. What is the profile of students in the program and how does the profile relate to or enhance the purpose and goals of the program? (Major headcount, degrees conferred, retention rate)

Declared majors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declared majors</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees conferred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees conferred</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparing the number of majors with the degrees conferred each year (averaged over four-year cycles), it’s evident that the retention rate is consistent. Considering the low number of designated tenure-line faculty, this suggests that the curriculum, course quality, purpose, and goals are sufficiently attractive to keep the majors from fleeing to another program.

15. Please present your student and alumni survey data examining student attitudes, satisfaction levels and dispositions.

In our 2015 Alumni Survey, there were 15 respondents in Creative Writing:

<p>| Employed | 91.7% |
| Pepperdine prepared them “reasonably” or “extremely” well for their employment | 91.6% |
| Written or published creative works within the past year | 80.0% |
| Written or published creative works within the past month | 46.7% |
| Used editing or analysis skills learned in Pepperdine’s creative writing classes within last month | 86.7% |
| Used editing or analysis skills learned in Pepperdine’s creative writing classes within five years | 100% |
| Pepperdine prepared them well to write at a level acceptable for work/profession to present material orally in work/profession | 100% | 92.3% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to act ethically and morally in the workplace</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to comprehend and analyze written texts</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to think creatively in the workplace</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to contribute and support work team members</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to apply facts and theories to solve problems</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to apply knowledge to real-world challenges</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine met academic expectations “reasonably” or “extremely” well</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with undergraduate program experience – “satisfied” or “very satisfied”</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would re-enroll at Pepperdine</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would recommend Pepperdine to others</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the program conferred its first degrees in May 2008, all of these alumni are from the past seven years. The data indicates a strong level of satisfaction with their preparation for work and creative lives.

16. Please describe evidence of students' research and publications, awards and recognition, professional accomplishments.

Three recent graduates have published full-length books: Pierce Brown, Red Rising, Golden Son, Morning Star (novel trilogy, Del Rey), which have been New York Times Best Sellers and translated into more than a dozen languages; Alexandria Ashford, Danke Schoen: Poems (Press Americana), winner of the Prize Americana for Poetry; and Gisele Firmino, The Marble Army (novel forthcoming in March 2016, Outpost19). Ashford and Firmino were Creative Writing majors, while Brown took a series of our Creative Writing courses and did not attend any subsequent writing programs.

During the past five years, nearly two dozen Creative Writing major graduates have been admitted to graduate programs in Creative Writing, including New York University, Boston University, Columbia University, Northwestern University, Louisiana State University, The New School, University of New Orleans, San Diego State University, University of North Carolina-Greensboro, University of Colorado-Boulder, Portland State University, and Queens University of Charlotte.

INTEGRITY

17. Are the graduates achieving the student learning outcomes at the expected level?

These are the results of our individual Program Learning Outcome assessments:

Program Learning Outcome #1: Demonstrate a moral, ethical, or spiritual consciousness in their own writing.

Final Portfolios were collected in ENG 301: Spiritual Writing from the 15 students in the class. The portfolios consisted of short stories and poems, including all previous brainstorming and drafts. No rubrics were publicly available for comparison, so a unique assessment approach and rubric were created for this purpose. All of the portfolios (100%) illustrated clear evidence of moral, ethical, or spiritual awareness, although the complexity of their ability to express it varied noticeably. This was the expected result. For the next 5-Year Review, more nuance will need to be applied to the
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assessment, in order to better understand the nature of “moral, ethical, or spiritual consciousness,” which the assessors found to be difficult to define in more than a general way.

Program Learning Outcome #2: Think critically and communicate clearly in analyzing Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and screen/television writing.

Twenty-five fiction response sheets were randomly selected from CRWR 303: Intermediate Creative Writing. The response sheets were rated according to a rubric created for this assignment based on one used in the English program. The response sheets are full, single-spaced page analyses of short stories, focusing on both conflict (in the story) and craft. The reviewers expected that 85% would average at least 3 (out of 5), which would be a rating of “adequate”. The results indicated that 92% achieved this rating.

Program Learning Outcome #3: Demonstrate proficiency in writing each of Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and screen/television writing.

Six final portfolios (approximately half of the class) were collected in CRWR 303: Intermediate Creative Writing, which is a multi-genre course. These portfolios were a compilation of each student’s work from the semester and included the final polished short story (or stories) and poem drafts, all prior drafts (to determine their revision process and effort), as well as a cover letter for the work. Each student had a choice for what creative work to include in the final portfolio, depending on their preference in genre: 1) Two short stories and 2-3 poems or 2) One short story and 4-6 poems. Six final portfolios were randomly selected for analysis. The assessment rubric was adapted from one made public by Loyola Marymount University, which was in line with others seen online. All but one portfolio was rated as “proficient” based on the rubric evaluation, which means that 83% were rated at this level or above.

Program Learning Outcome #4: Demonstrate expertise in writing and analysis of at least one of Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and/or screen/television writing.

Ten final portfolios were randomly selected from CRWR 405: Advanced Fiction Writing. The portfolios consisted of a novel synopsis and the first 50 pages of a new novel that was developed during the course. The reviewers used an adjusted adaptation of the Loyola Marymount rubric. Their expectation was that 75% of the portfolios were achieve an average of 4 (out of 5) on the rating scale. The results indicated that 90% achieved this rating.

In addition to these specific assessment projects, the program reviewers have also discussed student progress each year with the faculty to get a general sense of overall impact, as well as considered the results of graduate school applications and post-graduate publications. The consensus assessment was of a strong overall performance. The one potential weakness that came up several times was a lack of a clear learning alignment (or planned trajectory) through the three tiers of the program (Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced). The assessors could not yet determine, however, if such a planned trajectory was pedagogically viable because of the importance of aesthetic and pedagogical variation among the faculty (so that the students will not experience a single “model” of Creative Writing). One approach being considered is to outline a more general trajectory, which would allow for aesthetic and pedagogical variation while at the same time giving students a sense of movement and growth as they progress through the three courses.
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18. Is there assurance that students consistently meet the standards of performance that the major has established?

By completing the required courses in the major with satisfactory grades, students will achieve the expected standards of performance. Students who do not pass all of the required courses and meet the grade threshold will not graduate. In addition, all students are required to pass the Junior Writing Portfolio, which includes large writing samples from four separate courses. There is, however, no single “culminating” assignment for graduate Creative Writing majors.

19. Please present an integrated analysis of the data collected from the assessment of direct learning and indirect learning

All the data that has been collected – faculty evaluations, alumni survey, and the annual assessment of course assignments for the PLOs – indicate a strong performance by the Creative Writing program and a high level of satisfaction from program graduates. One potential weakness (as discussed in #17 above) is an undefined learning trajectory in the three-tiered sequence for major.

20. How does the program ensure that graduates meet the WASC FIVE CORE COMPETENCIES?

Alignment of PLOs with Core Competencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competency in Quantitative Skills is gained through the General Education program, which all students are required to complete. The core competencies of “Critical Thinking” and “Written Communication” were assessed along with all other programs at Seaver, and the Creative Writing students exceeded the expected outcomes for both competencies.

SUSTAINABILITY

21. With the rapid changes in the higher education environment, the University needs to demonstrate how financial viability and planning of their long-term stability are ensured.

For this section of the review report, programs are expected to address student demand, resource allocation to ensure quality, and the future need for the program.
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a. Student demand: For the past five years, Creative Writing has averaged 37 majors (high of 38, low of 35 – see #14 above) and more than 40 minors at any given time, with additional students taking courses as electives. This average is higher than the averages of many other majors at Pepperdine, including Art, Art History, History, Philosophy, all of Language Studies, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, Religion, and Sociology. The demand for the major has been consistent for nearly a decade, while the number of minors has increased over time from only a few to its current high number.

b. The degree to which resources are allocated appropriately so they are sufficient to maintain program quality: The Creative Writing program is able to provide quality courses and co-curricular experiences, but resources are insufficient in several ways.

   i. Insufficient number of tenure-line faculty in Creative Writing: As described in #24 below, there is only one tenured/tenure-line faculty member devoted full-time to Creative Writing (the program director, John Struloeff); all of the other full-time faculty (tenure-line or not) teach the majority of their classes in other programs (Leslie Kreiner in Film Studies and our separate MFA program, Heather Thomson-Bunn in First Year Writing, and our visiting assistant professor, Jeffrey Schultz, also in First Year Writing). All other peer institutions with a major or specialization in Creative Writing have a larger group of dedicated faculty that constitute a core group from year to year. Considering the number of majors and minors in the program, along with the support these faculty would add to the General Education program, more tenure-line Creative Writing designated faculty are needed.

   ii. No designated budget for a visiting author/reading series: Visiting writer programs are critical to the university Creative Writing experience. None of the peer institutions surveyed lacked a visiting writer program (the program reviewers were unaware, in fact, of any university with a Creative Writing program that lacked a visiting writer program). Since the program was created in 2006, visiting authors have been brought to campus to read and to talk to the students. Each of these authors is paid. The program director or division chair have had to seek funds (from a variety of offices and programs) for each visit, which is time-consuming and lacks dependability. Since four or more authors are brought every year, a budget should be established (perhaps by looking back at the average expenditures of the past five years), to help ensure the viability of this student experience.

c. Future need for the program: For more than a decade, there has been a strong upward trend in the field of Creative Writing.

Indicators:

Number of Creative Writing Degree-Conferring Programs (Source: AWP Official Guide to Writing Programs, December 2015):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AA/AFA</th>
<th>BA/BS Minor</th>
<th>BA/BFA Major</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MFA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Number of Creative Writing Positions Listed in the AWP Job List by Year (Source: AWP Job List Database, 2014-15):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Jobs</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>1169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Jobs</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track CRWR Jobs</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacademic Jobs</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 22. FACILITIES

Please describe the adequacy of:

- b. Office space: All full-time faculty in Creative Writing have their own offices.
- d. Programming venues: Adequate – large readings have been held in Elkins Auditorium, moderate sized readings in the Surfboard Room of Payson Library, and the Expressionists Magazine galas have been held in the Weisman Art Museum on campus.
- e. Student study spaces: Payson Library and the student union have adequate study tables and rooms.

### FACULTY AND STAFF

#### 23. What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty/staff in the program in relation to the program purpose and goals?

- a. Terminal degrees:

  88% of the Creative Writing (full-time and part-time) faculty who have taught in the program during the past five years have terminal degrees. The two faculty members who do not have terminal degrees in the field have extensive experience as professional writers (Randall Wallace is a world renowned film director and screenwriter and a New York Times Best Selling novelist, and Vickie Saxon has twenty years of experience as a writer of children’s books for Disney).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Degree and Specialization</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Struloeff</td>
<td>PhD in English (specialization in Creative Writing)</td>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Kreiner</td>
<td>PhD in English (specialization in Film/Creative Writing)</td>
<td>Claremont Graduate Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Hand Struloeff</td>
<td>PhD in English (specialization in Creative Writing)</td>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MFA in Fiction Writing</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Thomson-Bunn</td>
<td>PhD in English (specialization in Education/Writing)</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MFA in Fiction Writing</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Name</td>
<td>Specialty(ies)</td>
<td>Course Genre(s) Taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| John Struloeff       | Fiction/Poetry/Nonfiction | CRWR 203: Intro to CRWR (multi-genre)  
|                      |                    | CRWR 303: Intermediate CRWR (multi-genre)  
|                      |                    | CRWR 405: Advanced Fiction Writing  
|                      |                    | CRWR 406: Advanced Poetry Writing  
|                      |                    | ENG 301: Spiritual Writing (multi-genre)  |
| Leslie Kreiner       | Fiction/Poetry/Screenwriting | CRWR 203: Intro to CRWR (multi-genre)  
|                      |                    | CRWR 210: Intro to Screenwriting  
|                      |                    | CRWR 404: Creative Writing for the Professional Market (fiction)  |
| Cynthia Hand Struloeff | Fiction/Poetry            | CRWR 203: Intro to CRWR (multi-genre)  
|                      |                    | CRWR 405: Advanced Fiction Writing  |
| Nancy Dodd           | Screenwriting        | CRWR 410: Advanced Screen and Tele Writing  |
| Jeffrey Schultz      | Poetry              | CRWR 203: Intro to CRWR (multi-genre)  
|                      |                    | CRWR 303: Intermediate CRWR (multi-genre)  
|                      |                    | CRWR 406: Advanced Poetry Writing  
|                      |                    | ENG 301: Spiritual Writing (multi-genre)  |
| Vickie Saxon         | Children’s Books     | CRWR 440: Topics in CRWR (children’s books)  |
| Randall Wallace      | Screenwriting       | CRWR 410: Advanced Screen and Tele Writing (co-taught Spring 2011, Spring 2012)  |

c. Record of scholarship/awards for each faculty member:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Scholarship/Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Struloeff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      | -- The Man I Was Supposed to Be: Poems (Loom Press)  
|                      | -- More than 70 individual stories and poems in literary magazines, including The Atlantic Monthly, Prairie Schooner, ZYZZYVA, and Western Humanities Review  
|                      | -- Wallace Stegner Fellowship  
|                      | -- National Endowment for the Arts Fellowship  
|                      | -- Sozopol Fiction Fellowship (Bulgaria)  |
| Leslie Kreiner        |  
|                      | -- Rock Show (documentary series in post-production)  
|                      | -- Fighting Words (co-writer, documentary)  
|                      | -- Mississippi Son (co-writer, documentary)  
|                      | -- Frankie Laine: An American Dreamer (writer,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Heather Thomson-Bunn</strong></th>
<th>-- Articles on composition, pedagogy, and writing in <em>Pedagogy, College English, Mapping Christian Rhetorics, and Composition Forum</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Jeffrey Schultz**      | -- *What Ridiculous Things We Could Ask of Each Other: Poems* (University of Georgia Press)  
                            -- Individual poems in *Poetry, Copper Nickel, Indiana Review, Prairie Schooner, Missouri Review, and Boston Review*  
                            -- National Poetry Series Selection (for *What Ridiculous Things*)  
                            -- Ruth Lilly Poetry Fellowship  
                            -- Discovery/Boston Review Poetry Prize |
| **Cynthia Hand Struloeff**| -- *The Afterlife of Holly Chase* (forthcoming novel, HarperCollins)  
                            -- *The Last Time We Say Goodbye* (novel, HarperCollins)  
                            -- *Boundless* (novel, HarperCollins)  
                            -- *Hallowed* (novel, HarperCollins)  
                            -- *Unearthly* (novel, HarperCollins)  
                            -- New York Times Best Seller (for *Hallowed*)  
                            -- USA Today Best Seller (for *Unearthly* and *Hallowed*)  
                            -- IndieNext Selection (for *Unearthly*) |
| **Vickie Saxon**          | -- Dozens of children’s books published as a Disney writer (including *Finding Nemo, Frozen, and A Bug’s Life*)  
                            -- New York Times Best Seller  
                            -- Top Ten Best Seller for 2014 by Publisher’s Weekly  
                            -- Outstanding Editorial Development for Disney Fairies  
                            -- Currently writes for Disney, Mattel, and DreamWorks |
| **Randall Wallace**       | -- *Braveheart* (writer, feature film)  
                            -- *Secretariat* (director, feature film)  
                            -- *Heaven is for Real* (writer and director, feature film)  
                            -- *We Were Soldiers* (writer and director, feature film)  
                            -- *Pearl Harbor* (writer, feature film) |
24. **Are there sufficient numbers of faculty/staff to maintain program quality?** Do program faculty/staff have the support they need to do their work?

a. Distribution of faculty across ranks:
   - John Struloeff – Associate Professor (tenured)
   - Leslie Kreiner – Assistant Professor (tenure-line)
   - Heather Thomson-Bunn – Assistant Professor (tenure-line)
   - Jeffrey Schultz – Visiting Assistant Professor (non-tenure-line)/Adjunct 2010-13
   - Cynthia Hand Struloeff – Adjunct
   - Nancy Dodd – Adjunct
   - Vickie Saxon – Adjunct
   - Randall Wallace – Adjunct (co-taught the Advanced Screenwriting)

b. Female faculty: 5
   Male faculty: 3

c. Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty):
   4 Full-time/4 Part-time

   **Note:** Only one (1) full-time faculty member (tenured Associate Professor John Struloeff) is designated primarily to the Creative Writing program. The other three full-time faculty are primarily designated to either the MFA program (tenure-track Assistant Professor, Leslie Kreiner) or the First Year Writing program (tenure-track Assistant Professor Heather Thomson-Bunn and Visiting Assistant Professor, Jeffrey Schultz). Based on a review of Pepperdine’s peer institutions and other strong Creative Writing programs around the country, it is clear that our Creative Writing program’s faculty allocation is far too low.

d. Student-faculty ratio:
   12:1 (average for all 2010-2015 CRWR courses)

e. Faculty workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>tenured/full-time</th>
<th>3/3 or 3/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Struloeff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f. Faculty review and evaluation processes: For tenure-line faculty, the review process includes annual reviews by the Divisional Dean; the Three-Year Review during the third year of pre-tenure, which includes peer teaching observations, peer reviews of the faculty data form, and review and approval up the chain through the Divisional Dean, RTP (Rank, Tenure, and Promotion Committee), the Associate Dean, and the Dean; the Tenure Review is similar to the Three-Year Review, except it includes reviews by the Provost, President, and Board of Regents. All faculty (tenure-line and adjunct) have their teaching evaluations reviewed each semester by the Divisional Dean.

g. Mentoring processes: Each faculty member, whether full-time or adjunct, goes through a new faculty orientation program, which includes seminars and support when they first start. Mentoring after this is informal.

h. Professional development opportunities/resources (incl. travel and research funds):
Pepperdine offers a number of support opportunities for faculty annually, most on a competitive basis, including a Dean’s Research Grant (up to $2,000), Seaver Research Grant (up to $4,000), Division travel funds (up to $1,000 guaranteed for each faculty), and endowed fellowships ($2,000), professorships ($4,000), and chairs ($6,000). Occasionally, the Dean or Provost will financially support a faculty member in attending a special conference or training session.

i. Time for research, program development: For full-time faculty, the workload is intensive, with heavy teaching (20-24 class hours per academic year for tenure-line, 26-32 class hours per academic year for visiting) and service. Pepperdine has the highest teaching load of all of its 12 peer institutions, and it requires 25% of the time of tenured/tenure-line to be devoted to service, which is among or at the highest level of a service requirement. This heavy workload makes research, writing, and program development unusually challenging. Often the faculty need to look toward summer to work on projects outside of teaching and service.

25. Financial Resources:
(Please describe your operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends over a 3-5 year period.)

The Creative Writing program itself does not have an operational budget. Any funding for visiting writers or special activities must be requested on a case-by-case basis from the
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offices of the Humanities and Teacher Education Division, the Seaver Dean, the Provost, or the Center for Faith and Learning, with the majority of funds coming from the Division budget. Faculty pay and support comes from either the Division or the Seaver Dean.

Two specific funds that are for Seaver-wide programs but are allocated by the Creative Writing program Director and faculty are 1) the Expressionists magazine budget ($3,500 in the Division base budget, provided annually by the Seaver Dean), which pays for the publication of the undergraduate literary and arts magazine, along with several student open mic readings and a Gala event to celebrate the publication of the magazine and 2) the John Scott Douglas Scholarship in Creative Writing, which is an annual scholarship awarded through a competitive application process to any currently enrolled undergraduate student, with approximately 12-15 scholarships awarded each year and an annual (total) payout of approximately $55,000. The Creative Writing faculty and students are heavily involved in both Expressionists magazine (staff and contributors) and the Douglas Scholarship (as judges or awardees).
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About the Reviewer

Dr. Steve Heller is Professor & Chair of the Creative Writing Department in the Division of Graduate & Professional Programs at Antioch University Los Angeles, where he directs the following writing programs: MFA in Creative Writing, Post-MFA Certificate in the Teaching of Creative Writing, and inspiration2publication (an affordable extended education creative writing program staffed by trained graduates of the MFA program). The author of four published books and numerous stories and essays, as well as the recipient of many awards and distinctions for both writing and teaching, Dr. Heller is also past President of the Board of Directors of the Association of Writers & Writing Programs (AWP), the international professional organization for writers who teach. As Chair of AWP’s Professional Standards Committee, Dr. Heller wrote or consulted on most of the AWP hallmarks for effective creative writing programs documents, which as the BA in Creative Writing Program’s 5-Year Self-Study indicates, formed the basis for the establishment of BA in Creative Writing as a separate program at Pepperdine. Dr. Heller has participated in similar program reviews at the following institutions: the Northwest Association of Literary Arts (for DETC), the Northeast Ohio MFA in Creative Writing Program, an association of universities that includes Kent State, University of Akron, Cleveland State University, and Youngstown State University (for AWP), and the MFA in Creative Writing Program of Wilkes University (for MSA).

Documents & Evidence on Which This Report Is Based

In reviewing the BA in Creative Writing Program, the following documents and experiences were taken into consideration:

- Creative Writing Program 5-Year Review Report, 2015-16
- Pepperdine University External Review Summary Sheet
- AWP Hallmarks of an Effective BFA Program or BA Major in Creative Writing
- All Creative Writing Program course syllabi
- Creative Writing Faculty CVs
- Site Visit interviews with selected creative writing majors
- Site Visit interviews with selected creative writing faculty
- Site Visit observations of campus facilities, including classrooms, event forums, library facilities, Student Union, etc.
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Categorical Assessment

This report is organized according to the “Report Guidelines” section of the “Pepperdine University External Review Summary Sheet.” However, for a variety of reasons, the reviewer has moved “Curriculum” (listed as III in the “Report Guidelines) to the top of the list. The institutional goals enumerated under each Roman numeral category of the Report Guidelines are listed as questions.

I. Curriculum:

The Pepperdine BA in Creative Writing Program was designed by its founding Director of Creative Writing, John Struloeff. To bring both the major and minor in line standards in the discipline of creative writing studies, Dr. Struloeff examined the Pepperdine curricula in relation to “AWP Hallmarks of an Effective BFA Program or BA Major in Creative Writing,” which articulates standards and best practices in the field. He also examined curricula at highly regarded undergraduate creative writing programs across the nation. In 2007, creative writing studies were separated from the Division of Communications of Seaver College and established as a new Bachelor of Arts program within Seaver’s Division of Humanities & Teacher Education. A number of curricular changes, clearly described in the 5-Year Review Report (and therefore not repeated here) eventually resulted in the following requirements of 36 total units for the BA in Creative Writing (all courses are 4 units each):

Lower Division (200-level) Creative Writing Requirements:

- 4 units: Introduction to Creative Writing (CW) or Introduction to Screen & TV Writing

Upper Division (300-level) Required Courses:

- 12 units: Intermediate CW, Spiritual Writing (ENG), and Literary Study (ENG)

300-Level Options (English):

- 4 units: British Literature or American Literature or World Literature

400-Level Options (Creative Writing):

- 12 units, chosen from: CW for the Professional Market, Advanced Fiction Writing, Advanced Poetry Writing, Advanced Writing for Screen & TV, Topics in CW

400-Level Options (English):
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• 12 units, chosen from: Shakespeare, Topics in British Lit (pre-1800), Topics in American Lit, Anglophone Literature/Literatures in Translation, Topics in British Lit (post-1800), Topics in Multicultural American Literature

Evaluation of the BA in Creative Writing Curriculum:

1. Is the current curriculum content appropriate to the level and purpose of the program? (Answers in italics.)

   Overall, yes. As recommended by AWP, Pepperdine offers the following:

   • A minimum of three tiered workshops in their chosen genre: introductory workshops (CRWR 203 or 210), intermediate workshops (CRWR 303, ENG 301), and advanced workshops (CRWR 404, 405, 406, 410, and 440).
   • At least one craft-of-a-genre course in their chosen genre. Pepperdine offers no craft courses in specific genres, but craft issues are studied systematically in each workshop.
   • At least one tiered workshop in a supplementary genre (work in more than one genre is required). Work in three genres—fiction, poetry, and writing for screen and TV—are required.
   • Completion of a creative thesis or portfolio in the senior year. This hallmark is met indirectly by portfolios required in each of the three 400-level workshops.

2. Is the design of the curriculum adequate in terms of required depth and breadth of study, flow of courses, frequency of course offerings, overall coherence, and alignment with desired learning outcomes, enabling students to develop the skills and attain the outcomes required of graduates?

   Yes, for the most part. Breadth is achieved through the required study of three genres and the courses that support them. Greater breadth could be achieved through the opportunity to study creative nonfiction, the fastest-growing area of creative writing studies.

   Sufficient depth is achieved through the three-tiered workshop offerings. However, as noted in the 5-Year Report, identification of how to achieve and measure “proficiency” versus “mastery” in the second and third tiers of each genre needs more clarity. That is, how do individual instructors know when proficiency and mastery have been achieved? What are the criteria for each?

   High quality of instruction is borne out by examination of creative writing syllabi and interviews with both students and faculty. All creative writing courses are carefully designed and clearly in line with Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).

   Pepperdine’s BA in Creative Writing requires fewer required courses (9 versus 10-11) than its identified peer institutions, but also more required creative writing class hours (20 versus 7.5 to 15) than any of its identified peers. Pepperdine requires fewer literature
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courses for its CW BA (4 versus 5-7) than its peers, a reflection of the fact that Pepperdine’s BA in CW is a stand-alone program and not part of an English Department. The total number of hours required for the major is on the low side (36 versus 33 to 44). The three peers who require more hours for the major actually offer a BA in English with a Creative Writing Track. The only peer that offers a BA in Creative Writing, Valparaiso, actually requires the fewest number of hours for the major (5-Year Report, page 5).

3. Does the program clearly outline program requirements and offer courses regularly to ensure timely completion of the program?

Yes. Required courses are offered on a timely basis, allowing students to graduate on schedule. However, the campus-wide requirement of studying abroad or taking “excursions” during each student’s sophomore year has created some anomalies. For example, the CW advisor must recommend that students take 200-level creative writing requirements during their freshman rather than sophomore years. Students interviewed for this report complained of a lack of connection with their major during the travels that take place during their sophomore year. The academic connection between study abroad and one’s major seems to be a problem for ALL Pepperdine undergraduates, one deserving of further examination. Both CW faculty and students noted this disconnect.

4. Do you recommend any changes to enhance the curriculum (content, design, course availability, etc.)?

Yes. Based on both the popularity and potential professional benefits of the genre, I recommend adding the opportunity to the study creative nonfiction. Each of the students I interviewed expressed an interest in working in this genre. Two possible paths seem natural for this program.

Path One: Establish a requirement for BA in CW students of writing formal reflections during their excursions or study abroad experiences in their sophomore year. Precede this with some required reading—in either CRWR 203 or another course—to provide models of literary nonfiction writing based on travel.

Path Two: Make creative nonfiction regularly available as an optional genre, perhaps as part of CRWR 440 (Topics in Creative Writing), or through a 400-level course specifically devoted to travel writing.

II. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

The BA in Creative Writing Program has established the following program learning outcomes:

1) Demonstrate a moral, ethical, or spiritual consciousness in their own writing;
2) Think critically and communicate clearly in analyzing Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and screen/television writing;
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3) Demonstrate proficiency in writing each of Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and screen/television writing;

4) Demonstrate expertise in writing and analysis of at least one of Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and/or screen/television writing.

Program Learning Outcomes (Questions 1, 2, & 3):

1. Do the program student learning outcomes reflect the most important skills, knowledge, and values of the discipline/profession?

Yes. The above PLOs are appropriate and in line with AWP Hallmarks for “Rigorous & Diverse Curriculum,” which include the following:

- the existence of a program philosophy
- extensive study of literature
- a tiered course of study
- practice in more than one literary genre
- a capstone project
- consistent course offerings
- diversity in literary models
- an emphasis on revision
- grading, testing, and evaluation
- an introduction to vocational opportunities
- study of new media technologies.

The PLOs are also reasonably in line with the institutional learning objectives and historical mission of Pepperdine University (Five-Year Report, pages 2-3).

2. Do the criteria and standards of achievement for the program student learning outcomes adequately match disciplinary and professional standards?

Yes. Although the criteria for some of the standards (“proficiency” versus “expertise”; “development” versus “mastery”) are vague or unstated in the 5-Year Report, the use of a team of assessors employing detailed rubrics (used by other institutions or developed specifically to measure a unique PLO) reflects both the standards and best practices within the field of creative writing studies.

Of particular note is the creation of ENG 301, Spiritual Writing, to meet PLO #1: Demonstrate a moral, ethical, or spiritual consciousness in their own writing. This course, designed and taught by the CW Chair, manages to engage moral, ethical, and spiritual issues at the heart of the institution’s unique reason for being without making students feel awkward or out of place because of their personal beliefs. Unsurprisingly, assessors admitted difficulties in defining and measuring “moral, ethical, or spiritual consciousness” (5-Year Review, page 10). It seems clear that the work of all ENG 310 students does engage questions and issues relevant to this PLO but with varying complexity.

In relation to PLO #2 (thinking and communicating critically in analyzing fiction, poetry, and screen/TV writing), analyses of short stories were randomly selected from CRWR 303 (Intermediate Creative Writing) and rated. The goal of this course was to “develop” (as
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opposed to “master”) skills of critical analysis of fiction (5-Year Report, page 9). “Reviewers expected that 85% would have average at least 3 (out of 5), which would be a rating of “adequate.” Since 92% of student work achieved this rating, the evidence suggests that Pepperdine students are indeed “developing” the intended skills.

PLO #3: Demonstrate proficiency in writing each of Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and screen/TV writing. To measure achievement of this PLO, six final portfolios of creative work were collected from CRWR 303 (an intermediate multi-genre course). Five of the six portfolios were rated as “proficient” by assessors, based on an assessment rubric employed by Loyola Marymount (a peer institution and program). While the proficiency rate (83%) of randomly selected portfolios is impressive, assessing all portfolios of this relatively small class would have been even more revealing. An independent examination of selected student portfolios for the same course for this report confirmed the level of achievement but raised the same question.

PLO #4: Demonstrate expertise in writing and analysis of at least one of Pepperdine’s primary genres of creative writing: poetry, fiction, and/or screen/TV writing. To assess this PLO, assessors examined 10 randomly selected final portfolios from CRWR 405: Advanced Fiction Writing (5-Year Report, page 11). Assessors used an adaptation of the Loyola Marymount rubric, anticipating that 75% of the portfolios would achieve an average of 4 out of 5 on the rating scale. Instead, 90% achieved this rating—solid evidence that students were achieving, if not “expertise,” the level of achievement expectedly by the publishing, teaching writers who served as assessors.

3. Based on student work samples and annual learning results report, is student achievement of the program student learning outcomes adequate for the degree and the discipline?

Yes, with one caveat. As the 5-Year Report (page 11) notes, “The one potential weakness that came up several times was a lack of a clear learning alignment (or planned trajectory) through the three tiers of the program (Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced). The assessors could not yet determine, however, if such a planned trajectory was pedagogically viable because of the importance of aesthetic and pedagogical variation among faculty (so that the students will not experience a single “model” of creative writing. One approach being considered is to outline a more general trajectory, which would allow for pedagogical variation while at the same time giving students a sense of movement and growth as they pass through the three courses.”

Fear of developing a “cookie cutter” one-approach-fits-all method of teaching creative writing is shared by the faculty of most creative writing programs. The evidence reviewed for this report suggests that one potentially promising approach for CW faculty at Pepperdine would be to examine the syllabi for each sequence of CW workshops with an eye toward increasing in each tier the complexity of students’ engagement as readers, critics, and writers in each tier of the same genre. The term “complexity” should not be taken to suggest mere density of language. For example, a student writer might show significant growth as a literary artist through a prose fiction style that is progressively less ornate and more direct and spare, ala Hemingway or Chekov. Increased fluency of style (and greater complexity of expression and implication) can be achieved even with minimalist prose or verse.
Creative Writing

Focusing on complexity in examining course syllabi should allow a more precise assessment rubric to emerge, one that reflects the increased knowledge and experience students bring to each successive tier, as well as the greater challenges they face as their stories and poems become increasingly ambitious.

Based on the evidence reviewed, including samples of student work, CW faculty should feel confident that program learning outcomes are appropriate and that student achievement does in fact represent “a strong overall performance” (5-Year Report, page 11).

III. Assessment:

1. Is the assessment plan appropriate, and are the assessment practices yielding the needed information to determine how well and to what degree students are learning the program student learning outcomes?

   Yes, but both could be improved. For suggestions, see #3 under Program Learning Outcomes.

2. What changes are recommended to enhance student achievement or program assessment of the PLOs?

   The primary challenge in terms of assessment should be to develop a more precise performance rubric with language that all CW faculty can accept. The goal should be to create a rubric whose terms reflect greater knowledge and complexity of performance by students at each tier of the program. Again, see #3 under Program Learning Outcomes.

   Given the size of the required classes (a dozen or so students), it should be possible to assess the entire population of selected introductory, intermediate, and advanced classes, rather than a sample.

IV. Student Experiences and Learning Environment:

1. Are students satisfied with the overall quality of their learning experience?

   Yes. Based on both statistical (5-Year Report, page 7) and anecdotal (scheduled interviews with students) information gathered and reviewed for this report, both students and alumni are very satisfied overall with the quality of their learning experience in the BA in Creative Writing Program. Based on a 5 point scale (with 5 being highest, 1 lowest), the average overall score for both teacher effectiveness and course effectiveness for the last five academic years (5-Year Report, page 7) are nearly identical: 4.32 for teaching effectiveness and 4.28 for course effectiveness. These are high scores, equivalent to those of well-regarded creative writing programs this reviewer has served as external reviewer.

   Interviews with a total of seven Creative Writing majors identified the following strengths in their learning experience: the faculty, the nature and content of the creative writing workshops, the sequence of courses (the “tiered” workshops, though none of them used that academic term), and the opportunity to study abroad.
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Students expressed a desire for a greater variety of creative writing courses, especially creative nonfiction. Also desirable would be more innovative, genre-bending courses such as performance poetry or song. Comments: “The program seems a little too small; there aren’t enough classes.” “A lot of us are interested in creative nonfiction, but we rarely get to write it.”

2. Are students adequately supported through the curriculum and advising to ensure their learning success?

Student comments indicated room for improvement in this area. They would like to see at least one course in creative nonfiction, plus the opportunity to study less traditional genres.

Students expressed surprise when they figured out that they all have the same advisor (the program director). None had issues with the advisor but a few worried about a lack of options.

3. Are class size levels appropriate to enable student learning?

Yes. Over the past five years, average enrollment in creative writing classes has ranged from 9.83 to 15.6, for an average enrollment over that span of 12.39 (5-Year Report, page 7). AWP recommends small classes of “12-18 students in intermediate and advanced classes, with a maximum of 15 students in advanced workshop classes (optimum workshop class size: 12 students” (AWP Hallmarks, page 5). The size of Pepperdine’s creative writing classes are generally appropriate.

4. Does the program provide adequate opportunities for co-curricular programs such as internships, field experiences, and undergraduate research, as appropriate?

Yes, but these can be improved. As described under #3 and #4 of “Curriculum,” the study abroad option leaves many students feeling disconnected from their major for an entire year. A way needs to be found to make creative writing a part of each CW major’s sophomore year.

As for co-curricular activities directly associated with the Creative Writing Program, students expressed strong support for these, but believe they are vastly under-publicized, even among the creative writing majors. For example, some students did not yet know of the existence of the student literary magazine, Expressionists. Others did not know that there is a visiting writers series—and all were surprised at the number of well-known writers who have visited campus.

One clear issue is the lack of an established budget for the visiting writers series. Because the money for the series has to be raised annually, involving several departments, planning and publicity correspondingly suffer. This reviewer strongly recommends establishing a annual budget, administered by the appropriate dean, to fund the visiting writers series to benefit a variety of programs within Seaver College. Greater support and marketing of the reading series and student literary magazine should have a positive effect on enrollment in the major.

5. Are student support services adequate?
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Yes, though the Study Abroad Office could clearly work in closer cooperation with academic programs to bring academic relevance to that program.

6. Do you recommend any changes to improve student experience and learning environment?

Study Abroad: See #3 and #4 under “Curriculum”
Visiting Writers Series: See #4 under this section.
Creative nonfiction: See #4 under “Curriculum”

V. Faculty Quality:

1. Are faculty competencies & credentials appropriate for the discipline and the degree?

Yes. AWP recommends “accomplished writers who teach well.” By this the organization means “a faculty of published writers who have distinguished themselves as teachers and artists . . . Each faculty member has published at least one book by a respected press, and that book is in the genre that the faculty member teaches. Each faculty member holds an MFA degree in creative writing or a level of literary book publication that serves as an equivalent for the degree.”

For faculty who teach writing for screen & television, the equivalent of “literary book publication” would be scripts that haven been written and actually produced.

A review of Pepperdine CW faculty CVs revealed that all but one of the seven faculty who teach creative writing have achieved the equivalent of at least one published book—and the one who does not have this equivalent is a composition, rhetoric, and pedagogy specialist who is especially valuable to the program in achieving program learning outcomes related to critical reading and thinking. All CW faculty hold appropriate degrees or the equivalent.

The BA program has only one core faculty member, program director John Struloeff, whose credentials and experience are commensurate with the leadership position he holds. Leslie Kreiner, who teaches the introductory workshops in both creative writing and screen writing, as well as Creative Writing for the Professional Market, actually directs the MFA in Writing Screen and Television. The remaining faculty serve, in effect, as adjuncts in the Creative Writing Program.

2. Do faculty specialties correspond to program needs and to the concentrations in which they teach?

Yes. Faculty CVs reveal a rich level of achievement, including publication, in the areas in which the creative writing faculty teach. For an undergraduate-only program, the creative writing faculty at Pepperdine is unusually distinguished.

3. Does the system for evaluating teaching practices facilitate continuous improvement of teaching learning throughout the program.

Probably. Students evaluate each course as well as the instructor who teaches it. During the 5-year review process, the program did a very good job in examining curriculum and faculty performance. However, part-time faculty are not subjected to the same evaluative
4. Are faculty adequately supported and engaged in ongoing professional development necessary for staying current in their field and continuously updating their courses and curriculum?

Unlikely. While the professional development opportunities and resources listed on the 5-Year Report (page 17) are substantial, there is no indication that these benefits are available to visiting or part-time faculty (who make up the bulk of the CW faculty) as well as tenured/tenure-line faculty. For example, are all CW faculty guaranteed $1,000 in travel funds annually? The likely number of core faculty from other programs competing for various funds is not given.

More important, the teaching load at Pepperdine is higher than all of its 12 listed peer institutions (20-24 hours for tenure line and 26-32 for visiting faculty), and 25% of each faculty’s time is supposed to be devoted to service (that figure likely applies to tenured/tenure line faculty only (perhaps visiting as well), which reveals a significant problem for the program director, who, as the only core faculty member whose primary assignment is in the CW program, is likely asked to be asked to perform an inordinate amount of service, regardless of the percentage of his time it requires. “Often the faculty need to look toward summer to work on projects outside of teaching and service” (5-Year Report, page 17). This is not a scenario that encourages retaining a program’s most productive creative writing faculty, whose pressure to publish exceeds that of most faculty in the humanities.

5. Do you recommend faculty changes (qualifications, expertise, teaching practices, professional development, etc.) to enhance program quality and student learning?

Definitely. To improve program quality and enhance student learning, the BA in Creative Writing Program needs to add tenure-line faculty and not rely so heavily on adjuncts or part-timers who teach primarily in other programs. Greater (actually, any) staff support is also recommended. Having only one core faculty member who has to run every aspect of the program actually puts the program at risk. If the current director were to leave, the program would be left with insufficient institutional memory of how things operate. There is also a serious risk of professional burnout.

A degree of growth (the precise amount of which is beyond the scope of this review) will likely be required to add tenure-line faculty and support staff. A catch-22 has developed. If, for example, a total enrollment of 50 majors is required to support another tenure-line faculty member and at least a part-time staff member, how is the program to achieve this growth without first adding both faculty and staff? A temporary investment in additional visiting faculty (with more service duties) and a part-time staff could be part of a strategic plan to increase enrollment by first increasing the prominence of the BA in Creative Writing Program. This could be achieved by investing, as previously recommended, in the Visiting Writers Series, which could positively affect enrollment in other humanities programs as well. Finding a way to tie the campus literary magazine, Expressionists, to the Visiting Writers Program and the strategic enrollment growth plan would also be advisable. For example, each visiting writer’s contractual obligation could include being interviewed by an editor of Expressionists. Interviews could also be taped or conducted.
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live on the campus radio station. A video library of readings and literary events could be established. Etc.

VI. Diversity:

1. Does the program demonstrate a commitment to diversity in its curriculum and student and faculty composition?

Yes. Diversity is supported in the curriculum through two courses: ENG 436, Topics in Multicultural American Literature, and ENG 370 World Literature. The campus-wide opportunity to study abroad might provide a further investment in diversity, but no clear curricular connection exists at present.

2. Do you recommend changes to the commitment to diversity?

Yes, the Creative Writing Department could increase diversity by placing a greater emphasis on diversity of voices in workshops dealing with the craft of prose and verse. Such courses could stress how to become a fluent listener in voices that are not the writer’s own. Literary texts by diverse authors can of course be employed for the same purpose.

VII. Program Administration Support:

1. Are the library and student support resources current and adequate to meet student and faculty needs?

Yes. Payson Library is a modern facility with a strong support staff that appears to function efficiently in serving student needs.

2. Are laboratory facilities and support adequate to meet student and faculty needs?

Yes. In terms of facilities, what any creative writing program needs is a sufficient number of small classrooms with a single large table, or at least flexible seating, that create conditions conducive to the sorts of intimate discussions that are necessary for successful workshop experiences. During my two day visit I was shown a number of spaces where classes and literary events take place. All were appropriate. The event spaces in Payson Library, particularly “The Board Room,” were especially impressive.

3. Has the program accurately identified and prioritized the program’s most pressing resource needs?

Yes. Page 16 of the 5-Year Report contains this sentence: “Based on a review of Pepperdine’s peer institutions and other strong Creative Writing programs around the country, it is clear that our Creative Writing Program’s faculty allocation is far too low.” This statement accurately describes the position of the Pepperdine BA in Creative Writing Program in relation to its most relevant peers: Valparaiso University, Macalester College, University of Southern California, and Loyola Marymount University—especially in terms of core (tenured or tenure-line) faculty whose primary teaching assignment is in creative writing. For example, Macalester College currently lists four full-time tenured or tenure-line faculty, plus one full-time visiting faculty. To grow Pepperdine’s BA in Creative Writing program beyond its current enrollment of 35-40 students will require investment in
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more faculty with the full responsibilities of tenure-line appointments. As an interim step to facilitate growth, one or two visiting faculty positions with the potential to become tenure-line could be created and advertised with the expectation that the new faculty member(s) will participate fully in campus life and in efforts to grow enrollment.

4. Are the program’s student recruitment and retention processes adequate?

These could be improved, but not substantially without adding faculty. Retention rates, as reported on page 9 of the 5-year Report, compare favorably with those of other undergraduate creative writing programs at private schools. Finding ways to connect creative writing to travel experiences in students’ sophomore year would likely impact recruitment, if this connection could be included in strategies specifically designed to market the MFA program. During my visit and in all materials reviewed, I did not see evidence of a specific marketing plan for the BA in Creative Writing Program, other than utilization of the website. Creative writing could become more prominent in terms of marketing—without little or no increase in cost—simply by creating an annual budget line for the Visiting Writers Series and rotating that series into recruitment cycle marketing plans. Otherwise, without the ability to identify and thus publicize upcoming visitors during recruitment cycles, the Visiting Writers Series can be helpful with retention but not nearly so much with recruitment.

5. Is overall program administration efficient, effective, meeting professional standards?

The BA in Creative Writing Program has received strong and effective leadership from its Chair, John Struloeff. The program is well-conceived, well-organized, and well-run, especially considering the fact that Dr. Struloeff administers the program with the assistance of faculty whose primary assignments are in other programs, or who are adjuncts. Staff support seems minimal, with the Chair performing almost all “secretarial” duties required to operate the program. This is the case for most, if not all programs in Seaver College, but in the case of a one-person operation, the challenge is greater. Fortunately, Pepperdine does provide Dr. Struloeff with sabbatical and release time, but with no other faculty dedicated exclusively to the BA in CW program, any leave taken by Dr. Struloeff presents a challenge to the program’s smooth operation. The program exhibits diligent quality control, good relations with other programs, and participation in professional networks, all among AWP’s hallmarks of “Strong Administrative Support” (AWP Hallmarks, pages 6 & 7). Participation in professional networks by both faculty and students would undoubtedly increase with the addition of more tenure-line faculty.

6. Do you recommend any changes to strengthen the program’s current administration, support, and resources (including possible reallocations of resources from current program operations to fund new budgetary needs)?

The BA in Creative Writing Program does not appear to have any internal resources that could be reallocated to strengthen areas of need. Additional resources must therefore come from either Seaver College or from external sources, such as donor gifts or grants from foundations and organizations such as the National Endowment for the Arts, CCLMP, etc.

Additional resource needs discussed above are revisited under item #4 under “Overall Program Summary.”
VIII. Proposed Changes:

1. Are the changes proposed in the 5-Year Report responsive to the program’s most important needs?

   Yes. Proposed changes based on need are sprinkled throughout the 5-Year Report rather than concentrated in a particular section. This review will suggest a prioritized list under item #2 of “Overall Program Summary.” In the meantime, the most significant recommended changes in this review that are not reflected in the 5-Year Report are:

   - A goal of increasing enrollment from 35-40 to 50 total BA in CW students
   - A goal to include other genres of creative writing, particularly creative nonfiction
   - A goal to clearly connect the BA in Creative Writing Major with the sophomore year of study abroad

2. Does the program make use of assessment results, institutional research data, and other information obtained from students/alumni/employers as the basis of its proposed improvements?

   Yes, as noted throughout this document, the 5-Year Report is based on documentation and assessment of evidence, thorough analysis, and reference to both peer institutions and the AWP Hallmarks of an Effective BA Major in Creative Writing.

3. Do you recommend any changes to the program’s proposed changes?

   Yes. These are listed and described under “Suggested BA in Creative Writing Program Goals for 2016-2020,” pages 19-20 of “IX. Overall Program Summary.”

IX. Overall Program Summary:

1. What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the program?

   Strengths:

   - Strong Administrative Leadership (AWP Hallmarks, page 5): The BA program’s founding director, John Struloeff, has produced and administered an excellent program through careful design, informed examination of peer programs at other institutions, a serious attempt to adhere to the AWP Hallmarks of an Effective BA Major in Creative Writing, honest assessment of program learning outcomes, and exemplary collaboration with colleagues, both inside the program and with other academic programs within Seaver College. Evidence of all these things are found in every section of the 5-Year Report, as well as in interviews with faculty, students, and the Dean.

   - A rigorous and diverse curriculum: As outlined in the same-named section of the AWP Hallmarks (page 3), the BA program features a three-tiered (introductory, intermediate, advanced) workshop structure. While lacking craft courses dedicated
Creative Writing

to single genres, craft is taught systematically in each tiered workshop, as confirmed in the 5-Year Report and interviews with faculty and students. The BA program’s intermediate course in Spiritual Writing is mission-consistent and nearly unique—and speaks “program philosophy,” an “overarching set of values, beliefs, and pedagogy” that reflect best practices (AWP Hallmarks, page 2). Creative Writing students also have the opportunity to take useful literature courses through the BA Program in English. Some diversity is achieved through individual course requirements, especially in English 436: Topics in Multi-Cultural American Literature (5-Year Report, page 4).

- Accomplished faculty who teach well (AWP Hallmarks, page 4): All faculty who teach in the program are accomplished, publishing writers (5-Year Report, pages 14-15) who also receive relatively high overall teaching evaluations (5-Year Report, page 7) from their students.
- Accomplished visiting writers (AWP Hallmarks, page 5): The list of names of writers who have visited the campus (5-Year Report, page 8) is impressive for any program.
- A student literary magazine (AWP Hallmarks, page 5): Expressionists is impressive for an undergraduate journal.
- Student readings (AWP Hallmarks, page 4): The spaces for readings (particularly “the Board Room”) create an atmosphere appropriate to a program devoted to the literary arts.
- Good departmental relations (AWP Hallmarks, page 6): The BA in Creative Writing Program obviously maintains a robust and collegial relationship with the larger BA in English Program, without which the BA Program simply could not deliver its curriculum to students. Collegial relationships were confirmed by everyone I spoke with on campus.
- Diligent Quality Control (AWP Hallmarks, page 7): The 5-Year Report (numerous pages) makes clear the program’s commitment to its program student learning outcomes, including measurement, analytical assessment, and “closing the loop.”
- Small classes (AWP Hallmarks, page 5): With a few exceptions, most Pepperdine creative writing classes include 10-15 students, which is within AWP’s ideal range for undergraduate creative writing.
- A high graduation rate (AWP Hallmarks, page 6): “A high percentage of matriculated students graduate from the program, and small number drop out or transfer to other programs.” (Confirmed by 5-Year Report, page 9).

Weaknesses (challenges and areas that could be improved):

- Number of tenured/tenure-line faculty whose primary assignment is teaching creative writing in the BA in Creative Writing Program. Chair John Struloeff is the only full-time faculty who fits this description. This limits program functionality (especially in the area of advising) and growth potential.
- The range of literary genres regularly taught in the CW program. The program currently requires proficiency in three genres (fiction, poetry, and screenwriting) and offers little opportunity to study the fastest-growing genre in the field, creative nonfiction. Interviews with students confirmed a strong interest in studying CNF as well as other less established literary genres such as short-short prose forms, songs, and genre-bending writing such as performance poetry (including spoken
Students reported being disengaged from their major during their sophomore year during study abroad. They would like a stronger connection between this important co-curricular experience and their chosen major.

No established annual budget for the Visiting Writers Series. This series could have a much bigger impact on a variety of academic programs at Seaver College if an annual budget is established. Long term planning and promotion/marketing activities can be better coordinated if names and dates of visiting writers were established well in advance.

Lack of a clear learning alignment (or planned trajectory) through the three tiers of the program (Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced). 5-Year Report, pages 9-10.

Staff support for the Chair of the BA in Creative Writing Program. In Seaver College, program chairs must share staff support. In the case of the BA in CW, this leaves most of the secretarial work to the Chair. While this system appears to work smoothly across programs, it probably lessens opportunities for growth, especially in those with fewer tenured/tenure-line faculty, as the Chair and other faculty must give up writing and research time to organize and publicize co-curricular events and to perform other necessary service duties. New initiatives are less likely when faculty struggle to find time to do their own work.

2. What goals do you suggest the program set for the next five years, in order of priority, and how do these comport with those identified in the self-study? In your formal report, please identify and cite the evidence that supports your answer.

Note: Supporting evidence for the suggested priorities listed below are listed and discussed under relevant sections of the body of this review.

Suggested BA in Creative Writing Program Goals for 2016-2020:

1. Increase the number of creative writing majors from its current range of 35-40 to 50.

2. In support of goal #1, expand the creative writing curriculum to include additional genres, particularly creative nonfiction, for which there is a clear demand expressed by current students. (Specific strategies below.)

3. In support of goals #1 & #2, increase the number of full-time tenured/tenure-line creative writing faculty from one to at least two. (Specific strategy below.)

4. In support of goal #1, create an annual budget for Pepperdine’s Visiting Writers Series, thus allowing improved planning and publicity during recruitment cycles. (Specific strategy below.)

5. In support of goals #1 and #2, work with University administration and the Office of International Programs to create an appealing academic connection between the creative writing major and international travel and other co-curricular activities that all Pepperdine students undertake during their sophomore year. (Specific strategies below.)
6. Establish a clear learning alignment (or planned trajectory) through the three tiers of the program (Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced) along the lines of increasing complexity of student creative work and critical reading and response.

7. In support of goal #1, create opportunities—through release time and other incentives—for creative writing faculty to visit high schools and recruitment fairs, bringing with them student and alumni representatives, creative writing and visiting writer brochures, and the Pepperdine literary journal, Expressionists. Faculty are the most effective participants in recruiting activities.

8. In support of goal #1 and growth beyond the BA in CW, begin long range planning for a possible graduate degree in creative writing—or a creative writing track or option within the existing MFA in Writing for Screen and Television.

3. What are the most realistic and important strategies the program can employ to achieve the highest priority goals?

Strategies to Achieve Goals 1 through 5 above:

1. In relation to goal #1 (increase the number of majors to 50), each of the strategies listed below serves this goal, directly or indirectly.

2. In relation to goal #2 (expand the number of creative writing genres taught, especially including creative nonfiction), one possibility is to continue to require that students study three different genres but allow them to pick three genres from a list of four: poetry, fiction, screenwriting, and creative nonfiction (and adding appropriate intermediate and advanced workshops in creative nonfiction). If this strategy is employed, consider requiring all creative writing students to take intermediate poetry writing, as, based on national trends, this genre is the most likely to under-enroll. Another strategy to bolster creative nonfiction as a genre is described below, under the strategy in support of goal #5.

3. In relation to goal #3 (increase tenured/tenure-line faculty from 1 to 2), the main question is how to solve the chicken versus egg question: Which comes first, additional faculty or increased enrollment? The suggested answer is neither. The BA and CW Program currently supports a full-time Visiting Assistant Professor of Creative Writing position. I suggest combining two or more adjunct positions to create a second (temporary) visiting faculty position, with the ultimate intention of transforming one of the two visiting faculty positions into a second full-time tenure-line position as soon as the total enrollment target of 50 is reached. The second visiting position should facilitate the addition of creative nonfiction to the list of genres taught. Both visiting positions should include recruiting activities in their job descriptions. When the second tenure-line position is added the CW Program would have three full-time positions: one tenured (the Chair), one tenure-line, and one visiting position. This line-up, plus the remaining adjuncts and faculty from other programs, will position the Creative Writing Program for further growth.

4. In support of goal #4 (create a budget for the annual visiting writers series), the best strategy would be to locate this budget in the Dean’s office, since the series serves the students of several programs within Seaver College. I recommend forming a Visiting
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Writers Series Committee consisting of representatives from all programs served by the series. I further recommend making the Chair of the Creative Writing Program the chair of this committee (if that causes political problems, the chair position could rotate among programs). The committee could consist of both faculty and student representatives. The student reps should be in their junior year, so that they are A) on campus during the planning stage, and B) still enrolled at the time the invited writers visit Pepperdine. All of this could be accomplished without increasing the budget (although Seaver College may wish to invest in further publicity for the series for purposes of recruitment).

5. In support of goal #5 (create an academic connection between the creative writing major and study abroad undertaken during the sophomore year), as well as goal #1 (increased CW enrollment), there are numerous possibilities. Some of these relate only to the Creative Writing Program, but others could serve all Pepperdine students. I’ll give only one example here: All Pepperdine undergraduates are required to submit a writing portfolio; however, many students who are not in the humanities will have had few writing courses. Working with University administration and the Office of Studies Abroad, the Creative Writing Program could propose that all Pepperdine students keep a log or journal during their study abroad, and that a course be created, required or at least an option for all students, taught by the Creative Writing and/or English Program, that teaches them how to write memoir, travel essays, and other forms of creative nonfiction. This course could have a section especially for Creative Writing and English majors. Other students would take this course to beef up their General Education Writing Portfolio requirement. Connecting study abroad with reflective writing will undoubtedly increase demand for creative nonfiction courses in general and the creative writing major as well.

6. In support of goal #6 (establish a clear learning alignment or planned trajectory through the three tiers of the program), an examination of syllabi for introductory, intermediate, and advanced creative writing workshops should reveal areas where program student learning goals, course content, and instruction can be altered to facilitate student learning along the lines of increasing complexity of student creative work, critical reading, and critical responses. Although as important as priorities listed higher in the category, no additional resources should be required to achieve this goal.

4. What goals would require additional resources? What level of resources would these goals require? How might the program secure these resources?

Additional resources required for goals 1 through 5:

1. Goal #1: The likely resources required to increase enrollment to 50 students are discussed under the other goals, both above and below.

2. Goal #2: Although it is possible to add creative nonfiction to the BA in Creative Writing Curriculum without additional resources, it is not possible to do this AND increase enrollment as a result. The current faculty’s available time and energy are already stretched too thin. The strategy of using a second visiting position to gradually increase enrollment enough to justify converting one of the two positions to tenure-line is probably the most economical way to achieve the needed 25 to 27% growth to reach the target of 50 enrolled students.
3. **Goal #3:** Ditto goal #2.

4. **Goal #4:** As mentioned earlier, creating an annual budget for the Visiting Writers Series might not increase the cost of the series above what is currently spent, except in terms of promotional materials and activities related to marketing (see goals #7 and #8). The key is will be to gain support (or resources) from each stakeholder program, and to make sure that the series benefits all. The current Chair of the BA in Creative Writing Program seems a perfect choice to coordinate collaboration among programs in the arts and humanities.

5. **Goal #5:** The collaboration necessary to generate sufficient resources to academically connect the creative writing major with sophomore study abroad can be accomplished on either a small (just for CW majors) or large (connecting the writing portfolio required of all undergraduates to study abroad) scale. If students in other programs, especially those in the sciences, feel the same disconnect between their majors and their study abroad semester, requiring a travel log or journal that can provide the basis for later reflective writing (perhaps through an optional class), the investment in expanding the BA in CW curriculum and tenure-line faculty could have a positive impact on the entire Pepperdine undergraduate student body. The resources required to achieve the larger scale impact might actually be easier to accumulate, as faculty and administrators are likely to get behind a relatively inexpensive solution to what appears to be a chronic problem affecting many programs and departments.
Quality Improvement Plan

Based on the results of both the internal and external program reviews of the Creative Writing program, here is an outline of the program quality improvement plan:

1) Secure a tenure-track appointment in Creative Writing to address the significant lack of depth in the core permanent faculty for the major. All other peer institutions have a much larger number of core permanent faculty to support their Creative Writing programs. This lack of depth not only weakens the potential for growth in the major, but limits the program’s basic functionality. The appointment will likely be in fiction writing.

2) Secure permanent funding for a Visiting Writers Series, enough to fund four or five guest authors each year for readings, lectures, and classroom visits. This will put Pepperdine’s program in line with peer institutions.

3) Formulate a clear alignment among the three tiers within the core of the Creative Writing program. Currently there are Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced courses, to be taken in sequence, but there is no prescribed alignment of learning objectives. This alignment will need to allow for pedagogical and aesthetic freedom, which are forms of classroom diversity that are important to growth in a student writer.

4) Create a distinct track for Screenwriting within the Creative Writing major, in order to address the unique demand for this genre among the student population (Creative Writing, Film Studies, and elsewhere).

5) Investigate the feasibility of including Creative Nonfiction as a fourth genre within the major. This may take the form of a single elective course.

6) Investigate the feasibility of developing a study-abroad opportunity for the Creative Writing majors to address their sense of a “lost year” with regard to their major courses while in Pepperdine’s International Programs.

7) Investigate the feasibility of increasing staff support for the program.

8) Begin long range planning for a possible graduate degree in Creative Writing – or a Creative Writing track or option within the existing MFA in Writing for Screen and Television.
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Part I
Program Leaning Outcomes and Assessment
Our outcomes are consistent with best practices described in the Report of the Association for Departments of English ad hoc Committee on Assessment published by the Modern Language Association (our discipline’s major professional association).

I. A student who graduates with a major in English should be able to:

PLO #1 Critique and interpret English and American literary texts, including those with ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity

PLO #2 Communicate an understanding of rhetorical, composition, or literary theory and integrate that understanding in papers that reflect best practices in English

PLO #3 Employ sophisticated critical thinking, research, discussion, and presentation skills.

PLO #4 Demonstrate the skill to engage a text from a spiritual, moral and ethical perspective.

Alignment of PLOs with Institutional Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>PLO #1</th>
<th>PLO #2</th>
<th>PLO #3</th>
<th>PLO #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILO #1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that values diversity.

ILO #4
Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.

ILO #5
Respond to the call to serve others.

ILO #6
Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.

ILO #7
Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.

ILO #8
Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.

ILO #9
Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.

Comment: Based on evidence from the annual reports since our last five-year program review, we concluded that obtaining clear evidence with regard to both diversity and spiritual/ethical perspective presents a challenge. We concluded that we should create a new PLO that places diversity in PLO 4. Similarly, the question of theory posed a problem, and we propose that, throughout the program, the emphasis needs to be on being able to recognize and incorporate theoretical interpretation rather than simply using a theoretical approach in the senior seminar. We did some preliminary work with this in our assessment workshop, but the formal language for revised PLOs is yet to be determined.

Curriculum

The English Major has three tracks--Literature, Writing and Rhetoric, and English Education—and for all tracks the course requirements are scaffolded. All three tracks require English 215, which is an introduction to the critical reading and writing methodologies for English studies. They also require an intermediate course, English 390, which provides a foundation in critical theory. All three tracks require that students take English 436, the literature of diversity. And all three culminate in a capstone senior seminar, English 490, which is taken in the spring of the senior year.

Emphasis in Literature (10 courses)
The literature emphasis in the English major is designed for students who wish to pursue a career in teaching high school, to complete a graduate degree in English, to prepare for law school, or to prepare for any career requiring analytical, research, or writing skills.

ENG 101, English Composition (Prerequisite for all 300- and 400-level ENG courses
English
ENG 215, Introduction to English Studies
ENG 325, British Literature
ENG 326, American Literature
ENG 390, Literary Theory
ENG 426, Topics in American Literature
ENG 435, Topics in British Literature (post-1800)
ENG 436, Topics in Multicultural American Literature

Choose either ENG 420, Shakespeare or ENG 425, Topics in British Literature (pre-1800)
ENG 490, Senior Seminar

Emphasis in Writing and Rhetoric (12 courses)

This emphasis is designed for students who wish to pursue careers in publishing or other writing-intensive fields, attend law school, or complete a graduate degree in rhetoric or composition.

ENG 101, English Composition (Prerequisite for all 300- and 400-level ENG courses
ENG 215, Introduction to English Studies
ENG 305, Style and Editing
ENG 306, Advanced Composition and ENG 395, Writing Center Practicum (taken together)

Required Upper-Division Courses (24 units):
ENG 390, Literary Theory
ENG 490, Senior Seminar
ENG 402, Rhetoric for Writers
ENG 450, Topics in Rhetoric
One 400-level American Literature course
One 400-level British Literature course
Choose either ENG 405, Topics in Professional Writing or ENG 460 Principles of Writing with Technology
ENG 490, Senior Seminar

Education Emphasis and Secondary Teaching Credential
The education emphasis is designed for students who wish to teach in middle school or high school. Students should confer with the English education advisor for specific guidance in choosing and scheduling courses in English. By attending summer sessions, students can graduate in four years with a bachelor’s degree in English and a California Teaching Credential in English. They can fulfill their credential requirements in English and take the required 34 units in education as part of their undergraduate elective courses. Graduates of the English Education Program will be certified to teach English at the secondary level in California. This is an integrated program; students work on their BA in English as well as teacher certification simultaneously. Since this is a subject matter-approved program, students do not need to take the CSET. This certification also includes the areas of creative writing, speech, journalism, and drama; students who wish to specialize in one of these fields are encouraged to take additional courses in these areas.

General Education Requirements (10 courses)
English
COM 180, Public Speaking and Rhetorical Analysis
ENG 101, English Composition
HUM 111, 212, 313, Western Culture
THEA 200, Theatre Appreciation, or THEA 201, Introduction to Theatre Research, or THEA 210, Acting I: Introduction to Acting
Other Required Courses
ENG 215, English Studies
ENG 300, Language Theory
ENG 306, Advanced Composition
ENG 325, British Literature
ENG 326, American Literature
ENG 390, Literary
ENG 420, Shakespeare
One 400-level British literature course
ENG 400, Senior Seminar
ENG 436, Topics in Multicultural American Literature

Minor in Writing
This minor reflects the growing need for students to demonstrate a facility in the written word. The writing minor is designed for students who wish to pursue careers in any professional field such as business, publishing, editing, or library science. It is also ideal for students who wish to attend law school, complete a graduate degree in any discipline, or add this component of expertise to their major program of study.
Required Courses (24-26 Units):
ENG 215, English Studies
ENG 305, Style and Editing
ENG 306, Advanced Composition
ENG 402, Rhetoric for Writers
ENG 405, Topics in Professional Writing
ENG 495, English Internship.
Choose either ENG 450, Topics in Rhetoric or Literary Theory, or ENG 460, Principles of Writing with Technology

Honors Program in English
English majors who have completed ENG 215, Introduction to English Studies, and wish to write an honors thesis may apply to the English Honors Committee in the spring semester of their junior year. Successful applicants are approved based on GPA, a recommendation from the ENG 215 instructor, and a demonstrated potential for successful completion of the honors thesis. In the fall semester of their senior year, students will work with a faculty advisor to develop a research proposal, which must be approved by the English Honors Committee by the end of the fall semester. The proposal should include a bibliography of relevant material (primary and secondary) as well as an abstract of the project. Students should work closely with their faculty mentor on the thesis. During the spring of their senior year, honors students will enroll in ENG 490 (an existing course that also includes non-honors students) and write an article-length thesis. The thesis will be submitted in April of the students’ senior year to their thesis advisor and to the English Honors Committee, who will determine whether honors will be awarded. Students are encouraged to
present their research at local and national meetings and/or submit a revised article-length manuscript to a scholarly journal for publication. Students on whom the committee has conferred Honors on the basis of their theses will graduate with the notation “Honors in English” on their transcripts and diplomas.

Discussion: We compared our curriculum to six peer-institutions—three that included a writing emphasis (Calvin College, Valparaiso, and San Diego State University) and three that did not (Occidental, Macalester College, and Southern Methodist University). Pepperdine’s emphasis on Writing and Rhetoric is unusual—other schools focus either on Professional Writing or Creative Writing. In terms of the literature major, both SMU and Occidental have moved more in the direction of Cultural Studies. Our distribution between British and American literature is more like Macalester’s. The required number of courses in the major is comparable, although all other programs have more electives.

The curriculum comparison suggested some changes we might fruitfully make. Eliminating English 101 from the course requirements, while retaining the 10-course requirement for the major, would allow students more freedom to select electives. Also we concluded that it would be timely to incorporate digital humanities into our curriculum. We also decided that our ENG 215 introductory course should be focused on both literature and writing and rhetoric. We also discussed including English 300, Language Theory for all emphases.

Assessment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Annual Indirect</th>
<th>Annual Direct</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015 (5-Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td>Senior Thesis</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 325,326</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 390</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 400</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 300 Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1B (diversity)</td>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td>Senior Thesis</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 215, 325, 326, 390</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 390</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 400</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 300 Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td>Senior Thesis</td>
<td>Eng. 215, 325, 326, 390</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 390</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 400</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 300 Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td>Senior Thesis</td>
<td>Eng. 215, 325, 326, 390</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 390</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 400</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 300 Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4</td>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td>Senior Thesis</td>
<td>Eng. 215, 325, 326, 390</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 300</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 400</td>
<td>Portfolio: Eng 300 Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since we initially established this assessment plan—assessing all outcomes every year but in different level courses—we decided to stay with it through one full five year review cycle so that we have consistent evidence. After our next 5-year review, we will revise our assessment plan.
Also, we are having some difficulty with the question of “authentic” evidence, since “field-work” in literary and rhetorical studies is a bit problematic. What students do in their capstone course is what they would do professionally. We do not require an internship, but this is something we can talk about at our next English faculty retreat.

**Assessment of Student Learning 2011-2014**

For introductory courses (200- and 300-level), we expect 75% of students to be performing at the level of “Introductory” or above. For 400-level courses, we expect 75% of student to be performing at the level of “Practicing” or above. For the senior seminar evidence taken from senior theses, we expect 75% of students to be performing at the level of “Mastery” (though we are very uncomfortable with the term “mastery.”

**PLO #1 Knowledge of English and American Literature**

![Student Portfolio](image1)

![Capstone Papers](image2)
Conclusion:

We are meeting our expectations in student learning in portfolios and capstone papers. Surveys indicate that students are satisfied with their learning about literature. That the question is the same for both Literature emphasis and Writing and Rhetoric emphasis leads to a lack of clarity. We will revise the PLO to emphasize knowledge in both areas and not only literary knowledge.

**PLO #1 (b) Diversity**
Discussion

While Topics in Multicultural American Literature is required for all English majors, students appear not perceive that this reflects diversity. We propose changing the title of the course from Topics in Multicultural American Literature to Multicultural and Global Literature. We also propose combining multicultural/diversity with values into a single, more measurable PLO.
English

PLO#2 Theory

Student Portfolios

Capstone Papers
Discussion: We need to address a reading competency in theory across the entire curriculum, beginning with the ENG 215, this will allow students to address theory in their 400-level and capstone papers in a more sophisticated way. We could also be more explicit and deliberate about theory in every course. For example, English 326 is built on a particular theoretical foundation, and along the way exploit various theoretical approaches throughout (historical, bibliographical, New Critical, feminist, etc.).

**PLO#2b Writing**
Discussion: With one exception, evidence indicates that our intended outcomes in writing are being achieved. The exception is our 300-level British and American survey courses. We will create guidelines for writing to be used in all major classes.
English
PLO#3 Critical Thinking

Student Portfolios

Capstone Papers

(2013 papers were assessed for presentation skills and not critical thinking.)
Senior Survey

Discussion: Our outcomes are being met with critical thinking, with the exception of capstone papers in 2015. The lower than expected outcome there reflected two students who had considerable difficulty.

PLO #4 Spiritual / Ethical
Discussion: In our discussion about values, we contend that it is virtually impossible to teach literature and rhetoric WITHOUT engaging spiritual and ethical dimension. We find value considerations reflected in student portfolios and the capstone, but students do not identify values reflection. We propose two things: greater intentionality and explicitness in discussing the spiritual and ethical dimension of literature—and the revision of our PLO mentioned above that will combine diversity and values as one learning outcome.

**PLOs and Core Competencies**

At Seaver the core competencies are addressed throughout the General Education Program, but major programs should extend and reinforce these competencies. The English Program directly addresses two of the core competencies: writing and critical thinking. We directly assess writing as
English

one of our four PLOs and critical thinking as the other. Students who complete the English major at Seaver are demonstrating high levels of competency in both writing skills and critical thinking.

Part II – Program Viability

Faculty

We teach 28 major courses each year. The English faculty at Seaver is comprised of 10 tenured faculty members, and 2 tenure-track assistant professors who have both completed their second year of teaching. All of these faculty members have earned doctorates from distinguished institutions including UCLA, USC, University of Tennessee, University of Texas, Austin, Purdue University, Notre Dame University, and The Claremont Graduate University. Additionally, we have the resources available to us of two visiting professors, both with earned doctorates, one of whom directs the Writing Center and the GE Junior Writing Portfolio; the other whose position comes within the purview of the Glazier Institute, which emphasizes enhancing curriculum and teaching experiences that focus on the Jewish experience. We also have three visiting faculty who teach in the first-year writing program, and, when courses are available, teach General Education Literature courses when Additionally, two tenure-track faculty members who teach courses in our Film Major have degrees in English, and are available to teach both GE and major courses when needed. Ours is a publishing faculty that in the past four years has averaged between three and four books and more than twenty peer-reviewed articles published annually. One of our senior faculty is one of eight Pepperdine University Distinguished Professors and another holds a named chair. (Vitas are available on Courses site)

Although the English major at Seaver is relatively small, our tenure-track faculty has considerable breadth because everyone teaches both major courses and courses in the General Education program (First-year Writing, General Education Literature Courses, the Great Books Symposium, and Interdisciplinary Humanities)Typically each faculty member teaches one course in the English major each semester and the rest in General Education. The breadth in our faculty is reflected as follows:

4 have degrees and publish in the area of Writing and Rhetoric

3 have degrees and publish in British Literature
   (1 medievalist, 1 early modernist, 1 Victorian)

5 have degrees and publish in American Literature
   (1 Colonial, 1 19th-century, 2 20th-century, 1 contemporary)

Additionally, since some faculty members have interdisciplinary interests, we have important resources with 3 faculty members working in the area of Digital Humanities.
Discussion: In terms of faculty our resources are very strong for providing an excellent educational experience for our majors.

Students

Our students come from a variety of backgrounds, including 27% from underrepresented minorities. 70% of our majors are female, 30% male. (Although this gender imbalance may seem high, Seaver College has an overall distribution of 60% female, 40% male.) English majors are strong students who are well prepared for college, based on their entry GPSs and SATs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLL TERM</th>
<th>Fall 2010 (Term:2106)</th>
<th>Fall 2011 (Term:2116)</th>
<th>Fall 2012 (Term:2126)</th>
<th>Fall 2013 (Term:2136)</th>
<th>Fall 2014 (Term:2146)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT SCORE AND GPA BY MAJOR AND MINOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE NGC English - Credential</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE NGLISH English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE NGW English - Writing and Rhetoric</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNE NGLISH English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total (Major &amp; Minor - AVERAGE SCORE)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English

Student Scholarship

Our students, as demonstrated below regularly present papers at undergraduate conferences.

2009-2010
Elisha Soch – Sigma Tau Delta Conference (St. Louis, MO, Spring 2010)
Nicole Johnson – National Undergraduate Literature Conference (Utah, Spring 2010)
Elisha Soch - National Undergraduate Literature Conference, (Utah, Spring 2010)
Montserrat Luna - National Undergraduate Literature Conference, (Utah, Spring 2010)
Emily Beaman - National Undergraduate Literature Conference, (Utah, Spring 2010)
Rachel Paprocki - Alpha Chi Super-Regional Conference (Arkansas, Spring 2010)

2010-2011
Caroline Mobley, Elisha Soch, Meggan O’Neil, Aubrey Williams, Chelsea McGrath and Montserrat Luna all presented papers at SCCUR (Pepperdine Fall 2010)
Jessica Pillsbury, Mary Stutzman, Jacqueline Fetzer and Evanne Lindley all presented papers or creative work at the Sigma Tau Delta Conference (Pittsburgh, Spring 2011)
Montserrat Luna presented creative work at the National Undergraduate Literature Conference Utah, Spring 2011).
Alumni presenting Pepperdine work at conferences:
Kristen Voetmann and Martin Premoli presented papers at the Popular Culture Association Conference (San Antonio, Spring 2011)
Kristen Voetmann presented a paper at the C.S. Lewis Summer Institute Conference (Oxford & Cambridge, UK Summer 2011)
Laura Laplaca presented a paper at the Graduate Conference of Literature & Media (University of Tulsa, 2011).

2011-2012
Ruth Book presented a scholarly paper at the Southern Colorado Rhetoric Society Conference (Colorado State University, Fall 2011)
Kristen Kesonen presented a scholarly paper at the Victorian Interdisciplinary Studies Association of the Western United States (Houston, Fall 2011)
Kendall Alexander, Kristina McClendon, Kathryn Mogk, Jackie Fetzer, Kristen Kesonen, and Montserrat Luna presented creative and/or scholarly work at the Sigma Tau Delta Far Western Region Conference (Chapman University, November 2011)
Kathryn Mogk, Aubrey Williams and Jesse Aston presented scholarly papers at SCCUR (Mt. San Antonio College, Fall 2011)
Kathryn Mogk, Midwest Regional Conference on Christianity & Literature (Grand Rapids, MI, Spring 2012)
Evanne Lindley, Jeannie Purcar, Stephanie Nelson, Montserrat Luna & Meggan O’Neil - Sigma Tau Delta Conference (New Orleans, Spring 2012)
Natalie Lewis presented a scholarly paper at California State University Northridge’s Sigma Tau Delta Symposium (CSUN Spring 2012)
Montserrat Luna & Kristina McClendon presented papers at the National Undergraduate Literature Conference (Utah, Spring 2012)
2012-2013
Kristina McClendon, Ruth Book and Jesse Aston presented scholarly papers at SCCUR (CSUCI, Fall 2012)
Kathryn Mogk presented a paper at the Association of Core Texts Conference (Chicago, Spring 2013)
Brita Lundberg, Danielle Accovelli, Kristina McClendon, Becca Stankis, Aaron Schott, Kealy Jaynes, Ruth Book and Kathryn Mogk presented work at the Sigma Tau Delta Conference (Portland, Spring 2013)
Brita Lundberg and Elise Keitz presented work at the National Undergraduate Literature Conference (Utah, Spring 2013)

2013-2014
Alexandra McCollum & Jesse Aston presented scholarly papers at SCCUR (Whittier, Fall 2013)
Matt Finley, Taylor Heinrich, Jennifer Lockemeyer, Kristina McClendon, Kelly Okerson & Marisa Scofield presented scholarly papers at the Sigma Tau Delta Conference (Savannah, GA, Spring 2014)
Carolyn Dapper, Maia Rodriguez & Sam Perrin presented scholarly papers at the CSUN Spring Colloquium, (Northridge, CA, Spring 2014)

2014-2015
Matt Finley, Sam Perrin, Maia Rodriguez, Ashton Trumble, Meagan Arthur, Stacey Lee & Ally Potter presented scholarly paper and creative work at the Sigma Tau Delta Conference (Albuquerque, NM, Spring 2015)
Sam Perrin presented a scholarly paper at the Second International Thornton Wilder Conference (Newport, RI, Summer 2015)

Sigma Tau Delta (English Honors Society)
Sigma Tau Delta, serves as an effective center for English major community-building and has helped a number of our students build their confidence and resumés. It encourages student scholarship and offers an opportunity for students to be mentored and to receive graduate school and career counseling.

Internships
Internships are regularly offered but not required, although we are considering institution a required internship.

Alumni Placement
Our data on this is informal since the Pepperdine Alumni Association is reluctant to provide extensive data. We have a very good sampling of approximately half of our students from the last five years, the details of which appear on “Courses.”
Alumni Satisfaction

During the spring 2015 term, a survey was taken of Pepperdine Alumni (full report available on “Courses”). Because this had no aggregation by year of graduation, the evidence was not entirely helpful. It did, however, provide some good insights into the program. Overall, alumni felt the English Major Program’s strength lay in its faculty, small classes, and curriculum. Consistently, responses indicated that we could do a great deal more to prepare students for careers.

Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAENGW English - Writing and Rhetoric</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAENGLISH English</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAENGC English - Credential</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNENGLISH English</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There has been a significant decline in the English credential enrollment and in the Writing and Rhetoric enrollment. The literature decline is not as significant, though losing 15 majors between 2012 and 2013 is significant. (Please note Pepperdine could not provide more recent data than 2013). We certainly see these declines as significant, although this is not just happening at Pepperdine. The article, “Where have all the English Majors gone?” (posted on “Courses”), indicates that this is a national trend. This is an important reminder that we have to do a great deal more to help students understand the value and usefulness of the Pepperdine English Major.
**English**

**Discussion**

In terms of faculty resources, student success, and alumni satisfaction, our program is certainly viable. Currently our recruitment is limited. We try to reach out to those names sent by admission, but we also need to recruit internally among undeclared majors. We need to work very hard to recruit majors and to support them as undergraduates preparing for careers that might not be the traditional graduate school. Some ideas we wish to explore include: a joint English Computer Science major, a Digital Humanities minor, a required 2-unit internship, and working with Career Services to strategically enhance opportunities for liberal arts majors. An internship requirement would also help us to address our failure to align with ILO #5, 6, and 9. Some liberal arts colleges have been active in “selling” the value of a liberal education to the business and non-profit communities.

**Conclusion**

In terms of its faculty, students, curriculum, student learning, and alumni satisfaction, the English program at Seaver College is academically sound. We have, however, become complacent and have not attended as well as we should to the changing climate outside of academia. We clearly need to do a better job clarifying the relationship between the undergraduate English major and the kinds of career opportunities students are pursuing in the Twenty-first Century. To that end, there are some things that we can do to fine-tune the major—and there are things that we need to do to demonstrate to a wider field of students the continuing value of our major.

**Fine-turning**

- Revise the PLO by taking diversity out of the second PLO and integrating it into the PLO on values/
- Rework the curriculum of the English 215 course to cover all three emphases in the major and to clarify to majors the major’s value for lifetime careers and lifetime learning.
- Eliminate English 101 from course listings for major, and by keeping the number of courses consistent, allow either for an additional elective or the introduction of a Language Theory course for all majors.
- Introduce a Digital Humanities component across the curriculum.
- Emphasize writing expectations across the major.
- Shift the emphasis on theory from “using” in just the Capstone course to understanding across the curriculum.

**Emphasizing Value**

- Designate an individual or group of individuals to be responsible for marketing the English major.
- Develop a marketing plan.
- Redesign the internship component and require it of all majors as a means to helping students towards career options.
EXTERNAL REVIEWER REPORT

TO: Assistant Provost Lisa Bortman (lisa.bortman@pepperdine.edu)
FROM: Simone J. Billings, Department of English, Santa Clara University

1 PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1.1 STRENGTHS

The Report on Five-year Program Review 2015-16 identified well how the English Program’s goals for its curriculum aligns with both the practices described in a report on assessment by the Modern Language Association (the field’s major professional association) and with the student learning goals for Pepperdine University. The program’s Student Learning outcomes reflect appropriate attention to the most important skills, knowledge, and values of the discipline of English Studies: that students should graduate able to “critique and interpret English and American literary texts,” understand “rhetorical, composition or literary theory and integrate that understanding in papers,” and demonstrate “sophisticated critical thinking, research, discussion, and presentation skills.” The two students with whom I met, both seniors emphasizing literature, agreed that they felt confident in abilities to read and write critically, one commenting that as a result of majoring in English, students “know how to write professionally.” The Annual Reports from 2011 through 2015 that I had access to during my visit were very nicely parsed out with assessment by norming on senior portfolios and acknowledged the strengths and weaknesses of the program fairly. The Assessment of Student Learning 2011-2014 contained in the Program’s Self-Report Study parsed out the Program Learning Outcomes and responds well to what was found: for Program Learning Outcome 1, to revise the criterion “to emphasize knowledge in both [Literature and Writing and Rhetoric]; to combine “multicultural/diversity with values into a single, more measureable PLO”; “to address a reading competency in theory across the entire curriculum”; to increase “intentionality and explicitness in discussing the spiritual and ethical dimension of literature.” Documents related to student success while undergraduates and alumni success post-graduate confirm that “student achievement of the program student learning outcomes is adequate for the degree and discipline.”

1.2 WEAKNESSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

The Self Study by the English Program rightly identified the difficulty in its obtaining clear evidence of diversity and spiritual/ethical perspective in the data the Program had been collecting; however, in this section (Program Learning Outcomes), the Program determined that it would revise Program Learning Outcome #4 to encompass both the spiritual/ethical dimension as well as the diversity outcome. I suggest that the Program rethink grouping together all elements that it had difficulty finding evidence for and instead consider one of two other options. The first option would be to consider that the inclusion of diversity in the Program’s current Student Learning Outcome 1 is an appropriate place for that dimension and to consider including aspects of “ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity” to its Program Learning Outcome #2 since papers that reflect understanding of “rhetorical, composition, or literary theory” can and often do attend to effects and consequences related to “ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity.” Alternatively, the Program might consider revising Program Learning Outcome #1 to delete “include those with ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity” so as to construct a fifth learning outcome, Program Learning Outcome #5, “Communicate in papers and other assigned texts – in literature classes, in writing and rhetoric classes, and/or in education and secondary teaching credential courses – an awareness and understanding of effects, consequences, and responsibilities related to ethnic, gender, and cultural...
English diversity.” This second option has the benefit of acknowledging the three different emphases within the English Program.

2. ASSESSMENT

2.1 STRENGTHS

The Self-Report of the Program Review used an appropriate and effective method to assess student learning in terms of the Program’s Student Learning Outcomes: the Program examined not just capstone papers but student portfolios and senior surveys as the Program chose to assess all outcomes every year. The Program did well in expecting not 100% but 75% of students to perform at the intended level (introductory, practicing, mastery) of the different level course chosen each year of the assessment. The Program also rightfully comments on the discomfort with the term “mastery” for the highest level of achievement; most of us professionals would maintain that we are always striving toward mastery but truly primarily at the practicing level given that the field continues to develop and we must continuously learn even if in the field for decades. The Program, as the Report notes, “directly addresses two of the core competencies: writing and critical thinking”; accordingly, evidence in the assessment demonstrates that majors demonstrate “high levels of competency in both writing skills and critical thinking.” The Program rightfully recognizes that it needs to revise the first outcome to gather information about knowledge in both the literary and the other emphases within its program. Members of the Program recognize that they need to be more explicit and intentional for students to see the presence of diversity in its courses. Although the English Program could not readily gather alumni data – the Report notes that “the Pepperdine Alumni Association is reluctant to provide extensive data” – they did have access to half of their graduates from the last five years. From this information, the assessment compiled a list of occupations or pursuits alumni had listed. This is a fine first step in a compilation that should be continued to see whether patterns remain constant or change across the years. In its assessment of curricular offerings, the Program appropriately compared theirs to comparable schools.

2.2 WEAKNESSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

Assessing for all outcomes each year may diffuse attention to any one outcome for the three emphases within the Program; with only 4-5 Student Learning Outcomes, the English Program may wish to consider assessing one Program Learning Outcome for students across courses that represent the three levels (introductory, practicing, mastery). In this way, the Program may gather data that would inform whether and how it scaffolds that particular outcome for majors in the English Program. For example, the report identified that “While Topics in Multicultural American Literature is required for all English majors, students appear not [to] perceive that this reflects diversity” and thus proposed “changing the title of the course” to include “Global.” This titular change may cause students to perceive that solely one course is providing them with coursework related to diversity. In actuality, likely the three emphases – Literature, Writing and Rhetoric, and Education and Secondary Teaching – discuss matters related to issues of diversity, whether ethnic, cultural, or gender, due to content and trends in the discipline: issues related to ethnic, cultural, and gender diversity are present not just in American Literature but in British Literature, world literatures, writing and rhetorical studies, and the training of teachers. Comparable to the Report’s observation that “it is virtually impossible to teach literature and rhetoric WITHOUT engaging spiritual and ethical dimension,” a valid observation, the proposal to use “greater intentionality and explicitness in discussing the spiritual and ethical dimension of literature” might well be extended to a strategy for the Learning Outcome of diversity. Evidence of such coverage can perhaps be extracted from syllabi listing readings in courses from the three emphases. If the English Program decides to combine diversity and values as one learning outcome, by examining one learning
outcome across introductory, intermediate, and advanced classes in a given year, the Program could
determine whether students are at the appropriate levels – introductory, practicing, and mastery –
and be able to determine whether the Program is adequately scaffolding or providing learning of
that outcome.

The alumni data collected by the Program provide a solid start to providing useful
information about the Program’s learning outcomes, but the manner in which the data were
presented (as a list) makes it difficult to draw specific conclusions readily. The list of 115
individuals by name could have been aggregated into categories that might link to the Program’s
outcomes – for example, categorizing the occupations listed into Business, Graduate School,
Teaching, Service, and Other, I organized 35 as in business occupations of some sort (e.g., donor
relations manager at the Los Angeles Arboretum), 35 in graduate school (from law to international
studies to rhetoric to art history to Victorian studies), 16 in teaching, 4 are doing or have done
service of some sort (City Year or Peace Corps), and 25 in Other (unemployed, applying to graduate
school, copywriter, reporter, “backpacking internationally,” etc.). Members of the English Program
may wish to categorize the list in ways that make sense to them since my quick grouping may not
fully or accurately capture what they would find most useful. Also, members of the Program may
wish to consider continue gathering data on alumni so for the next 5-year review they could have a
cohort group of 5 years out and another of 10 years old to draw conclusions from regarding the
whereabouts of their alumni.

I appreciate the openness of the Program to discuss further making an internship a
requirement, but I am uncertain whether that will necessarily fully address students’ expressed
desire for career guidance. Perhaps the student chapter of Sigma Tau Delta or the Program could
hold an annual panel comprised of alumni from different fields to speak one afternoon or evening to
current students; perhaps a late afternoon or early evening social could bring alumni and students
together to let students see the possibilities of where to go with an English major. Perhaps the
Program could construct (with administrative assistant aid) testimonial cards and pages for students
to see where alumni have gone and how they have been able to use the skills learned in the English
Program. (See https://www.scu.edu/english/life-after-scu/why-english/ and individual alumni
profiles available on links there, such as https://www.scu.edu/english/life-after-scu/why-
english/shannon-m-nessier-class-of-1999.html.)

3 CURRICULUM

3.1 STRENGTHS

The Report provided not just the Self-Study/Report but also the Program’s 4-year plan of
course offerings Fall 2015-Spring 2019, so the English Program clearly knows the importance of
planning so that it indeed “clearly outlines program requirements and offers courses regularly to
ensure timely completion of the program.” The courses align with the Program’s Learning
Outcomes reasonably. The current curriculum content is indeed appropriate for a unified English
program and adequate in its design for “students to develop the skills and attain the outcomes
needed for graduates of this program.” Further, the current curriculum content is sufficient for the
“level and purpose of the program.” The three emphases – Literature, Writing and Rhetoric, and
English education – represent a unified English Program, providing appropriate breadth for
undergraduates at a university. As reported in the Self-Study, students in these three emphases share
common required classes: English 215, Introduction to English Studies, English 390, Literary
Theory, English 436, Topics in Multicultural American Literature, and English 490, Senior
Seminar. These common required courses across the three emphases provide opportunities for
student community as well as a common core for the major. The Program commendably provides
an opportunity for excellent students to apply for an Honors Program in English to work on an
Honors thesis in English during the senior year and the possibility to have the notation “Honors in English” on both transcripts and diplomas. Alumni responding to the qualitative survey were very positive about the benefits of “the analytical aspect of reading literature” and the writing involved in the major.

Faculty in the Program comment that “English has synergy with the cultural environment of Pepperdine,” for students can study abroad and take advantage of the Great Books program and go to graduate school in literature or in writing and rhetoric. Faculty also point to the fact that they are discussing adding digital humanities into their program as a requirement early in the curriculum to reinforce analysis and research in a way that fits development in the field. One of their faculty members plans, with the assistance of a grant, to offer such an upper division course and to have a speaker in the fall term on digital humanities, and the program has been in conversation with the computer science department to offer classes in coding for humanists. In terms of courses that explicitly address diversity, members of the department note that they can and do offer special topics such as in the films of Sidney Poitier but acknowledge that the availability of courses is limited. Faculty in the Program are comfortable with the foundation courses’ being traditional in emphasis on British and American literature. The Self-Report and Assessment includes the requirements for the Minor in Writing, which provides minors with fine grounding and the Program with an influx of students from other majors. The Self-Report also discusses comparisons with six peer-institutions, accurately noting that its literature curriculum is more similar to the more conservative Macalester’s than to the more progressive Cultural Studies model of Southern Methodist and Occidental. The Report appropriately concluded that “it would be timely to incorporate digital humanities into our curriculum” and that the “English 215 introductory course should be focused on both literature and writing and rhetoric.” The faculty seem open to “including English 300, Language and Theory, for all emphases.” Faculty strongly note that the English Program serves all majors and all students across the liberal arts and engineering majors since the Program’s General Education footprint is large such as in the Great Books program as well as in the critical writing and reading classes.

3.2 WEAKNESSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

As noted under Assessment, English 436, Topics in Multicultural American Literature, might be re-titled so that it can cover British and transnational literature, such as Caribbean literature. The students with whom I spoke recommended that the American survey course cover more diverse authors and that there be possibility for more modern literature, that is, literature “later than the 1950s” and greater breadth of multicultural literature available than a single course. A few comments from alumni in the qualitative survey recommended more opportunities for understanding “the contemporary literary landscape” since “the most recently published piece I read for a class was from the 1970s/80s” and another asked for “more specific genres, i.e. Post-colonialism.”

Currently students who emphasize Writing and Rhetoric and Education take at least two courses in literature, but students who emphasize literature are not required to take a course in Writing and Rhetoric – even though the description of the Emphasis in Literature in the Self-Study notes the emphasis “is designed for students who wish to pursue a career in teaching high school…[or] to prepare for law school.” It would seem that students preparing to teach high school or to enter law school might benefit from a course such as English 300, Language Theory, or English 450, Rhetoric for Writers. Perhaps all majors, regardless of emphasis, would benefit from taking English 300 as the Self-Report says faculty discussed.

The four-year plan for course offerings, however, seems to plan for the Language Theory class to be offered only in Spring 2017 and in Spring 2019; if they wish all students to take English 300, the Program will need to offer the course more than twice in the proposed 4-year plan. Particularly the plan to offer English 460, Writing and Technology, only twice, in Spring 2016 and Spring 2018, seems too infrequent when that area is increasingly more relevant and important for students.
English

regardless of emphasis within an English major.

During the group faculty meeting, some faculty noted that the Writing and Rhetoric emphasis needs an introductory course akin to that for literature. A pragmatic solution offered was that the introductory course cover both rhetorical and literary studies since, it was asserted, there is capacity for such coverage among the regular full-time faculty. Another possibility, however, is that both have a separate introductory course since likely each emphasis has more than enough theory for students to have a term-long foundation course as the introduction to that emphasis.

4 STUDENT EXPERIENCES AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

4.1 STRENGTHS

Both the students with whom I met and those who responded to surveys distributed by the Program expressed high satisfaction with “the overall quality of their learning experience.” In particular, they noted the guidance and mentorship possible because of the “incredible” instructors who are spiritual as well as academic mentors. The passion instructors have for people and books and literature inspire the students. As one student responded on the alumni survey, the faculty “not only stretched my mind but they also challenged my heart.” Others identified the strengths of the environment and Program to be “the community at Pepperdine created by students and professors,” “the faculty and their dedication to teaching,” “the educators at Pepperdine, be that Professors, adjunct or visiting faculty.” Students and alumni alike believed they were “adequately supported through the curriculum and advising to ensure their learning success”; further, comments on class size were all positive. The London Summer English Program provides a fine and suitable study abroad opportunity for students within the major; one of the students with whom I met had studied there while the other studied in Switzerland. They remarked that it’s part of the Pepperdine culture to study abroad while undergraduates.

Students seem to have “adequate opportunities for co-curricular programs”: the presence of a Sigma Tau Delta chapter (Sigma Tau Delta is an international honor society for English majors, both undergraduate and graduate) can help students receive acknowledgement of their academic performance as well as supply opportunities for presentation at conferences and scholarship and internship opportunities. Information provided to me on the conferences students attend to deliver papers included regular appearances at the Sigma Tau Delta convention. Both alumni and current students present work at other conferences, such as the Popular Culture Association or the C.S. Lewis Summer Institute or the Graduate Conference of Literature and Media or students at the Southern Colorado Rhetoric Society Conference or the Midwest Regional Conference on Christianity and Literature. Such widespread and frequent appearance at conferences by undergraduates evidences a supportive environment for student learning and excellent mentoring by some faculty, encouragement for students to think of themselves as beginning scholars in the field. Two instructors routinely offer internship classes for interested students, and a section of that internship class is scheduled for each term, according to the 4-year plan for course offerings. The Program’s web site identifies an internship for students with the journal Christianity and Literature available through the Humanities and Teacher Education division in which the English Program is housed.

Additional evidence of the strengths of the Student Experiences and Learning Environment comes from the class I observed of Dr. Jennifer Smith, an upper-division Shakespeare course held in the Great Books Room in the library. Not only student report but observation of the careful scaffolding in the first class of the teaching of Shakespeare’s sonnets indicate high quality of teaching. Dr. J. Smith clearly had established a strong rapport with students, who talked easily with both each other and with her prior to class. Likely because not all students in the class were English majors, Dr. J. Smith began with the question of what is a poem and moved to likening a poem to the
playing of a musical instrument, to music, to measured sound. Carefully introducing terms, she respectfully asked questions that invited student response to help the instructor’s knowledge grow as well as that of the students: “Would you tell me how [music] is organized?” Among my myriad observations of instructors’ classes, I have instead heard instructors say instead, “Can you tell the class … ?” Besides the instructor clearly structuring class in ways designed to educate students well, the room for this class and the library as a whole are excellent environments to instill in students a respect for learning and to provide a space for deep learning.

4.2 WEAKNESSES/RECOMMENDATIONS

Some students in both the senior surveys and alumni surveys note that they would have liked more career guidance and advice although some also noted that they did not find internships through the career center useful. One respondent to the alumni survey remarked, “Internships proved to be pointless, other than to satisfy class credits. The Career Space does little to nothing helping students find internships in their specialized area.” In the group meeting with faculty, members noted that they were aware of this student need, and they identified the two members who rotate the teaching of the internship class. But as is often the case in various departments on various campuses, whether students are aware of or encouraged to or seek internships depends on the instructors’ or advisors’ or mentors’ awareness of these opportunities. In a small to medium-sized major, regardless of whether one teaches primarily literature or primarily writing or primarily education, instructors might wish to ensure all majors and minors know of such opportunities. Perhaps as faculty hear about internships or conference or publication opportunities for undergraduates, they could send that information to the administrative support individuals to post on a page on the Program’s web site so that students, who rely so much on the web for information, might find information in that way. Perhaps the bulletin board in the hallway that the chair, Dr. Clegg, pointed out they wished to use for posting information about the major could be used to post opportunities or testimonials from alumni working and studying in diverse fields (cf. 2.2 above) to help students know of their options post-graduation. (The current video on the web site emphasizes why to major in English more so than the options post-graduation; the web site says to see job possibilities by looking at the list of distinguished alumni, but I could find no link to that page.) These different ways of accessing information may seem redundant but would perhaps widen the field of information beyond an individual instructor informing an individual student, for as one respondent to the alumni survey observed, “I would have liked to have learned how I could apply these skills/field of knowledge in a career path aside from graduate school/becoming a professor.” To be sure, some students do apply to and attend graduate school, and perhaps to assist the students in knowing whom to contact for information on graduate schools across the field, the Program could identify specific faculty to be point persons on graduate school. At Santa Clara University, for example, we designate two individuals from our most recent hires and therefore closest to the graduate school experience and landscape to be those individuals. These same strategies can be applied to student opportunity to submit papers for conferences or publication – the posting on the bulletin board, the page on the Program web site for student opportunities to submit work, the appointment of a point person for student consultation. Perhaps more students in the Sigma Tau Delta chapter can be encouraged to apply for scholarships and internships and publication available only to Sigma Tau Delta members.

Perhaps the Program would wish also to continue discussions across the emphases to ensure full representation during self-studies and reviews of programs. The two students I spoke with during the campus visit were both from the Literature emphasis although one does plan to go to graduate school in publishing. Perhaps it would have been useful had I had the opportunity to speak
also with students from the Writing and Rhetoric emphasis or the Education emphasis since in reality I had the opportunity to hear current student perspective on only part of the Program. Perhaps the Program might wish to categorize student and alumni reports and surveys according to emphases since such parsing might reveal interesting distinctions that could be informative about the Program as a whole. The Program already asks graduating seniors to identify their emphases, so this parsing could readily be done.

During the group faculty discussion while I was visiting the campus, some faculty expressed that a challenge in providing students with the best or most ideal learning environment is infrastructural: that they must schedule and use shared public space in the library. The Great Books room is a fabulous space that would also serve courses other than Great Books equally well, such as Writing and Rhetoric or Education or capstone courses.

5 FACULTY QUALITY
5.1 STRENGTHS
For a Program rather than a Department, English is blessed with excellent teaching scholars. Twelve of the fifteen full-time faculty are tenure-steam, two of these untenured and five in non-tenure track lines. As noted in the Self-Report, the tenure-stream faculty have all “earned doctorates from distinguished institutions” and the faculty “in the past four years has averaged between three and four books and more than twenty peer-reviewed articles published annually.” Further, as noted in the Self-Report, one senior faculty member “is one of eight Pepperdine University Distinguished Professors and another holds a named chair.” The faculty vitae reviewed during my on-campus visit also reveal individuals who are active and consistent in delivering papers. Faculty specialties seem matched to the needs of the Program and to the concentrations in which they teach. However, with regard to evaluating teaching practices, I received and reviewed no data on this matter in either the Self-Report on during the site visit. Nonetheless, the strengths of a professionally active faculty indicate that the “faculty are adequately supported and engaged in ongoing professional development necessary to staying current in their field.”

Program faculty are also actively engaged in the life and service of Pepperdine. Several of the full-time faculty provide service to Pepperdine, such as serving as spiritual mentors to students. Others have administrative appointments, serving as an Associate Dean of Teaching for Seaver College and Director for the Center for Teaching and Learning, Director of Film Studies, Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, Director of the First-Year English Program, Director of the Writing Center and the GE Junior Writing Portfolio, and Chair of the English Program. Faculty teach in both the major and in the core routinely, a pie chart in the Self-Report showing that the faculty load in the major is only approximately a little over a third whereas the contribution to General Education literature and other is greater than half. So the importance of the English Program’s faculty to Pepperdine’s delivery of General Education courses to students is marked.

5.2 WEAKNESSES/RECOMMENDATIONS
Although faculty are teaching within their professional concentrations and within the Program’s needs, the rank of those teaching the major courses seems oddly skewed. According to the pie chart in the Self-Study on who is teaching major courses, Visiting Professors – those in non-tenure-track positions – teach the majority of major courses. Likely this division is due in part to the many faculty serving in administrative positions and thus having reduced teaching loads. Perhaps the Program and Pepperdine might wish to investigate ways to make these positions and the individuals serving the Program and Pepperdine in these positions recognized as more than “visiting,” as continuing positions. Additionally, the Self-Report notes that the Program has “important resources with 3 faculty
English members working in the area of Digital Humanities.” With the trend and importance of that area to the field of English and English Studies, I would encourage the Program and the University to continue progress in that direction.

6 DIVERSITY
6.1 STRENGTHS
Elements within the Self-Report of the Program and within discussion with faculty in the group meetings indicate a strong “commitment to diversity in its curriculum, student and faculty composition.” During the meeting of the Humanities and Teacher Education Division I attended, for example, it was apparent that different individuals were called upon to lead the opening devotional and prayer. Individual accomplishments were recognized even if the event or accolade was outside of the University. On the agenda for the meeting was the continued discussion on diversity initiatives. And during the group faculty meeting, the entire faculty was involved in discussing ways to increase student awareness of representation of diverse groups in readings in all the courses, whether in the Literature or the Writing and Rhetoric courses offered. The faculty is impressive in its commitment to this area, but it also recognizes that one can do only so much in recruiting students and faculty from diverse groups.

6.2 WEAKNESSES/RECOMMENDATIONS
I see no weaknesses in this area that the Program has not already tried to address. Specific recommendations for diversity in the curriculum have been provided in 3.2 above.

7 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT
7.1 STRENGTHS
Overall, the program administration seems to meet professional standards and is effective and efficient. Resources of the Program in terms of the library and student support seem not only current but excellent given the numerous student presentations at various conferences, the library facility, and the courses that currently are offered in the Great Books room of the library. There are no laboratory facilities and support associated with this Program.

The Program’s student recruitment and retention processes reflect a national trend as detailed in an article from Inside Higher Ed, “Where have all the English Majors gone?”: that the numbers are declining. The Program astutely situates its own decline within this national trend but also sees the decline as “an important reminder that we have to a great deal more to help students understand the value and usefulness of the Pepperdine English major.” The video on the opening page of the Program’s web site certainly does underscore why a person can and should choose to major in English at Pepperdine. Further, the Self-Report recognizes that their “recruitment is limited” but could extend to recruiting from the undeclared majors, not just to students who have been admitted. The Program also recognizes that it must detail what fields students enter post-graduation other than graduate school, citing the way that some other colleges “have been active in ‘selling’ the value of a liberal education to the business and non-profit communities.” Faculty dedication to and interest in the field are strengths that cannot be and should not be underplayed in attracting new majors.

7.2 WEAKNESSES/RECOMMENDATIONS
As detailed in 2.2 and in 4.2 above, certain steps to make increasingly visible the merits of majoring in English could be taken – publicizing on the bulletin board and on the Program’s web site the viability of an English major for entering multiple fields with alumni testimonials and lists. Additionally, faculty of first-year writing courses at other universities often help recruit majors from the undeclared and less committed majors in other fields. The Program may wish to discuss the
opportunity to recruit from these introductory General Education courses, especially for the Writing and Rhetoric and Education emphases which have seen a decline of late.

The Self-Study suggests a plan to explore offering a joint English Computer Science major or a Digital Humanities minor as well as to work with Career Services and require a 2-unit internship. Of these, perhaps working with Career Services before requiring the internship would be a logical step. Also, exploring the Digital Humanities minor would make sense since there are currently plans for a Digital Humanities symposium in the Fall. Concurrent with this exploration could be consulting with Computer Science.

The Self-Study identified the most pressing need in this area to be the recruitment of new majors. However, I see also as a need the increase of administrative (office) support for a Program that serves so many Pepperdine students besides its own majors. Increased administrative (office) support would enable the Program to keep a web site fresh and to work on developing new pages, tasks which teacher-scholars with heavy General Education responsibilities as well as responsibilities to their majors cannot be expected to do. A large Program such as this needs more dedicated administrative (office) support. There are currently two administrative assistants in the office that serves the Humanities and Teacher Education Division – the entire Division with 8 distinct majors – as well as supporting the Associate Dean.

8 PROPOSED CHANGES

8.1 STRENGTHS

The Self-Report has identified well what it needs to do: to continue to provide breadth of courses and fine mentoring and teaching of its majors. As stated in its conclusion, “In terms of its faculty, students, curriculum, student learning, and alumni satisfaction, the English program at Seaver College is academically sound.” Using data gathered through their self-assessment and student/alumni surveys, the members of the Program have proposed certain improvements to their Program since they recognize that they “have, however, become complacent and have not attended as well as we should to the changing climate outside of academia.” They plan to address the drop in majors in several ways. They are proposing to bring the curriculum into the 21st century by adding elements of digital humanities to their courses and potentially adding a minor in that area – two refinements that are in keeping with what other universities and colleges are doing. They plan to revise parts of the major to include an introduction to all three emphases of the major – again a refinement that other universities and colleges have been doing if they have a blended major (one that covers Literature and Cultural Studies, Writing and Rhetoric, and/or Education). They plan to emphasize the value of an English major in specific ways, such as developing a marketing strategy and designating an individual or group to market the major. Each of these proposed changes is appropriate to changes in the discipline as a whole.

8.2 WEAKNESSES

For the most part, I see the proposed changes to be excellent use of the data collected and the self-study conducted. The Program may, however, wish to consider some of the suggestions or recommendations made in each of the X.2 sections above, in particular 2.2, 3.2, and 5.2.

9 OVERALL PROGRAM SUMMARY
The above sections indicate two major strengths in the English Program:

- Quality of the faculty (Evidence: student interviews and alumni survey, review of faculty CV’s, class observation, group meeting with faculty)
- Student experiences and learning environment (Evidence: student interviews and alumni survey, review of course offerings, visits to classrooms and other campus buildings)
Besides being explicit and intentional in demonstrating the diversity of readings in courses – an easy enough fix – the program might wish to focus on these goals for the next five years to build on their strengths:

- Revise the curriculum for the English major as proposed in the Self-Study -- to explore the inclusion of digital humanities within different courses and as a minor (Evidence: student interviews, group meeting with faculty, review of Self-Study and faculty CV's)
- Revise the curriculum for the English major as proposed in the Self-Study and perhaps tweaked with my suggestions -- to include an introduction to the three emphases in students’ portal course(s) (Evidence: student interviews, group meeting with faculty, review of Self-Study)
- Investigate models from other colleges and universities for converting Visiting Faculty lines to continuing faculty lines even if non-tenure-track (Not mentioned in the Self-Study but seems apparent in the Evidence of the Self-Study that shows who is teaching major classes and that indicates the high General Education coverage provided by the Program)

The above three goals could help to address the pressing need identified in the Self-Study: the recruitment and retention of majors.

The most realistic and important strategies to achieve the highest priority goals are the same as the goals suggested in the above section.

The goal that likely would require additional resources would be the third goal, that of converting non-continuing faculty lines to continuing faculty lines. However, the return to the Program in terms of increased faculty stability in the major and the core could also aid in the recruitment and retention of majors. Students who declare a major on the basis of the experience they had with their first-year instructors often wish to take additional classes from these instructors; students who need letters of recommendation benefit from having those written by individuals who can list faculty ranks indicating the faculty members are continuing rather than temporary faculty. The Program might secure these resources by petitioning for new lines from the Provost’s and Dean’s offices.

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS about Program Review in general:

During my campus/site visit, I appreciated greatly the opportunity to meet students, faculty, and administrators on campus and to attend a division meeting and a class. These sessions provided good details that helped to provide evidence for some of the conclusions I drew on my own and for specifics that provided additional support for assertions made in the Self-Report.

In planning for future visits from External Reviewers, however, perhaps the Program and Division might arrange time for the External Reviewer to meet with members of different faculty ranks separately or to have open times for individual faculty members to meet with an External Reviewer. It is unusual for external reviewers to meet only with all the faculty of a program or major in a group setting, particularly when among the faculty present are a program or department chair and an associate dean. Although faculty may indeed all get along well both professionally and personally, on all campuses I’m familiar with, most faculty have commented that they feel somewhat restrained in how fully they can express opinions when an administrator is present, regardless of whether they are tenured or not, regardless of whether they are in tenure-stream or non-tenure track lines. As someone who has served in various administrative capacities on my campus, I know that even those who have been friends for decades remarked on this phenomenon to me when I was in a position of authority over them. To be sure, some individuals will be fully candid regardless of the rank of others in a room, but for greatest likelihood of candidness and thereby a more robust, honest, and full review, the schedule for an (or the) External Reviewer should include these sorts of sessions.
with faculty.

Also, in planning for future visits from External Reviewers, perhaps the Program would wish to ensure that students who meet with the External Reviewer represent at least two if not all three of the emphases if a Program has more than one emphasis within its major.

-----------
Our outside reviewer essentially concurred with our own assessment of the English Program. She had one misreading of the charts and data. She said we needed to assure that our major courses were taught by full-time tenure track faculty. In fact, they are. She also suggested that we may wish to have a separate outcome for diversity. We will fully take this into consideration.

In terms of its faculty, students, curriculum, student learning, and alumni satisfaction, the English program at Seaver College is academically sound. We have, however, become complacent and have not attended as well as we should to the changing climate outside of academia. We clearly need to do a better job clarifying the relationship between the undergraduate English major and the kinds of career opportunities students are pursuing in the Twenty-first Century. To that end, there are some things that we can do to fine-tune the major—and there are things that we need to do to demonstrate to a wider field of students the continuing value of our major.

**Fine-turning**

- Revise the PLO by taking diversity out of the second PLO and integrating it into the PLO on values.
- Rework the curriculum of the English 215 course to cover all three emphases in the major and to clarify to majors the major’s value for lifetime careers and lifetime learning.
- Eliminate English 101 from course listings for major, and by keeping the number of courses consistent, allow either for an additional elective or the introduction of a Language Theory course for all majors.
- Introduce a Digital Humanities component across the curriculum.
- Emphasize writing expectations across the major.
- Shift the emphasis on theory from “using” in just the Capstone course to understanding across the curriculum.

**Emphasizing Value**

- Designate an individual or group of individuals to be responsible for marketing the English major.
- Develop a marketing plan.
- Redesign the internship component and require it of all majors as a means to helping students towards career options.

Pursue strengthening the relationship between Career Services and the liberal arts, especially English.
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PROGRAM REVIEW: INTRODUCTION

The Film Studies major is an interdisciplinary major housed in the Humanities and Teacher Education division at Seaver College. The major offers a Bachelor of Arts in Film Studies with an emphasis in Critical Studies or Film and Digital Media Production. Seaver students can also earn a minor in Film Studies.

Brief History of Program

Film Studies is a young major and this report represents the major first five-year review. The Film Studies minor was created out of growing demand for film studies courses at Seaver College. In 1995, Dr. Michael Gose taught the first film course with an opening enrollment of 67 students to the highest enrollment reaching 235 students in spring 1999. The enrollment average was about 80 students since spring 1995. In addition other faculty in the college proposed new discipline specific film course (international languages, African American studies, women studies, religious Studies, and cultural studies). In 1999, Dr. Michael Gose (in consultation with Dr. Joi Carr and Dr. Erika Olbricht) presented a proposal for a Film Studies minor to Seaver Academic Council (SAC) and University Academic Council (UAC). The minor was approved and offered in the 2001-2002 (Seaver
The Humanities and Teacher Education Division capitalized on the momentum that film studies was achieving across the college toward developing a major in the discipline. Dr. Joi Carr (in consultation with the Humanities and Teacher Education division) developed and proposed the Film Studies major, which was proposed/adopted in 2006 and began in 2007-2008 (Seaver College catalogue). The program began as a thirty-six to thirty-eight units course major in critical studies. The following year digital media production was added to the major, led by Dr. Leslie Kreiner, creating a two track major that shares the same core courses in critical studies. Dr. Joi Carr was central in crafting the new curriculum that will be instituted in fall 2012 and in 2014 (the core course units for the Film Studies major increased from 15 units to 16 units to accommodate creating a course to fulfill the general education (GE) Fine Arts requirement for undergraduate studies).

External Content

a. This should explain how the program responds to the needs of the area in which it serves: this can include the community, region, field, or discipline. In other words, describe contributions to the discipline or field of study.

Interdisciplinary which includes an emphasis in religion/values.
Has an outside concentration which integrates film studies with a specific discipline.
Unique relationship with Hollywood film community (religion and film studies).
Unique relationship with Malibu film community.
Focused on film studies rather than a broader and more nebulous media studies program.

MISSION, PURPOSES, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES

I. Program Learning Outcomes – PLOs

A student who graduates with a major in Film Studies should be able to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #1</th>
<th>Demonstrate their understanding of the critical and technical language associated with film studies, including genres, classic narrative and non-narrative forms, mise-en-scène, cinematography, editing, sound, and modes of screen reality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO #2</td>
<td>Demonstrate their critical thinking, analytical, research, and public presentation skills as well as the use of print and technology sources appropriate to the discipline of film studies, including their application to issues of ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PLO #3**  
Demonstrate their ability to articulate, through close reading and writing, their own worldviews. They will be able to explain and respond thoughtfully to the religious, social, ideological, spiritual, moral, and ethical values implied in film texts through their close readings and reflections.

**PLO #4**  
[Students with an emphasis in digital media production:]  
Demonstrate their skills in the praxis of film production.

### Alignment of PLOs with Institutional Learning Outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>PLO #1</th>
<th>PLO #2</th>
<th>PLO #3</th>
<th>PLO #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to the call to serve others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum

Bachelor of Arts in Film Studies

Film, an art form and entertainment medium born and developed in the 20th century, arguably has been the single most powerful influence on our culture since its inception, and film and other evolving media forms continue as dynamic forces in the 21st century. As such, they are important subjects of academic inquiry. In the Seaver College film studies program, students will study the history of this art form and the ways in which it touches the various aspects of our individual and communal lives—esthetic, spiritual, political, national, racial, and economic.

Required Courses

Five Required Core Courses: 16 units
FILM 111/311 Film and Culture (GE) .............................................. (2)
FILM 200 Introduction to Film Studies (PS, RM)............................. (4)
FILM 300 Film Theory and Criticism (WI).................................... (4)
FILM 301 The History of American Cinema .................................. (4)
FILM 480 Senior Project in Film Studies....................................... (2)
A maximum of one upper-division course can satisfy a requirement in the major or minor as well as a general education requirement.

Film and Media Studies Emphasis

Choose five of the following: 20 units
FILM 315 Film As Art ........................................................................ (4)
FILM 365 Japanese and Asian Film (GE) ........................................ (4)
FILM 411 Film Genres .................................................................... (4)
FILM 421 Topics in Film Studies* ................................................. (4)
FILM 431 African American Cinema .............................................. (4)
FILM 441 Women and Film ........................................................... (4)
FILM 451 Religion and Film ............................................................ (4)
FILM 462 Italian Cinema from Neo-Realism to the Present .............. (4)
May be repeated once when topics vary.

Choose two of the following: 8 units
COM 506 Media Worldwide.......................................................... (4)
COM 512 Intercultural Media Literacy ...................................... (4)
FILM 210 Introduction to Screen and Television Writing ......... (4)
FILM 250 Film Production and Editing ....................................... (4)
FILM 410 Advanced Writing for Screen and Television ............. (4)
**Film Studies**

**Film and Digital Media Production Emphasis**

**Required courses in addition to the core courses in the major: 14-16 units**

- FILM 250  Film Production and Editing  ........................................... (4)
- FILM 320  Producing and Directing ............................................... (4)
- FILM 325  Cinematography .............................................................. (4)
- FILM 595  Film Studies Internship .................................................. (2-4)

**Choose one of the following: 4 units**

- FILM 470  Narrative Filmmaking: Theory and Practice ....................... (4)
- FILM 560  Documentary Filmmaking: Theory and Practice ................... (4)

**Choose three of the following: 12 units**

- FILM 210  Introduction to Screen and Television Writing .................... (4)
- FILM 315  Film As Art ........................................................................... (4)
- FILM 365  Japanese and Asian Film (GE) ........................................... (4)
- FILM 410  Advanced Writing for Screen and Television ....................... (4)
- FILM 411  Film Genres ........................................................................ (4)
- FILM 421  Topics in Film Studies* ....................................................... (4)
- FILM 431  African American Cinema ................................................... (4)
- FILM 441  Women and Film ................................................................. (4)
- FILM 451  Religion and Film ................................................................ (4)
- FILM 462  Italian Cinema from Neo-Realism to the Present ............... (4)

*May be repeated once when topics vary.

**Assessment Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Schedule</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Authentic Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO #1 2011/2012</td>
<td>FILM 200 analysis paper, critical research essay, mid-term, final exam; FILM 300 mid-term, final exam, research project; FILM 301 Out-of-class essays, research project, final writing assignment; other upper-division film class essays, research project; FILM 480 project</td>
<td>Senior survey; student reflections on FILM 480 project</td>
<td>Internship experience, employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #2 2012/2013</td>
<td>FILM 200 analysis paper, critical research essay, mid-term, final exam; FILM 300 Mid-term, final exam, research project</td>
<td>Senior survey, student reflections on FILM 480 project</td>
<td>Internship experience, employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of Student Learning 2011-2014

**PLO #1  Demonstrate understanding of the critical and technical**

*Demonstrate their understanding of the critical and technical language associated with film studies, including genres, classic narrative and non-narrative forms, mise-en-scène, cinematography, editing, sound, and modes of screen reality*

Since this was the first year of assessment of any aspect of the major, based primarily on our previous knowledge of the work of the students in the major, that approximately 75% would be assessed to have satisfactorily met the goals of PLO #1 upon assessment of their work.

As a means of assessing students’ work related to this PLO, we evaluated 34 assignments from five film classes:

- FILM 300 (Film Theory and Criticism), spring 2012
- FILM 301 (The History of the American Cinema), fall 2011
- FILM 421 (British, French, and German Film), fall 2011
- FILM 421 (The 1950s and Film), spring 2012
- FILM 480 (Senior Project in Film Studies), fall 2011 and spring 2012.

Of these assignments, five were senior films made by all of our graduating seniors, working in pairs or groups (meaning that all of our graduating students’ final projects were evaluated), along with the reflection papers written by students about their participation in and responsibility for their films. Grades received on these assignments ranged from A to C-.

The feedback received in the senior surveys was evaluated with particular attention to how they reflected students’ views of characteristics of the major related to the components of PLO #1. Our comments about the surveys can be seen below, under “Indirect Evidence.”
**Film Studies**

**Direct Evidence:** For purposes of this aspect of the assessment process, a rubric was created in which PLO #1 was broken down into four integrally-related categories, each of which was separately rated on each student assignment that was evaluated (see Appendix B). The four categories were “Critical and Technical Language,” “Genres, Narrative Forms, and Non-Narrative Forms,” “Mise-en-scène, Cinematography, Editing, Sound,” and “Modes of Screen Reality”—which, taken together, represent the whole of PLO #1. Each assignment was given a rating of “1” (“little reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”), “2” (“satisfactory reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”), “3” (“very good reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”), or “N/A” (“reflecting knowledge of these components of this PLO was not necessarily pertinent to or required of this assignment”). It is important to remember that not all components of a PLO, of course, will be pertinent to every assignment and thus cannot be expected to be reflected in all assignments.

Thirty-four written assignments were re-read and scored, irrespective of the grades they received, according to the degree to which they reflected the relevant components of the PLO. The five senior student films and the reflections written by the twelve students who made them were among those scored and included in this group. The results were as follows:

![Score Distribution Chart]

*Note that nearly half (47%) of assignments in the “Modes of Screen Reality” category were assigned a score of “N/A.”

**CONCLUSION/FINDINGS**
Film Studies

- Action Item #1: As a result of our own observations of the film studies curriculum as well as feedback from students, the film studies faculty, in partnership with the Communication Division, significantly revised the major curriculum during the past year, especially for those students who choose the production emphasis in the major. These revisions were also approved by the faculty of the Humanities and Teacher Education Division, the faculty of the Communication Division, the Seaver Academic Council, and the University Academic Council, and will go into effect this fall. The changes are as follows:
  - The number of units required in the major was increased by 4 (one additional course) as a means of making it more rigorous and comprehensive
  - Students choosing the non-production emphasis in the major may now choose two (rather than one) screenwriting courses and may also choose to take one production course, which previously had not been options
  - The deletion of the current Media Production (MPRD) courses taken by film studies students and the addition of the following courses: Film Producing and Editing, Producing and Directing, Cinematography, Narrative Filmmaking, and Documentary Filmmaking.

We anticipate that the effect of these changes will be to (a) make the curriculum more rigorous; (b) bring the production and non-production students closer together in their educational experiences; and (c) offer more film-studies-specific (rather than television, broadcasting, journalism, and other non-film fields) production courses to our students who choose the production emphasis. As our outstanding graduating senior in 2012, Luke Rodgers, wrote in his senior survey, “I love this program, and I am truly grateful for all it has taught me,” but he also said, “There is a strong disconnect between the productions and critical studies portion of the Film Studies major…. Production professors rarely introduce ideas of theory, genre, etc., going only for things like mise-en-scène, lighting, editing, etc.” It is our hope that the new curriculum will help to address this perceived gap, and it will likely take the next two years (through 2013-2014) to determine whether this in fact occurs.

- Action Item #2: We were on the one hand pleased that the percentage of students who satisfactorily met the goals of PLO #1 exceeded our minimum expectations; and the results make us confident that our students have in fact for the most part learned and experienced what they have needed to learn and experience in relation to this PLO. On the other hand, we also believe that we need to re-examine our rubric and our scoring of student assignments in order to confirm this confidence. This should be done by the time we complete the next annual review, in 2013.

- Action Item #3: We are comfortable for the time being with the program learning outcomes as they currently exist; we have, however, made two minor revisions to the curriculum map related to FILM 200 and FILM 300. Specifically, the curriculum map designations of FILM 200 were changed to “I,
Film Studies

D,” indicating that the thrust of this course is such that its focus is very closely aligned with PLO #1 in particular. Likewise, the curriculum map designations of FILM 300 were changed to “D, M,” indicating that the focus of this course, especially as it pertains to film theory and criticism, is very closely aligned with PLO #1, and that film students, although they will continue to be exposed to these concepts throughout the curriculum, will not receive the amount of intentional exposure to them in other classes that they do in FILM 300.

PLO #2  Demonstrate their critical thinking, analytical, research, and public presentation skills, including cultural diversity

Demonstrate their critical thinking, analytical, research, and public presentation skills as well as the use of print and technology sources appropriate to the discipline of film studies, including their application to issues of ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity.

As noted last year we are a young major and this is the first year we have assessed program learning outcome #2 and the second year we have systematically reviewed our major in tandem with institutional outcomes. As such, based on students classroom performance, we were confident that that approximately 75% of the students work in the major would be judged to have satisfactorily met or exceeded the goals of PLO #2 upon assessment.

As a means of assessing students’ work related to this PLO, we evaluated 71 assignments from fifteen film classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILM 200</td>
<td>Intro to Film</td>
<td>mid-terms and essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 301</td>
<td>The History of the American Cinema</td>
<td>research papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 421</td>
<td>1960’s and American Cinema</td>
<td>research papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 441</td>
<td>Women and Film</td>
<td>mid-terms and research papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 480</td>
<td>Senior Project in Film Studies</td>
<td>research papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILM 200</td>
<td>Intro to Film</td>
<td>mid-terms and essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 300</td>
<td>Film Theory and Criticism</td>
<td>mid-term exams and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 315</td>
<td>Film as Art</td>
<td>mid-term/final exams and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 421</td>
<td>Film Directors</td>
<td>research papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 431</td>
<td>African American Cinema</td>
<td>mid-terms and final group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 451</td>
<td>Religion and Film</td>
<td>research papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 480</td>
<td>Senior Project in Film Studies</td>
<td>production notebooks, short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 480</td>
<td>Senior Project in Film Studies</td>
<td>oral presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 595</td>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>final paper and screenplay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The essay, exams, and research paper grades ranged from A to C. We also reviewed senior survey feedback in relation to PLO#2 and included evaluative work on senior final project oral presentations. We hoped to capture a sampling across the major, inclusive of multiple pedagogical styles.

**Direct Evidence**

For purposes of this aspect of the assessment process, we utilized a rubric in which PLO #2 was broken down into five categories, each of which was separately rated on each student assignment that was evaluated in the following way (see Appendix A):

**PLO #2 rubric components**
1. Critical thinking
2. Analytical thought
3. Ethnic, Gender, or Cultural Diversity
4. Integration of Research
5. Public Presentation

**Give each assignment a rating of:**

“1” (“little reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),
“2” (“satisfactory reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),
“3” (“very good reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),
or “N/A” (“reflecting knowledge of these components of this PLO was not necessarily pertinent to or required of this assignment”).

All seventy-one of the assignments were re-read/screened and scored, irrespective of the grades they received, according to the degree to which they reflected the relevant components of the PLO below. The three senior student films and the reflections written by the twelve students who made them were among those scored and included in this group. The results were as follows:
*Note we only assessed the senior final projects and final group projects in the Women and Film course in this category. These assignments are archived and the entire film faculty is present during the senior presentations which makes oral presentation assessment plausible. Each upper division class requires an oral presentation; however, assessing those assignments are not as beneficial for overall PLO assessment in the discipline as a whole.

**CONCLUSION/FINDINGS**

**Far exceeded our expectations:**

The data reveals that our students are excelling in four of the components of PLO #2: critical thinking, analytical thought, integration of research and public presentation. These areas revealed that all of the samples we reviewed scored 2 or 3 (“satisfactory to very good reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”) in the areas of critical thought and oral presentation. Integration of research scored above the 75% threshold as we expected. Each of the courses represented have contributed to our students in the PLO component areas listed above.

**Below expectation:**

However, the ethnic, gender or cultural diversity component is woefully below our 75% threshold, 57.8%. The data reveals that only two of our core courses in the discipline engage this area with some success: Film 200 Intro to Film and Film 300 Film Theory and Criticism. In addition, FILM 441 Women and Film and FILM 431 African American Cinema are among the 31 representative student assignments that scored 3 (“very good reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”) in this area.
**Film Studies**

**CLOSING THE LOOP**

**Action Item #1:** Our major concern is related to the diversity component in the major. If students opt out of the two primary elective courses that explicitly engage this aspect of the discipline our graduates will not explore this body of knowledge in a meaningful way. We will request that all core courses represent an integration of some aspect of ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity into the course content focus. As a result, we believe all of our students will study some aspect of diversity with clear intention. Our students will no longer have the freedom to opt out of this aspect of their development in the discipline.

**Action Item #2:** We are pleased that the percentage of students who exceeded the critical/analytical goals of PLO #2 was near 100%; we are convinced that the majority of our students are gaining the critical thinking skills necessary to matriculate successfully in the discipline. However, we will be diligent in regard to all of the elective courses in regard to rigor and a satisfactory attempt to include diversity elements where appropriate. As director of the program, Joi Carr will meet with the department faculty (including adjuncts) in Fall 2013 in an effort to engage this conversation and hoping to make significant progress in the next academic year. Prior to the meeting Joi Carr will send out correspondence regarding this Fall’s course offerings requesting immediate attention to this aspect of course content. We will add the diversity component of PLO#2 to next year’s assessment rubric to review our progress.

**Action Item #3:** The review also revealed that FILM 315 needs more rigor in terms of analytical engagement. This course is currently taught as an addendum to FILM 200 Intro to Film. We will request that the adjunct faculty currently teaching this course teach the content as described in the academic catalog for majors at the 300 level since it serves as an upper division elective—rather than teaching the course for GE students who also enroll. In consultation with Steve Parmelee and the Fine Arts Division in Spring 2013, Joi Carr requested the GE Fine Arts designation be removed from FILM 315 and added to FILM 111/311, which is more suited for GE students. The request was approved by the Seaver Academic Council in May 2013 and will be reviewed by University Academic Council in August 2013 for implementation Fall 2014.

**PLO #3** Demonstrate their ability to articulate, through close reading and writing, their own worldviews.

*Demonstrate their ability to articulate, through close reading and writing, their own worldviews. They will be able to explain and respond thoughtfully to the religious, social, ideological, spiritual, moral, and ethical values implied in film texts through their close readings and reflections*

Based on students classroom performance, we were confident that that approximately 75% of the students work in the major would be judged to have satisfactorily met or exceeded the goals of PLO #3 upon assessment.
Film Studies

As a means of assessing students’ work related to this PLO, we evaluated one hundred and thirty-three assignments from fifteen film classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMER 2013</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILM 595</td>
<td>J. Car</td>
<td>3 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 2013</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 200</td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>15 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 200</td>
<td>A. Harrington</td>
<td>15 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 301</td>
<td>S. Parmelee</td>
<td>5 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 421</td>
<td>S. Parmelee</td>
<td>10 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 441</td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>10 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 595</td>
<td>J. Peterson</td>
<td>1 doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRING 2014</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 200</td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>15 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 300</td>
<td>A Harrington</td>
<td>15 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 421</td>
<td>S. Parmelee</td>
<td>10 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 431</td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>14 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 451</td>
<td>S. Parmelee</td>
<td>10 docs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 480</td>
<td>G. Clifford</td>
<td>3 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 480</td>
<td>S. Parmelee</td>
<td>3 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 595</td>
<td>S. Parmelee</td>
<td>3 doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 595</td>
<td>J. Peterson</td>
<td>1 doc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grades on the collected essays, exams, and research papers ranged from A to C. We also reviewed senior survey feedback in relation to PLO#3 and included evaluative work on senior Capstone final projects and their oral presentations. We hoped to capture a sampling across the major, inclusive of multiple pedagogical styles and concomitant effectiveness.

Direct Evidence

For purposes of this aspect of the assessment process, we utilized a rubric in which PLO #3 is broken down into five categories, each of which is separately rated for each student assignment evaluated (see Appendix A):

PLO #3 rubric components
1. Critical thinking [included for this year’s Core assessment]
2. Analytical thought through close read
3. Ethnic/Race, Gender, or Cultural Diversity [included for world view and for review for action item from last year’s assessment work]
4. Articulation of own worldview (implicitly/explicitly)
5. Worldview Sub-category: Religious/spiritual/moral reflection

Give each assignment a rating of:
“1” (“little, unsatisfactory, reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),
**Film Studies**

“2” (“satisfactory, developing stage, reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),

“3” (“very good, developing toward mastery stage, reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),

or “N/A” (“reflecting knowledge of these components of this PLO was not necessarily pertinent to or required of this assignment”).

All one hundred and thirty-three of the assignments were re-read/screened and scored, irrespective of the grades they received, according to the degree with which each assignment reflected the relevant components of the PLO below. The graduating senior final Capstone projects and reflections also among those assignments scored and included in this group. The results are as follows:

*Note: For this PLO sub-category we specifically assessed the senior capstone projects, final exam projects in the Women and Film and African American Cinema, the diversity unit assignment in FILM 300, and essay assignments in FILM 451 Religion and Film.

*Sub-category: Religious/Spiritual/Moral Reflection

**CONCLUSION/FINDINGS**

**Exceeded our expectations:**

The data reveals that our students are excelling relatively well in all of the components in PLO #3 related to close read, writing, and articulation of worldview. The samples we reviewed scored 2 or 3 (“satisfactory to very good reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”) in the areas of close read and articulation of worldview, scoring in the 87-100% range, above our 75% expectation threshold.

In addition, our second year review of the ethnic, gender or cultural diversity component of PLO#2 reveals the immediate changes we made to the program this year at the course
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content level has already and will significantly enhance the quality of this learning outcome in the future. Every representative assignment included some aspect of this PLO in a meaningful way, scoring 2 or 3 at 100%, above or 75% threshold.

**Below expectation:**

There were a few comments in the senior surveys we will have to explore and address. One student reported that she felt one particular professor graded papers without addressing the content of her thought with regularity. She believed this repetitive habit of grading cosmetically (“grammar only”) prohibited her from growing in her analytical writing skills.

**CLOSING THE LOOP**

**Action Item#1**

In our first department meeting in the fall we will discuss pedagogical styles and grading styles toward facilitating a list of best practices that will foster qualitative results for our Program Learning Outcomes, especially related to developing clear analytical claims beyond first order. We noticed some of the papers at the 200 level lacked the quality of depth we expect at the introductory level. We will also address the practice of merely grading for grammar by providing a list of grading best practices that promotes an opportunity for student reflection on her/his own rhetoric style and thought development toward clear, cohesive, argumentative prose.

List and comment on specific changes in your program which have been made in response to Action Items in previous Assessment Reports.

Action Items related to diversity program outcomes were vigorously addressed with new strategies implementation this academic year. We also re-assessed with PLO#3:

**Action Item #1 (2013 Report):** Our major concern is related to the diversity component in the major. If students opt out of the two primary elective courses that explicitly engage this aspect of the discipline our graduates will not explore this body of knowledge in a meaningful way. We will request that all core courses represent an integration of some aspect of ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity into the course content focus. As a result, we believe all of our students will study some aspect of diversity with clear intention. Our students will no longer have the freedom to opt out of this aspect of their development in the discipline.

**Action Item #2 (2013 Report):** We are pleased that the percentage of students who exceeded the critical/analytical goals of PLO #2 was near 100%; we are convinced that the majority of our students are gaining the critical thinking skills necessary to matriculate successfully in the discipline. However, we will be diligent in regard to all of the elective
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courses in regard to rigor and a satisfactory attempt to include diversity elements where
appropriate. As director of the program, Joi Carr will meet with the department faculty
(including adjuncts) in Fall 2013 in an effort to engage this conversation and hoping to
make significant progress in the next academic year. Prior to the meeting Joi Carr will send
out correspondence regarding this Fall’s course offerings requesting immediate attention to
this aspect of course content. We will add the diversity component of PLO#2 to next year’s
assessment rubric to review our progress.

PLO #4 Demonstrate their skills in the praxis of film production

Students with an emphasis in digital media production: Demonstrate their skills in the
praxis of film production.

The means of assessing this outcome:

Direct Evidence

Assessing short film and advanced writing assignments from the following courses. The
assignments were scored against a rubric created by the Association of American Colleges
and Universities (AACU) and the film studies faculty (see Appendixes A and B):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL 2014</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILM 250</td>
<td>C. Chapin</td>
<td>short films (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 320</td>
<td>M. Smith</td>
<td>short films (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 325</td>
<td>S. Lucas</td>
<td>short films (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 470</td>
<td>S. Salas</td>
<td>short films (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 480</td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>capstone final project: short film (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPRING 2014</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILM 250</td>
<td>C. Chapin</td>
<td>short films (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 250</td>
<td>C. Chapin</td>
<td>short films (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 320</td>
<td>M. Smith</td>
<td>short films (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 410</td>
<td>N. Dodd</td>
<td>screenplay (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 470</td>
<td>S. Salas</td>
<td>short films (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 480</td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>capstone final project: thesis paper (1), reflective paper (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 480</td>
<td>V. Knutsen</td>
<td>capstone final projects: reflective papers (5); short films (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 480</td>
<td>L. Kreiner Wilson</td>
<td>capstone final project: screenplay (1), reflective paper (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 560</td>
<td>C. Detweiler</td>
<td>short films (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All production courses are cross listed as MPRD and creative writing course are
cross listed as CRWR.
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1. Indirect Evidence:
   - Senior surveys from graduating seniors
   - 60 minute focus group with graduating production students in FILM 480.

2. Authentic Evidence—Information about student success in internships and employment during the summer and academic year.
   - FILM 595  Carr  reflective journals (summer)
   - Senior Survey data

This was our first year assessing outcome #4 in the major. As such, based on student performance at the capstone level the last three years, we were confident that approximately 75% of the student work in the major would demonstrate to have satisfactorily met or exceeded the goals of PLO #4 upon assessment (scores ranging above 2 satisfactory understanding).

As a means of assessing the data related to PLO #4, we evaluated 35 short film assignments from fourteen film classes:

In relation to PLO#4, we also reviewed internship reflective assignments, senior survey feedback, and included evaluative comments on graduating senior capstone final projects and concomitant oral presentations.

- **Direct Evidence** – Discuss performance-based evidence gathered from observation or an evaluation of student work. Be sure to include empirical data as well as rubrics and other evaluation tools.

For purposes of this aspect of the assessment process, we utilized a rubric in which PLO #4 is broken down into six categories, each of which is separately rated for each student assignment evaluated (see Appendix A):

**PLO #4  rubric components**
1. Overall Narrative
2. Tech 1 (Mise-en-Scene )
3. Tech 2 (Sound Design /Scoring)
4. Script Development
5. Directing
6. Diversity Exploration [base lining exploration and quality of it, regardless of assignment requirement]

**Give each assignment a rating of:**

“4” (“sophisticated understanding, developing toward mastery stage, reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),
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“3” (“sound understanding, developing toward mastery stage, reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),

“2” (“satisfactory understanding, developing stage, reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),

“1” (“minimal understanding, unsatisfactory reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),

“0” (“unacceptable, does not meet any benchmarks/characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),

or “N/A” (“reflecting knowledge of these components of this PLO was not necessarily pertinent to or required of this assignment”).

All the assignments were re-read/screened and scored, irrespective of the grades they received, according to the degree with which each assignment reflected the relevant components of PLO #4. The graduating senior final Capstone projects are also among those assignments scored and included in this group. The results are as follows:

Conclusions

MEETS OR EXCEEDS OUR EXPECTATIONS:

The data reveals that over 94% of our students, at each developmental phase in the program, are demonstrating a competency in narrative storytelling (through the
audio/visual medium). The students are grasping cinematic techniques related to capturing quality footage and arranging the footage into a cogent narrative. The majority of the assignments scoring 3 (sound understanding) or higher represent 300 level or 400 level courses.

**Senior Final Projects**

We are continuing to monitor the depth with which our graduating seniors explore diversity in assignments without being assigned or prompted to do so. The results are as follows:

PLO#3 Demonstrate their ability to articulate, through close reading and writing, their own worldviews. They will be able to explain and respond thoughtfully to the religious, social, ideological, spiritual, moral, and ethical values implied in film texts through their close readings and reflections.

The Final Capstone Projects were quite strong this year technically and rich in the area of exploring diversity. Seventy-five percent of our graduating seniors explored aspects of diversity as central to their narrative development and most were able to develop the overall scope of the exploration in a compelling and relevant way.

Beyond the technical improvements the students exhibited this year, the critical reflection and maturity that resonated this year was satisfying to witness. Several of the projects tackled complex social issues with sensitivity in a non-conventional (stereotypical) way. Some of the projects asked provocative questions that provoked the audience to consider the human condition in all of its multidimensionality. For example:

“A Matter of Choice” a short film by Samantha Cash
- exploration of child birth and loss from a gendered perspective, including post pardon depression
- explores mental health from a gendered perspective
- features strong adult female story and performance
- note: camera positions and lighting is visually stunning, capturing the young woman’s emotional distress

“Forgive Me Dad” a short film by Emir Kumova
- a sensitive look at Alzheimer disease and the impact it has on the familial dynamics
- casting was strong with generational representation
- specifically, explores guilt and shame caregivers might feel when caring for loved ones, wrestling with obligation, love, and the desire to be free from the service/perceived life constraints.

“Running Scared” a short film by Brittany New
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- explores the social construction of race/ethnicity and challenges ideological narratives regarding young black males, calling for media literacy

“Conscious” a short film by Matthew Ontiveros
- explores mental illness from a young adult male perspective

“Pink Bicycle” a short film by Richelle Chen
- featured an adolescent wrestling with sexuality
- features generational representation with compassion

**BELOW EXPECTATIONS/AREAS OF CONCERN:**

Although we exceeded the satisfactory requirement for at least 75% of our students to be able to demonstrate skills at each developmental phase, we believe we still have much more work to do with the curriculum. Our introductory level courses reveal that students are not receiving fundamental skill development in courses designed to do so (in particular FILM 250 Film Production and Editing and FILM 320 Producing and Editing). We consider the follow areas in need of our immediate attention:

- evidence that sound design development needs to start earlier and with more robust and comprehensive introductory and intermediate training
- evidence that directing skills (developmentally) need to start earlier
- evidence that all production track majors should be required to fulfill an introductory screenwriting course since story arcs lack clarity and nuance
- evidence that all production students need more training at the introductory and intermediate level in editing
- evidence that students need more development in telling creative approaches to hackneyed narratives (the shorts are replete with similar visual choices, pacing, and scene development)
- evidence that there is a need to address and track students more closely to strengthen sequenced development (for preparation for next stage of skill-set development)

**Brief Summary of Focus Group Data**
themes that emerged from Seaver graduating seniors—

- feeling overwhelmed and/or unprepared for capstone experience
  - “feeling very underprepared coming from other classes to this class”
  - “It has been easier for me at least because 320 prepared me for 480”
“Moderately competent in everything, not good in one thing. Up till now we have been able to choose our classes and avoid our weaknesses, but in this class [FILM 48] we have to do everything.”

- perceived that the lower level courses did not fulfill course description “[FILM 250] It was a very basic class. I feel like it was sort of a waste of my units.”
- perception that film studies production students are not welcome in Communication Division

“People [students and staff] said they were annoyed with the film study class…up there taking the equipment.”

- perceives lack of consistency in skill development across semesters in the same course
- cites issues with equipment check out
- cites issues with not knowing about insurance and filming policy

**CLOSING THE LOOP**

**Action Item #1**

Reflect on curriculum to address the developmental gaps in the trajectory of study. This action may include one or more of the following: augmenting current courses, creating additional courses, and requesting faculty to teach course as designed and published in the academic catalog. We will use this summer and fall to identify and develop an actionable plan and submit request for changes through the appropriate channels.

**Action Item #2**

Strategize and initiate plan for developing a more collaborative, nurturing, and welcoming climate and partnerships across cinematic endeavors at Seaver.

**Action Item#1 (update 2014 Report)**

In our first department meeting in the fall we will discuss pedagogical styles and grading styles toward facilitating a list of best practices that will foster qualitative results for our Program Learning Outcomes, especially related to developing clear analytical claims beyond first order. We noticed some of the papers at the 200 level lacked the quality of depth we expect at the introductory level. We will also address the practice of merely grading for grammar by providing a list of grading best practices that promotes an opportunity for student reflection on her/his own rhetoric style and thought development toward clear, cohesive, argumentative prose.

**Next steps—**

We have not yet addressed this action item comprehensively. As Program Director, I plan to identify ongoing professional development opportunities for our faculty to explore
pedagogical resources—in addition to including opportunities throughout the academic year for us to reflect collaboratively on our own pedagogical approaches.

**PLOs and Core Competencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment of Writing Competency**

**Rubric Components**

1. Context of and Purpose for Writing
2. Content Development
3. Genre and Disciplinary Conventions
4. Syntax and Mechanics
5. Sources and Evidence
6. Diversity Exploration

**Give each assignment a rating of:**

“4” (“sophisticated understanding, developing toward mastery stage, reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),
“3” (“sound understanding, developing toward mastery stage, reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),
“2” (“satisfactory/basic understanding, developing stage, reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),
“1” (“minimal understanding, unsatisfactory reflection of the characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),
“0” (“unacceptable, does not meet any benchmarks/characteristics pertaining to this component of the PLO”),
or “N/A” (“reflecting knowledge of these components was not necessarily pertinent to or required of this assignment”).

We evaluated the following assignments for all graduating seniors—the senior capstone reflective paper and one critical paper from an upper division course:
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Capstone Courses for Assessment of Writing Competency

SPRING 2014

FILM 480  J. Carr  capstone final project: thesis paper (1), reflective paper (1)
FILM 480  V. Knutsen  capstone final projects: reflective papers (5)
FILM 480  L. Kreiner Wilson  capstone final project: screenplay (1), reflective paper (1)

Other Upper Division Courses

FILM 315  B. Graf  final paper (1)
FILM 365  M. Sugimoto  final papers (2)
FILM 410  N. Dodd  screenplay (1)
FILM 421  S. Parmelee  final papers (1)
FILM 441  J. Carr  final papers (1)
FILM 451  S. Parmelee  final papers (1)
FILM 462  J. Carr  final papers (2)

We conclude that 85% of our graduates should be able to provide evidence for a skill level at or exceeding a basic understanding toward sound understanding (score of 2 or higher). We assessed nine capstone assignments and nine upper division final paper assignments for graduating seniors. The results are as follows:

| PLO #4 | Component | Score 4 | Score 3 | Score 2 | Score 1 | Score 0 | N/A | Students Scoring
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3, or 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18/18 = 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context of and Purpose for Writing</td>
<td>4/18 = 22.22%</td>
<td>13/18 = 72.22%</td>
<td>1/18 = 5.56%</td>
<td>0/18 = 0%</td>
<td>0/18 = 0%</td>
<td>18/18 = 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Development</td>
<td>3/18 = 16.67%</td>
<td>9/18 = 50%</td>
<td>6/18 = 33.33%</td>
<td>0/18 = 0%</td>
<td>0/18 = 0%</td>
<td>18/18 = 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</td>
<td>2/18 = 11.11%</td>
<td>11/18 = 61.11%</td>
<td>5/18 = 27.78%</td>
<td>0/18 = 0%</td>
<td>0/18 = 0%</td>
<td>18/18 = 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syntax and Mechanics</td>
<td>3/18 = 16.67%</td>
<td>9/18 = 50%</td>
<td>6/18 = 33.33%</td>
<td>0/18 = 0%</td>
<td>0/18 = 0%</td>
<td>18/18 = 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sources and Evidence</td>
<td>1/18 = 5.56%</td>
<td>6/18 = 33.33%</td>
<td>2/18 = 11.11%</td>
<td>0/18 = 0%</td>
<td>9/18 = 50%</td>
<td>9/9 = 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>2/18 = 11.11%</td>
<td>3/18 = 16.67%</td>
<td>8/18 = 44.44%</td>
<td>3/18 = 16.67%</td>
<td>0/18 = 0%</td>
<td>2/18 = 11.11%</td>
<td>13/16 = 81.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Findings –

We are pleased to confirm that 100% of our graduating seniors scored above the 85% threshold of demonstrating the ability to write in a satisfactory manner in this competency. We note that the critical studies students seemed to be stronger in the area of writing that includes extensive research. We conclude that this phenomenon might be attributed to their core upper division courses that require more of this kind of development in the discipline. The reflective assignments reveal that our students are comfortable and quite adept at articulating poignant critical self-reflective thought.

Critical Thinking and Diversity

Critical Thinking is a core competency in the Film Studies major. All of the core courses and upper division electives courses in critical studies require development and demonstration of this Core skill. This year we evaluated one hundred and thirty-three assignments in relation to critical thinking, along with PLO #3. For a detailed list of courses and assignments we assessed please see section “VIII. Status Report of Assessment Activities” of this report. The following scores reflect the results we assessed regarding this particular Core Competency (the rubric for the score are delineated in section “VIII” as well):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Students Scoring 2 or 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>5/133 = 3.76%</td>
<td>20/133 = 15.04%</td>
<td>108/133 = 81.20%</td>
<td>0/133 = 0%</td>
<td>121/133 = 96.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have learned that our program learning outcomes related to this Core Competency provides a rich opportunity for our students to demonstrate their facility with developing, hypothesizing, analyzing, evaluating, and articulating complex issues with sophistication. We are pleased that over 96% of the assignments assessed scored within or above the satisfactory skill set, with 81.20% scoring toward strong development and mastery for upper division students. The graduating seniors’ Capstone assignments were exemplary this year: 4 short films, one screenplay, and one thesis. The depth and complexity of their work demonstrated a mastery of this skill as well. See section “VI. Diversity” for an in-depth discussion of the diversity outcome and the content of the Capstone final projects.

The five assignments that scored in the unsatisfactory range were from FILM 451 Religion and Film. The assignment sheet clearly articulates the critical component required although...
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students did not successfully engage a critical approach to the assignment. We deemed the work received and assessed from FILM 451 well below satisfactory levels. Perhaps there may have been stronger papers from other students in the course that the professor could have selected and submitted for review. However, we are confident that as evidenced the majority of our students are gaining competency in this area at each level of formation.

Diversity Outcomes

List and address specific PLOs, courses, or other aspects of your curriculum which address diversity issues or further the students' understanding of and sensitivity to diverse populations, learning styles, cultures, or individuals.

PLO #2 includes the diversity component of the Film Studies program:

Demonstrate their critical thinking, analytical, research, and public presentation skills as well as the use of print and technology sources appropriate to the discipline of film studies, including their application to issues of ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity.

Since we assessed PLO #2 last year we have a clearer understanding of where this aspect of critical learning takes place in the major. The data revealed that most of this engagement takes place in one core course and two elective courses while also revealing that two core courses scored unsatisfactorily in this area:

one core course
FILM 200 Intro to Film (Joi Carr)
scored successfully above 90% of assignments are represented in 43.66% scored 3 “very good reflection”

two elective upper division courses
FILM 431 African American Cinema (Joi Carr)
scored successfully 100% of assignments are represented in 43.66% scored 3 “very good reflection”

FILM 441 Women and Film (Joi Carr)
scored successfully 100% of assignments are represented in 43.66% scored 3 “very good reflection”

two unsatisfactory core courses
FILM 300 Film Theory and Criticism (Harrington)
scored unsatisfactory above 95% of assignments are represented in the 39.44% that scored 1 “little reflection”
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FILM 301 History of American Cinema (Parmelee)
scored unsatisfactory above 95% of assignments are represented in the 39.44% that scored 1 “little reflection”

As a result, last year we posited Action Item #1 which now requires all core courses to immediately include at least one unit or an assignment that engages the diversity outcome in an explicit and measurable way and Action Item #2 requires all upper division elective units to include diversity elements where appropriate (excerpt from report):

**Action Item #1 (2013 Report):** Our major concern is related to the diversity component in the major. If students opt out of the two primary elective courses that explicitly engage this aspect of the discipline our graduates will not explore this body of knowledge in a meaningful way. We will request that all core courses represent an integration of some aspect of ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity into the course content focus. As a result, we believe all of our students will study some aspect of diversity with clear intention. Our students will no longer have the freedom to opt out of this aspect of their development in the discipline.

**Action Item #2 (2013 Report):** We are pleased that the percentage of students who exceeded the critical/analytical goals of PLO #2 was near 100%; we are convinced that the majority of our students are gaining the critical thinking skills necessary to matriculate successfully in the discipline. However, we will be diligent in regard to all of the elective courses in regard to rigor and a satisfactory attempt to include diversity elements where appropriate.

As a result and as outlined in last year’s report as actionable, Joi Carr, Director of Film Studies Program, met with the department faculty (including adjuncts) in August 2013 to discuss and strategized our findings. We all agreed to be proactive and intentional in this area in all of our courses. In FILM 300 Film Theory and Criticism, Dr. Andrew Harrington agreed to add an explicit assignment that requires students to write a 1,000 word essay that applies criticism or theory that frames from a race or feminist perspective to a selected film text. Dr. Steve Parmelee reported that he had papers last year in his courses that engaged diverse subjects, but did not judiciously select them for review. Despite this, we now know that we must have clear intention in every core course that helps facilitate critical engagement with diversity whether integrated throughout course content or as an explicit content unit. We will no longer allow students to opt out of engagement by self-selection, be it elective courses or affinity subjects. Next year in FILM 301 History of American Cinema, Dr. Steve Parmelee will add an assignment that requires critical reflection and/or analysis in this area. Next year we also plan to take a closer look at all of our elective courses we teach annually and discuss ways to integrate this engagement as content and/or assignments.

And, as follow up to the changes we implemented, this year our assessment once again included diversity for review. We hoped to see immediate progress in this area by design. The new assignment in FILM 300 was successful and an assignment we now will be able to
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assess with ease in the future. In FILM 200, this year the midterms and final exams included more critical and contextual questions related to the diversity material already taught in the course. We also noted that, where appropriate, students were encouraged to select topics and critical approaches that wrestled with content/perspectives related to gender, socio-cultural, religious, ageism, ability, and/or race/ethnicity. The results were encouraging. All of the eligible assignments met or exceeded our expectations in this area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #3 Component</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Students Scoring 2 or 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic/Race, Gender, or Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>0/133 = 0%</td>
<td>7/133 = 5.26%</td>
<td>113/133 = 84.96%</td>
<td>13/133 = 9.78%</td>
<td>120/120 = 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again, the Final Capstone Projects were outstanding. All six of the projects have rich analytical thought that engages each focus with clarity and complexity: themes ranging from alienation and isolation to critical self-reflection and vocation; stories that exemplify emotional depth, compassion, maturity, even handed exploration, and social complexity. We consider the quality of critical framing and analysis presented in the following projects this year of high caliber:

“(In)Sight,” a short film by Sophia Acosta, Brandon Cruise, Sarah Houston, Elizabeth Pietrucha, Tibein Tedemet
- documentary on the invisible community of workers who serve the Pepperdine population
- explored with sensitivity from the margins to the center with self-awareness of the socio-political terrain present in the piece

“I Fratelli Ricci,” an original screenplay, feature film length by Allie Adkins
- has two young Italian men as protagonist who struggle because of their station in life

“Stage Play,” a short film by Chloe Cummings, Morgan Jefferson, Ryan Wiczek, Egan Escudero
- has middle age French woman as protagonist who is alienated from society
- entire film in French featuring non-traditional casting and exploration of celebrity culture and self-delusion

“The Storyteller,” an original screenplay, feature film length by Mary Gwen Scott
- has a young female protagonist as subject who discovers her voice as storyteller
- develops a strong character arc that explores vocation from a gendered perspective
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“New School,” a short film by Aisha Almada, Taylor Heinrich, Candace Lowry, Ryan Piché
- documentary on technology for children in the classroom
- explores both point of views on technology and its positive and negative consequences for children in the classroom
- however, the children’s voices were not present in the examination

“The Lord of Leisure,” a short avant-garde film by Tisha Matthews
- has young man as protagonist who struggles with social connection and the meaning of life
- silent film with audio/visual distortion that embodies tenor of psychological exploration

“The Clash Between Pre-existing Music and Written Score in Film,” a critical paper by Madison Broadbent
- explores the corporate agenda and reality of film scoring as industry rather than art form

GE EDUCATION
Alignment of PLOs with General Education Requirements

Program which fulfill GE Requirements.

Two elective courses in the major fulfill the following:
FILM 315 The Film as Art (GE) fine Arts
FILM 365 Japanese and Asian Film (GE) Non-Western

Assessment of courses:
assessed as part of the major: FILM 315 The Film as Art (GE) fine Arts
is not assessed as part of the major: FILM 365 Japanese and Asian Film (GE) Non-Western

ASSEMENT COLLABORATION

Collaboration: Joi Carr, the current director of the Film Studies Program, was the principal writer of this report. Steve Parmelee and Leslie Kreiner Wilson were in consultation regarding data review. All student assignments for this report were provided by Dr. Steve Parmelee, Dr. John Peterson, Dr. Joi Carr, Dr. Leslie Kreiner Wilson, and our adjunct professors, Dr. Andrew Harrington, Dr. Beverly Graf and Professor Graeme Clifford. Dr. Parmelee and Dr. Kreiner Wilson, director of Pepperdine’s MFA Program in Screen and Television Writing, offered their feedback regarding senior final projects and oral presentations, which were incorporated. Students provided their senior surveys and

MEANING, QUALITY, AND INTEGRITY OF THE DEGREE

MEANING

Degree supports institutional mission/learning outcomes and embodies distinct values/institutional commitment:

Film Studies major engages qualitative dialogue regarding diversity, which prepares students for “live of purpose service and leadership”:

The WASC Statement on Diversity is clear that diversity is intrinsically connected to quality. WASC expectations for institutional review includes an important and meaningful diversity component: "Each institution will work toward "appreciation of diversity" as an outcome of undergraduate instruction, and consider all forms of diversity as they affect the education process" --valued in faculty, staff, student body, curriculum and co-curriculum (75). The WASC Statement is clear that programs such as this one must have a presence in the curriculum: "A quality education introduces students to the richness of the intellectual world and broadens the range of scientific and cultural topics on which students can exercise discernment, logic and balanced judgment. Many colleges and universities have found that these purposes are advanced by curricula that examine more fully the philosophies, values, perspectives, history and achievements of the various cultures of the world and the United States" (73).

What is the value of a diverse trans-disciplinary program here at Seaver?

The Film Studies major makes particular contributions to the following goals of the Strategic Plan:

- develop the use of film as a “varied teaching technique”
- recognize that students’ learning is influenced by a variety of factors
- give students an opportunity to “integrate ideas and concepts from different disciplines”
- “encourage the connectedness of learning”
- develop a “comprehensive” view of learning
- seek “an interdisciplinary mindset characterized by the willingness to experience with students the connectedness and integration of knowledge across the curriculum”
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- give students “opportunities to learn about other cultures and the diversity that exists within our own culture in terms of gender, race, ethnic background, class, age, and religion”
- give students opportunities to draw upon multiple disciplines and integrate their ideas to address common themes, issues, or problems.
- contribute to the “general knowledge of the larger world and understand both the wide range of its cultures and their interdependence and the place of their own culture in relationship to the world”
- help appreciate “that multicultural Los Angeles is a microcosm of the world”

The Mission of Seaver College affirms that “there are sources of truth deeper than those of secular culture.” Film studies offers a particularly strong opportunity to discuss ethics and values and explicate Christian perspectives while honoring the objective search for truth. We believe film studies develops critical thinking and critical self-reflection, interdisciplinary learning, and practical skills useful for lives of service. Film has moved to the center of liberal education, posing all of the moral, aesthetic, ideological, perceptual and epistemological questions a Seaver graduate should expect to be conversant in. Film is also a social, cultural and historical document. Thus it shares the concerns and approaches of courses of study as diverse as history, religion, philosophy, sociology, psychology, and political studies, providing students with “intellectual and cultural breadth.”

While we expect the same rigor and preparation students would expect of any major and any film studies major program, we expect that given the Christian commitments and mission of the university, Pepperdine will continue to increase its leadership role in the area of “Religion and Film,” or as described by Rob Johnston, “Reel Spirituality.” Pepperdine already co-sponsors The City of Angels Film Festival. This festival has deliberately engaged Christian scholars and filmmakers. Pepperdine also initiated the Spiritus Award, which recognizes academic writing that calls attention to films that have explicitly or implicitly addressed religious values.

Peer institutions and program curriculum:

Comparison/Alignment:

a) Baylor offers a BA in Film and Digital Media (a thirty-six semester hour program) with at least one three-hour course in speech communication, the remaining eighteen hours for the major must be taken from FDM courses and at least fifteen of the thirty-six semester hours must be at the “3000” or “4000” level.

b) Calvin College offers a Film and Media Studies major. All of the courses are discipline specific with topical elective courses for upper division units.

c) Loyola Marymount only offers a minor.

d) Macalester offers a Media and Cultural Studies major.
The Seaver Film Studies program is aligned with film/media studies program/practices across thirteen of our peer institutions that we have studied. Most of the programs do not offer the kind of interdisciplinary emphasis that we do, but the core courses we offer in most cases a comparable across institutions. We have learned through this five year assessment process that some of the learning development does need strong alignment on the production track for second year students to prepare for upper division practice and mastering of sound design and editing. As discussed in the program review, we have made a few changes to the curriculum to accommodate GE educational requirements and to add breadth to topical subject matter at the 400 level. Compared to our peer institutions, our program offers more depth and breadth in relation to screenwriting, production, and critical studies options (more interdisciplinary in nature).

Film Studies Program and Pedagogy: We have been remiss in this area and plan to develop a culture and practice of reflecting on pedagogical scholarship and practices in the field (as a community). We do, however, as a faculty group, discuss approaches to grading student assignments and assessment of student work. It is important to note that students report deep satisfaction with interaction with faculty (since our program is small and students develop close mentoring relationships with fulltime and affiliated faculty). They seems pleased with experiencing our high-touch environment.
### Film Studies COMPARISION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Institutions</th>
<th># units #credit hour</th>
<th># courses #electives within major</th>
<th>Intro to Discipline</th>
<th>Theory/ History</th>
<th>Capstone Course/ Experience</th>
<th>Internship</th>
<th>Prod. Track/ Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University (BA in Film and Digital Media)</td>
<td>“36 semester hours” (most 3 units)</td>
<td>12?/ Unclear</td>
<td>FDM 1198 Practicum in Audio Production FDM 1199 Practicum in Video Production FDM 1303 Introduction to Mass Communication FDM 1304 Visual Literacy</td>
<td>Seems students can choose their own mix of this and production oriented classes – from a long list – see note below</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FDM 4V03 1-3 semester hours (seems it may be optional)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin College (Film and Media Major within Communication Arts and Sciences)</td>
<td>“35-40 semester hours” (3-4 units)</td>
<td>12 or more/ Unclear</td>
<td>2, 4 unit courses CAS 145 Introduction to Film and Media and CAS 190 Introduction to Digital Filmmaking</td>
<td>Seems students can choose their own mix of this and production oriented classes – from a long list – see note below</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes CAS 346 Internship in Communication 3 units – seems to be an option from a long list, not required</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Marymount University (Film, Television, and Media Studies minor)</td>
<td>Minor only – see note below “18 semester hours” (most 3 units)</td>
<td>6?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>100% for this degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macalester College (Media and Cultural Studies)</td>
<td>40 (4 units)</td>
<td>10/ Yes, 2 “approved”</td>
<td>MCST 110 Texts and Power: Foundations of Media and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>100% for this degree (one course production option)</td>
<td>Yes, MCST 488 Advanced Topics Seminar</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No (can take one production class)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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QUALITY

Co-Curricular Experiences

Seaver College offers a number of opportunities for students to integrate with their academic program experience:

a) ReelStories is a student led film festival that allows students to submit short films and serve as leaders in the program development and implementation of the festival. The festival has base funding and is supported by various Student Affairs office staff and administration.

b) Academic Advisors and Curricular Advisors in the Registrar’s Office.

c) Several physical work spaces on campus with hardware and software support: ACE Writing Lab

d) Several Student Affairs Offices to support matriculation and maturation (service and opportunities for critical self-reflection):
   o ACE Writing Lab (also conducts workshops in media production and editing)
   o Career Center (mentoring, career assessment, and internship exploration)
   o Volunteer Center (provides opportunities to match with service in desired areas and development of global citizenship)
   o Counseling Center provides group session and community building opportunities and individual sessions/assessment toward wellness/support.
   o Office of the Chaplain and Convocation Office/Series

e) The Seaver Dean’s Distinguished Lecture Series provides forums for students to discuss issues related to diversity and inclusion.

f) The Multicultural Theater Project (MTP) is a high impact practice toward transformative learning. Directed by Joi Carr, MTP presents arts-based critical pedagogical that explores diversity through the arts: annual productions and distinguished guest panel and master classes.

g) Research and development of scholarship: Student Undergraduate Research Program and Academic Undergraduate Research Program, and the Faculty/Student Mentor Program

h) Faculty/Staff scholarships for current Seaver undergraduate students

i) International Programs—Pepperdine has seven international sites that student can explore for an academic year to a summer. Students are immersed in the cultural experience while studying General education courses and discipline specific opportunities: Buenos Aires, Argentina, Florence, Italy, Heidelberg, Germany,
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Lausanne, Switzerland, London, United Kingdom, Shanghai, China, Washington D.C., USA, and Australia for Film/Media production students.

**Student Success**

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) provides this data annually and houses the reports on the OIE website and LiveText site. The following comments are derived from the following reports: OIE Alumni Survey, Humanities Teacher Education Division (2015), the OIE Alumni Survey (2015 Qualitative Report) and the Seaver College Registrar’s Office. The program is still quite young so we are beginning to disaggregate the kind of data we need to insure the quality of our program for everyone. Since its inception in 2008, the Film Studies program has graduated 61 majors and 71 minors (since this program began). We have had an influx of women in the major in the last two-three years. We are working on our graduation rate and disaggregating the data without duplicating information. We do not yet have the exact percentage rate available at the time of this report. We believe retention is above 75 percentage, graduating 90% of student enrolled. Students report a great deal of satisfaction with faculty interaction and feel well equipped in the area of critical thinking in the discipline.

**Research/Awards**

The program has three fulltime faculty members who mentor and conduct research with undergraduate each term and summer through the following programs: Student Undergraduate Research Program and Academic Undergraduate Research Program, and the Faculty/Student Mentor Program. Here is a brief list of recent graduates and honors:

Sarah Houston (class of 2014), Fulbright Scholar
Haven Nutt (class of 2013), Kodak Super 8 Filmmaking Challenge (Short Film, Mr. Man)
Taylor Johns (class of 2012), Oscar Nomination for Best Documentary (Associate Producer)
Tucker Alleborn (also class of 2012), Oscar Nomination for Best Documentary (Gaffer)

Our graduates are employed in several major media outlets: Disney, ABC, CBS, Paramount, 1821Media, TimeWarner, JimmyKimmel Live, Marvel Comics, AMC, NFL Network, Fox Sports, and local affiliate stations.

**Areas for improvement students report:**

Helping student gain a greater appreciation for/of the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.

Housed the Film Studies department in one division

Need for a dedicated Internship Director (more critical connections with industry networks)
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Desire for adjunct faculty to have office space in the division on a regular basis

Desire to integrate visual effects and animation into the program

INTEGRITY

The program review related to the integrity of the program can be reviewed under section I of program assessment review, which includes discussion of WASC Core Competencies.

SUSTAINABILITY

Facilities

The program is currently experiencing a transitional period out of the rapid growth and demand of the program. In our Quality Improvement Plan we will be making requests toward bolstering our classroom allocation and equipment resources. The facilities are adequate, but the new pressing demand across several media-centric programs at the undergraduate college will require intentional resource management and additional base funding for equipment and faculty/staff support.

Program Viability

FACULTY AND STAFF

The film Studies program only hires faculty with terminal degrees in the area of critical studies, cultural studies, screenwriting, and media production. We currently have two fulltime faculty for the critical studies track (explicitly) all the other courses are taught by fulltime affiliated faculty for the media production track and other disciplines on campus (languages primarily—Italian and Japanese).

FACULTY AND STAFF

Joi Carr, Associate Professor of English and Film Studies
Carin Chapin, Adjunct Faculty
Graeme Clifford, Adjunct Faculty
Craig Detweiler, Professor of Communication
Nancy Dodd, Adjunct Faculty
Beverly J Graf, Adjunct Faculty
Andrew Harrington, Adjunct Faculty
Vanessa Knutsen, Adjunct Faculty
Leslie Kreiner, Associate Professor of Creative Writing
Stephen Parmelee, Associate Professor of English and Film Studies
John Peterson, Assistant Professor of English
Michael Petitti, Adjunct Faculty
Susan Salas, Visiting Associate Professor of Telecommunications
Michael Smith, Associate Professor of Media Production
Mike Sugimoto, Associate Professor of Asian Studies
Film Studies

External Review Report, March 2016
Submitted by Miranda Banks, Associate Professor of Visual & Media Arts, Emerson College

After two decades of faculty teaching popular and individual film courses, and six years of a popular minor in Film Studies, Pepperdine’s Sever College capitalized on the success of this new minor and the expertise of its faculty across the college to build a Bachelor of Arts in Film Studies. Since its inception in AY 2007-2008, the major has offered two emphases: one track in Film and Media Studies and one in Film and Digital Media Production.

Now, nine years in, the Film Studies Program at Pepperdine University is at a watershed moment. With its innovative and compelling interdisciplinary initiatives, the Film Studies is clearly ready to be integrated more fully in the university’s future development and strategic goals. The following pages offer insights and recommendations for how to help institutionalize the successes inherent in the curriculum and program design of Film Studies. In the coming years, if it is given the institutional support it needs, Film Studies could turn into a robust program and an important bridge between the university and the Hollywood film industry.

Film Studies and the Mission of Pepperdine University

Pepperdine University holds as its mission building innovative leaders with high ethical character who will make a difference within their communities and around the world. Sever College in particular, defines its role as building moral and intellectual leaders who will go into their professional lives valuing service and responsibility over simple achievement, and who integrate artistic, intellectual, and ethical thinking into their work and their lives’ purpose. It is clear to see how the Film Studies major fulfills this mission. On its own merits, and in accordance with Pepperdine’s mission, Film Studies trains students to become well-rounded critical thinkers, responsible artists, and creative leaders.

Today’s students and parents are outcomes oriented. With this in mind, it is worth noting that from a business perspective, excellence in critical and creative thinking, cultural competence, and strong writing skills are considered essential and coveted skills by many employers, not just in the media industries, but in American industry overall. Many of the most talented business and industry leaders have encouraged young people to get a liberal arts education. In 2010, Apple and Pixar founder Steve Jobs argued that, “It’s in Apple’s DNA that technology alone is not enough… It’s technology married with liberal arts, married with the humanities, that yields the results that make our hearts sing.” Other CEOs have followed suit, as cited in Fast Company: “[T]ech CEOs across the country agree that liberal arts training—with its emphasis on creativity and critical thinking—is vital to the success of their business.” In other words, data has shown that industry and artistry are often both at their best when the skills are combined. Film Studies is bridging these areas well—and with focused intentionality.

Whether graduates of the Film Studies program go on to work in Hollywood or not, they will get an excellent education and the skills the university believes are essential to becoming great servant-minded leaders and wise life-long learners. The faculty, the students, and the program chair spoke about Film Studies as a great passion and as the
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highlight of their work at the college. Students in the program were willing and eager to
have dynamic conversations about art and culture—and they are eager to be challenged.
The faculty are excited about the stories students want to tell about the human condition.
The chair of the program, Dr. Joi Carr, is an exceptional leader with her own footprint in
the industry who has built an exciting interdisciplinary program. With its Christian mission
and its unique location in Malibu, Pepperdine University has the opportunity to become a
moral center in Hollywood.

Strengths of the Program

Though classes are separated across upper and lower campus, the passion students have toward their
major, the strong bond students feel toward faculty, the passion faculty feel towards the curriculum,
and the faculty’s investment in the success of their students speaks to the cohesiveness of the
program and its potential to grow. The student learning outcomes reflect the disciplinary standards
and best practices for assessment within the discipline of Film Studies. The assessments of student
achievement yield a narrative of impressive growth and increasing academic rigor.

Since its inception, Film Studies had benefited by being guided by the vision of Joi Carr’s
experience with building curriculum, practical and scholarly knowledge of film, and dedication to
the college and the success of the program. The two tracks within the program have been designed
to offer synergies but also allow students to hone in on their areas of interest. The design of this two
track major has been even more impressive considering that the program director has had little to no
power of oversight to help film production faculty craft and sequence the production curriculum
(and interrupt practices by faculty that teach courses outside the developmental purpose/design of
the course as prescribed to facilitate student learning).

The critical studies courses offer a strong intellectual grounding. In particular, the theory oriented
courses seem rigorous and thought-provoking. Students articulated and faculty concurred that
students as they move through the program are increasingly able to make connections between film
theory and film practice. Students on the production track expressed that they were “more
knowledgeable and appreciative” of the art and history of film after taking their critical studies
courses. Film Studies faculty—full, affiliate, and adjunct—provide a strong grounding through
coursework, but offer students room for creative experimentation with their projects. While the
major is still new, the blend of intellectual rigor and creative production has already been present in
a number of thoughtful capstone projects that embody the vision of the college. Student capstone
projects have included stories about postpartum depression, Alzheimer’s disease, the social
construction of race and ethnicity, mental illness, and generational conflict.

When the affiliated Film Studies faculty in the Communication Division are able to teach film
studies students, the quality of the student experience—and their output is markedly improved (as
noted in assessment last year). These faculty, like Michael Smith, are deeply invested in the Film
Studies major and are eager to teach more cinematic production courses. Students are thriving under
the tutelage of the dedicated screenwriting faculty (Leslie Kreiner and Nancy Dobbs) and small
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workshop format courses. They are also benefitting from industry guest speakers and distinguished guests through the Multicultural Theatre Project that broadened reflection on the intersectionality of socio-cultural identity. Students are building skills in character development and narrative arc that are starting to positively affect the quality of student capstone films (more depth and complexity). In addition, with access to guest speakers/connections made through faculty, and engagement in special events in Los Angeles, students have been able to secure meaningful internships. So far students have been making great strides in getting jobs, but with more support from career services for internships or a dedicated departmental staff member, the program could place students in internships that might later lead to full-time positions, as evidenced in the alumni data.

**Challenges Faced By Film Studies**

There are a number of critical concerns related to the allocation of resources that need to be addressed, most notably related to academic oversight, space, and technology.

**Film Studies Across the Divisions:**

As the numbers of students within the major attest, the Film Studies program captures the interest of undergraduates who flocked to the major, 71 gradates since the programs inception. And yet, these numbers have fluctuated recently—not because of lack of interest but rather from lack of clarity about where film is taught within the college. For many years, film was the domain of the Humanities and Teacher Education Division. In the past few years, new production majors focused on cinematic arts have been cropping up across the college, in Communication, in Theatre, and in Humanities. These students have been filling the Film Studies critical courses and production courses, but have not been counted as part of one single major. This influx has put enormous strain on Film Studies faculty (in both divisions), who are working with students with vastly different foundational courses, especially related to aesthetics, history, criticism/theory.

Since 2008, Film Studies students have been taking studies courses through the Humanities and Teacher Education Division and their general production courses through the Communications Division. The production courses are often filled by students across two (if not four) different major disciplines: Film Studies, Media Production (Communication), Theatre and Media Production, and Journalism. The faculty hired to teach film production (FILM 250) must split their course time between the needs of two (to four) very distinct student groups. And yet the disciplinary needs for these students are rarely compatible. Because of this need for the course to cover the basics for all students, students found the course “basic.” The Communications Division has serviced the production classes. But the coursework has focused on a social science study of media. While this is a critical and important method for academic study, it is not a discipline unique from Film Studies. In order for the Film Studies program to grow and for students to graduate with the knowledge and craft-based expertise demanded of film program graduates, Film Studies needs cinema-specific courses and cinema-specific production equipment. With these in place, students will be better prepared for internships as well as jobs once they graduate. Concomitantly, these disparate disciplines that are at times in one course also affects the way in which faculty may choose to teach the courses which at times deviates to far from the original course design and purpose.
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Part of these difficulties lay in defining Film Studies as a discipline. Depending on the university, the film studies has emerged out of humanities, fine arts, mass communication, or broadcast journalism. Ultimately, as these programs have become stand alone departments or divisions, faculty have been pulled together from these disparate fields of study. Both because of its strong focus on aesthetics and culture, Film Studies offers an important approach into the inquiry and production of visual storytelling. Because the structure of the major is grounded by the service mission of Pepperdine University, students who complete the major are intellectually prepared to take on the challenges they will find in an industry in crisis. At a time when Hollywood is faced with an enormous number of problems—from changes in media technologies that have upset economic structures, to calls to curb excessive violence, to campaigns to increase racial and gender equity both in front of and behind the screen—graduates who have a strong background in historical knowledge of the medium, documentary and fictional narrative, cultural analysis, ethical storytelling, and collaborative production are sorely needed throughout the industry. Film Studies is already a successful interdisciplinary program. Rather than letting it be gutted for resources by new programs, the administration should consider folding these new production programs into this already existent, already thriving program. But without proper guidance from the provosts’ office, the different divisions of the college will soon be building programs that are competing with each other for faculty, courses, equipment, and students (which seems as the emerging case at Seaver College).

Foundational Critical Courses:

In speaking with students and reviewing course syllabi, there is some overlap among studies courses. In particular, FILM 315 and FILM 300 cover some of the same ground. Students in FILM 300 are not sufficiently challenged by course material or by learning assessments. Some students even said, “We watched way too many films in class.” It is critical that these courses be examined to make sure that the courses are not only additive in terms of content but also increasingly rigorous.

In terms of production, as of now, most students in the major do not get their hands on film equipment until their junior year, depending on the instructor in FILM/MPRD 250, who may be teaching the course with her/his desired interest rather as prescribed in the curricular design. Ideally there should be a production course taught early on within the major—or a theory and practice course that includes some production, irrespective of the professor who teaches it. Since the Humanities faculty of Divisional Dean have no control over who is hired or allocated to teach these courses, this current practice makes it difficult for qualitative assessment of student learning—when the content of the course fluctuates drastically based on who may be hired to teach in any given year.

Intermediate Courses:

Now that the program has successfully graduated 71 majors, the faculty is much better to assess and clarify the areas that need to be enriched within the curriculum. While there is some concern about overlap among foundational courses, the area for the most growth needs to be in intermediate courses in sound design, in screenwriting, and in industry analysis. In particular, the faculty is in
agreement that they need a course in audio recording and sound design and intermediate screening writing.

Currently, screenwriting classes are not required, but as the program grows, the curriculum will need to include a required screenwriting class in order to achieve its learning outcomes, for students to attain the outcomes needed for graduates of the program, and will enhance the quality of students’ capstone projects, no matter which track they are following. While there is a strong introductory screenwriting course and an advanced screenwriting course, there is great demand for an intermediate class. Currently, one faculty member is doing nine unpaid directed studies on top of her regular course load and another faculty has five on top of his course load. This practice can be tracked to the beginning of the program and must be addressed, along with the practice of program directors functioning on top of a regular course load with no compensation or course release. These overloads are an untenable burden on faculty and a new faculty line and support is highly recommended.

Finally, students would be well served by taking an intermediate studies course that analyses the contemporary film industry and addresses such topics as copyright and piracy, production cultures, regulation, globalization, media convergence, and corporate conglomeration.

Equity in Production Courses:

Four upper-level female students expressed frustration with gender dynamics in production classes. They have found it difficult to get access to cameras, especially when men in their classes come in with previous technical experience. When faculty ask for volunteers, they generally pick students who are already comfortable with the equipment. This means that often women do not touch the cameras and instead are relegated to organizational or less creative roles. FILM 325 would be perfectly suited to have students switch roles each week. For some students, this class was the most balanced. FILM 470 is designed so that students have the same production role throughout the semester, so faculty should make sure that there is equity among students who get key roles. In order for the program to fulfill PLO #2, these concerns about equity not only need to be rectified, but they should be addressed directly as part of the learning in the course.

Branding and Program Administration Support:

While it seems to be a site for potential donors and bringing in prospective students, there is lack of clarity among students and faculty about the role of the Institute for Entertainment, Media, and Culture. The website currently points to “media production”—which is currently a part of Film Studies, Communication, and Theatre, links to Journalism.

As of now, the Film Studies faculty has little opportunity to meet—either in meetings or in the hallways. Because the program is primarily split across two divisions, faculty are required to meet with their divisions rather than with their colleagues within the major. As well, affiliate faculty in Communication are fractured within their department with offices quite far apart and with little to no opportunity to meet, to coordinate, to schedule and scaffold learning in their classes, and to help enrich this growing program.

Equipment and Production Program Administration Support:
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Much like the aforementioned courses, production equipment has been spread across disciplines as well. When Film Studies was approved as a new major, the administration approved the purchase of film equipment. Because production is housed within Communication, the divisional deans decided that Communication would have control of purchasing. While some equipment was procured, it is now shared between students across the campus for majors and non-majors. While this may make sense in terms of storage, in reality, film students are often working with equipment designed for video broadcast and news journalism rather than film production equipment. Cinematic arts production students need dedicated equipment and a separate A/V base funding line to ensure that student have access to industry standard equipment and tools for development and practice. The college does not currently have a A/V tech department for non-majors to check out similar equipment for other purposes beyond course instruction. The Communication Division facilitates the demand for the entire college.

Opportunities for Film Studies and Goals for Growth
In terms of both curricular content and faculty, the Film Studies program is growing stronger, with increasingly coherent curricular visions for students as they matriculate through the program and become 21st century leaders in the fields of entertainment arts and visual culture. The program has extraordinary opportunity to grow—and some simple steps could turn a small program into a marquee program.

Screenwriting Track
As mentioned earlier, currently, one faculty member is doing nine independent studies in screenwriting. The demand for these courses and students interest in honing their skills as creative writers, show that interest in screenwriting is growing. With an MFA in screenwriting already established, the next step for the undergraduate major could be a Film Studies track with an emphasis in screenwriting.

Growth Areas in Studies:
Television, Streaming media, and game design are rapidly growing industries that are based in the cinematic arts. Audiences are turning to a variety of screens to find premiere content at home or on their mobile devices. One tech company declared, “Welcome to the Golden Age of Television Across All Platforms.” The game industry is a juggernaut, with $22.4 billion in consumer spending in 2014, four out of five American households own a games device, and 42 percent of Americans playing video games regularly (3+ hours a week). The industry is increasingly focused on content—whether it is packaged into 5 minute, 22 minute, 47 minute, 2-hour, or 12 hour blocks. The entertainment content companies work across media platforms and it is likely that graduates of the Film Studies program will work in a variety of entertainment industries. Increasing courses on the cinematic arts would be an excellent growth area for the major that could attract even more students. As well, the Reel Spirituality film festival, if it could be established as a Pepperdine event, could be programmed by students as part of a course on film festivals.
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Unification of Studies and Production Faculty

In the Film Studies program, Pepperdine University has an opportunity to become a spiritual center for the entertainment industry. What other college or university with such a strong moral compass has such proximity to the entertainment industry? At the external review meeting with studies and production faculty, the group expressed their deep interest in solidifying their bonds as a cohesive faculty. While the faculty housed in Humanities and Teacher Education are comfortable in their current home, the production faculty feels stymied by their attachment to the Communications division. There is interest in hiring (or reallocating) a production faculty member to the lower campus (HUTE), thereby bridging the areas, but there is serious—and understandable concern—that a production faculty may not be easily tenured in a Humanities and Teacher Education division. Film Studies is a rich program and could build into an impressive program that capitalizes on its connections to the entertainment industry. As it grows, the question of its best divisional home will need to be addressed. As an outsider, it would be easy to imagine a thriving Film and Media Studies division in the University’s future—one that focuses on critical analysis, cinematic arts production, and screenwriting.

Building Internship Program

Whether through Career Services or through the Institute for Entertainment, Media, and Culture, the program should increase internship opportunities for Film Studies Students. Students interested in cinematography could intern at Panavision, located nearby in Woodland Hills. Those who are passionate about studies should be accessing internships at archives, foundations, or libraries affiliated with studios, guilds, or the Academy. This is an enormous area for growth for the department that would deepen students’ learning experiences as well as their chances for future employment. The department needs a dedicated staff allocated to this work as faculty are already overburdened with course loads and student advising.

Endowed Chairs

The program needs more fulltime faculty in critical studies and production. With such strong ties to Hollywood—and even entertainment industry residents in Malibu—the institution should consider courting donors for endowed chairs in Film Studies. This would add to the program’s footprint on the campus and provide a special faculty position that would exclusively serve the Film Studies program.

Program Recommendations

Integration of Film Studies Faculty

A long-term goal for the program would be an integration of production, studies, and screenwriting faculty under one roof. It is highly recommended that the provost, senior administrators, divisional deans, and the film studies faculty work together to find a solution to the short-term concerns of students and faculty. This will then pave the way for further discussions about the possibility for the integration of Film Studies faculty, either under one division or as a more cohesive and supported interdisciplinary program. As well, it would be ideal for there to be some shared space for faculty and students to regularly convene once or twice a semester.
**Film Studies**

In the short term, Film production faculty should have their offices moved so that they are closer together and easier for students to locate. The Film Studies faculty should meet together regularly to plan curriculum, to discuss capstone projects, and to address any programmatic concerns. And it should be better articulated what it means to be affiliate faculty. Ideally on the program’s website, all affiliated faculty should be listed and profiled.

**Increased Production Resources:**

Students and faculty must be able to use the technology that is best suited to their research and creative work. At the very least, campus media services should be open to supporting flexible and diverse industry formats governed by curricular needs first and foremost. Faculty can be trusted to identify the necessary materials for responsible pedagogy in their fields, including but not limited to LED lightkits, 4K monitor, and lens kits.

Until a new foundational production course can be offered or the current one is closely guided by film faculty (as of now this is not possible given equipment constraints), student-to-student mentorship would help first and second year students integrate into the major. Freshmen and sophomore students are eager to gain experience working as crew members on seniors’ capstone projects. This would be an internship-like experience for students during their first few semesters and would help build community among the majors.

**New Faculty Lines:**

Beyond the need for more faculty teaching production, the faculty is in agreement that they need at least one course in audio recording and sound design. The program should increase faculty within studies, as well, ideally in the areas of global cinema and contemporary film industry studies. As well, if screenwriting continues to grow, a new faculty member will need to be hired. Ideally when Film Studies faculty are hired, current Film Studies faculty from across the campus should have a voice in the hiring process.

**Increase Diversity and Equity**

As of now, students can matriculate through the Film Studies major without ever taking a course that focuses on identity in front of or behind the screen, whether on gender, race, ethnicity, class, or religion. Not only should diversity be required within the major, some aspects of diversity should be integrated into every course. Doing this is critical to the major staying consistent with national trends. To this end, a course in global non-Western cinema should be required, as well. This will strengthen the program and attract new students.

**Sequencing of Courses**

In order to best build the curriculum, it is critical that core courses be examined by a group of faculty across the program to ensure that the courses are sequenced correctly so that course content builds across the curriculum and becomes increasingly rigorous and rich. All courses should be assessed for overlap and faculty should be clear about what students will come into their courses already knowing. This will be made easier if upper division Film Studies courses are exclusively about the cinematic arts and are either exclusively offered to Film Studies students or to students who have taken the same introductory courses.
**Film Studies**

Administrative and Staffing Support.

While ideally the program would be housed in one place, if it is to be split, then perhaps there is a way to build program leadership across the divisions, either with two co-chairs or with an added Associate Chair of Film /Media Arts (Associate Divisional Dean). The key is that Film Studies must have divisional and college leadership that understands and supports the unique synergies needed for the program to thrive.

Across many of the interdisciplinary programs at Pepperdine, the staffing of smaller majors is often just placed on the director of the programs’ shoulders. Some staff run multiple departments. This can pose challenges for the creation of program continuity and managerial succession. It is recommended that staff support help bridge faculty across the multiple divisions and assist with programmatic and technical equipment needs.
Quality Improvement Plan (QIP)

The following QIP arises out of our internal four year assessment and our five year review, which includes reflection in the external review report conducted by Dr. Miranda Banks:

We have learned that our program has a strong and viable critical studies foundation that develops graduates who demonstrate superior analytical and critical thinking skills, who are prepared to enter the film/media industry with confidence and the ability to engage the craft/discipline in a meaningful way. Graduates (graduating seniors) report that they “know” film (the cinematic arts) and feel satisfied with their intellectual journey here at Seaver. We have learned that the interdisciplinary nature of our program is unique and sets us apart from our peer and aspirational institutions. We graduate creative leaders who “think” and want to tell stories that matter in the world related to the human condition. The Film Studies program is strong in many areas: course interdisciplinary options, student learning outcomes and program learning outcomes aligned with mission and strategic plan, and WASCUC core competencies. Students cite the overall course study as fulfilling (aesthetics, theory/criticism, and production) and their ability to interact with experts in the industry during panel discussion and guest lectures as bonus experiences. They also cite faculty relationships as the most enriching part of their experience here (in external review interviews and assessment surveys).

This reflective time has also pointed out areas that require our immediate attention toward insuring that the Film Studies program continues to thrive and grow. We hope to spend the rest of this term and summer reflecting together to devise our next steps toward resolving some of the areas of concern. We consider the follow areas in need of our immediate attention (from student perspective):

- evidence that sound design development needs to start earlier and with more robust and comprehensive introductory and intermediate training
- evidence that directing skills (developmentally) need to start earlier
- evidence that all production track majors should be required to fulfill an introductory screenwriting course since story arcs lack clarity and nuance
- evidence that all production students need more training at the introductory and intermediate level in editing
- evidence that students need more development in telling creative approaches to hackneyed narratives (the shorts are replete with similar visual choices, pacing, and scene development)
- evidence that there is a need to address and track students more closely to strengthen sequenced development (for preparation for next stage of skill-set development)
- evidence that students feel uncomfortable with the program functioning out of two divisions
- evidence that some students feel unprepared for capstone experience
- evidence that students perceive a schism between division resources/professional community
- cites issues with equipment check out (and feeling unwelcome by staff/students)
- cites lack of knowledge of art as industry (business)
Film Studies
Requires Deeper Reflection

We have learned that being housed over two divisions without regular communication and purview over faculty and course designation creates challenges toward student learning, qualitative assessment, and follow up on action items post assessment (from faculty perspective):

**Challenges:** Program Alignment (curriculum, practices, processes, and resources)

- No control over professors who teach production course
- No control over content taught in production courses
- No control over resources
- No dedicated resources for Film Studies program
- No control over who matriculates in courses: students from multiple disciplines are in critical studies and production courses together at different developmental and discipline specific stages (with varied foundational courses some related to aesthetics, history, criticism/theory of film others communication theory and social science)
- Need for intermediate courses: in screenwriting, sound design, editing, art as industry (business), and global cinema.
- Develop animation/visual effects course/opportunities
- Closer review of core courses and development stages
- Resources (administrative support, faculty, directed studies courses stipend/course load option, dedicated equipment/software) proximity
- Need for pedagogical workshops: engaging class in sustained peer to peer discussion, providing critical feedback on written paper beyond grammatical information.
- Providing opportunities for students to experience a variety of instructors rather than one faculty member for three or more classes.
- Gender dynamics in class room setting in production classes: creating a space for everyone to have opportunity to thrive
- Branding of program (communicating to college and public)
- Relationship to media arts at the college across the various divisions (theatre, communication, humanities, international languages)
- Develop clear relationship/protocol with affiliated faculty and divisions
- Develop internship program

**Suggestions from External Reviewer:**
Unification of Studies and Production Faculty
Building Internship Program
Integration of Film Studies Faculty
Increased Production Resources:
New Faculty Lines
Increase Diversity and Equity
Sequencing of Courses
Administrative and Staffing Support.
Film Studies
Next Steps:

We are grateful that the external review provided a clearer picture of what we believe to be the trajectory of cinema/media arts at Seaver College. The faulty have expressed a strong desire to create a heathier institutional sphere/structure that will help facilitate the growing needs of the college’s demand for this field of study.

1) Film Studies tenure-track faculty and affiliated tenure-track faculty and visiting faculty will meet over the next few months to reflect on Film Studies program and Media Production program.

2) Combine programs: Based on the initial feedback from the faculty, we plan to develop one program and/or programs that includes film studies, production, screenwriting, and business (a bachelor degree and/or bachelor of fine arts degree).

3) Combine resources: explore options that include requesting resources for all film/media arts related degrees (with specificity for each discipline)

4) Propose combining faculty: We will be exploring the option of developing a new institutional structure that will be inclusive of all cinema/media arts elements at the college— a new school, a new division, or a new way the divisions can function as one entity with purview over areas in this field of study.

5) Propose new faculty line in critical studies and production
PARTIAL EVIDENCE FROM ASSESSMENT REPORT

Below Expectations/Areas of Concern:

Although we exceeded the satisfactory requirement for at least 75% of our students to be able to demonstrate skills at each developmental phase, we believe we still have much more work to do with the curriculum. Our introductory level courses reveal that students are not receiving fundamental skill development in courses designed to do so (in particular FILM 250 Film Production and Editing and FILM 320 Producing and Editing). We consider the follow areas in need of our immediate attention:

- evidence that sound design development needs to start earlier and with more robust and comprehensive introductory and intermediate training
- evidence that directing skills (developmentally) need to start earlier
- evidence that all production track majors should be required to fulfill an introductory screenwriting course since story arcs lack clarity and nuance
- evidence that all production students need more training at the introductory and intermediate level in editing
- evidence that students need more development in telling creative approaches to hackneyed narratives (the shorts are replete with similar visual choices, pacing, and scene development)
- evidence that there is a need to address and track students more closely to strengthen sequenced development (for preparation for next stage of skill-set development)

Brief Summary of Focus Group Data

themes that emerged from Seaver graduating seniors—

- feeling overwhelmed and/or unprepared for capstone experience
  - “feeling very underprepared coming from other classes to this class”
  - “It has been easier for me at least because 320 prepared me for 480”
  - “Moderately competent in everything, not good in one thing. Up till now we have been able to choose our classes and avoid our weaknesses, but in this class [FILM 48] we have to do everything.”
- perceived that the lower level courses did not fulfill course description
  - “[FILM 250] It was a very basic class. I feel like it was sort of a waste of my units.”
- perception that film studies production students are not welcome in Communication Division
Film Studies

- “People [students and staff] said they were annoyed with the film study class...up there taking the equipment.”
- perceives lack of consistency in skill development across semesters in the same course
- cites issues with equipment check out
- cites issues with not knowing about insurance and filming policy

**Action Item #1 (2012):** Our major concern is related to the diversity component in the major. If students opt out of the two primary elective courses that explicitly engage this aspect of the discipline our graduates will not explore this body of knowledge in a meaningful way. We will request that all core courses represent an integration of some aspect of ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity into the course content focus. As a result, we believe all of our students will study some aspect of diversity with clear intention. Our students will no longer have the freedom to opt out of this aspect of their development in the discipline.

**Action Item #2 (2012):** We are pleased that the percentage of students who exceeded the critical/analytical goals of PLO #2 was near 100%; we are convinced that the majority of our students are gaining the critical thinking skills necessary to matriculate successfully in the discipline. However, we will be diligent in regard to all of the elective courses in regard to rigor and a satisfactory attempt to include diversity elements where appropriate. As director of the program, Joi Carr will meet with the department faculty (including adjuncts) in Fall 2013 in an effort to engage this conversation and hoping to make significant progress in the next academic year. Prior to the meeting Joi Carr will send out correspondence regarding this Fall’s course offerings requesting immediate attention to this aspect of course content. We will add the diversity component of PLO#2 to next year’s assessment rubric to review our progress.

**Action Item #3 (2012):** The review also revealed that FILM 315 needs more rigor in terms of analytical engagement. This course is currently taught as an addendum to FILM 200 Intro to Film. We will request that the adjunct faculty currently teaching this course teach the content as described in the academic catalog for majors at the 300 level since it serves as an upper division elective—rather than teaching the course for GE students who also enroll. In consultation with Steve Parmelee and the Fine Arts Division in Spring 2013, Joi Carr requested the GE Fine Arts designation be removed from FILM 315 and added to FILM 111/311, which is more suited for GE students. The request was approved by the Seaver Academic Council in May 2013 and will be reviewed by University Academic Council in August 2013 for implementation Fall 2014.

**Action Item#4 (2013)**

In our first department meeting in the fall we will discuss pedagogical styles and grading styles toward facilitating a list of best practices that will foster qualitative results for our Program Learning Outcomes, especially related to developing clear analytical claims.
**Film Studies**

We noticed some of the papers at the 200 level lacked the quality of depth we expect at the introductory level.

We will also address the practice of merely grading for grammar by providing a list of grading best practices that promotes an opportunity for student reflection on her/his own rhetoric style and thought development toward clear, cohesive, argumentative prose.

List and comment on specific changes in your program which have been made in response to Action Items in previous Assessment Reports.

Action Items related to diversity program outcomes were vigorously addressed with new strategies implementation this academic year. We also re-assessed with PLO#3:

**Action Item #5 (2013 Report):** Our major concern is related to the diversity component in the major. If students opt out of the two primary elective courses that explicitly engage this aspect of the discipline our graduates will not explore this body of knowledge in a meaningful way. We will request that all core courses represent an integration of some aspect of ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity into the course content focus. As a result, we believe all of our students will study some aspect of diversity with clear intention. Our students will no longer have the freedom to opt out of this aspect of their development in the discipline.

**Action Item #6 (2013 Report):** We are pleased that the percentage of students who exceeded the critical/analytical goals of PLO #2 was near 100%; we are convinced that the majority of our students are gaining the critical thinking skills necessary to matriculate successfully in the discipline. However, we will be diligent in regard to all of the elective courses in regard to rigor and a satisfactory attempt to include diversity elements where appropriate. As director of the program, Joi Carr will meet with the department faculty (including adjuncts) in Fall 2013 in an effort to engage this conversation and hoping to make significant progress in the next academic year. Prior to the meeting Joi Carr will send out correspondence regarding this Fall’s course offerings requesting immediate attention to this aspect of course content. We will add the diversity component of PLO#2 to next year’s assessment rubric to review our progress.

**Action Item #7 (2015 Report):**

Reflect on curriculum to address the developmental gaps in the trajectory of study. This action may include one or more of the following: augmenting current courses, creating additional courses, and requesting faculty to teach course as designed and published in the academic catalog. We will use this summer and fall to identify and develop an actionable plan and submit request for changes through the appropriate channels.

**Action Item #8 (2015 Report):**

Strategize and initiate plan for developing a more collaborative, nurturing, and welcoming climate and partnerships across cinematic endeavors at Seaver.
Film Studies
Action Item#9 (update on 2014 Report)

In our first department meeting in the fall we will discuss pedagogical styles and grading styles toward facilitating a list of best practices that will foster qualitative results for our Program Learning Outcomes, especially related to developing clear analytical claims beyond first order. We noticed some of the papers at the 200 level lacked the quality of depth we expect at the introductory level. We will also address the practice of merely grading for grammar by providing a list of grading best practices that promotes an opportunity for student reflection on her/his own rhetoric style and thought development toward clear, cohesive, argumentative prose. One student reported that she felt one particular professor graded papers without addressing the content of her thought with regularity. She believed this repetitive habit of grading cosmically (“grammar only”) prohibited her from growing in her analytical writing skills.

Next steps—
We have not yet addressed this action item comprehensively. As Program Director, We plan to identify ongoing professional development opportunities for our faculty to explore pedagogical resources—in addition to including opportunities throughout the academic year for us to reflect collaboratively on our own pedagogical approaches.

Senior Final Projects

We will continue to monitor the depth with which our graduating seniors explore diversity in assignments without being assigned or prompted to do so. The results are as follows: PLO#3 Demonstrate their ability to articulate, through close reading and writing, their own worldviews. They will be able to explain and respond thoughtfully to the religious, social, ideological, spiritual, moral, and ethical values implied in film texts through their close readings and reflections.

The Final Capstone Projects were quite strong this year technically and rich in the area of exploring diversity. Seventy-five percent our graduating seniors explored aspects of diversity as central to their narrative development and most were able to develop the overall scope of the exploration in a compelling and relevant way. Beyond the technical improvements the students exhibited this year, the critical reflection and maturity that resonated this year was satisfying to witness. Several of the projects tackled complex social issues with sensitivity in a non-conventional (stereotypical) way. Some of the projects asked provocative questions that provoked the audience to consider the human condition in all of its multidimensionality. For example:

“A Matter of Choice” a short film by Samantha Cash
- exploration of child birth and loss from a gendered perspective, including post-pardon depression
- explores mental health from a gendered perspective
- features strong adult female story and performance
Film Studies

- note: camera positions and lighting is visually stunning, capturing the young woman’s emotional distress

“Forgive Me Dad” a short film by Emir Kumova
  - a sensitive look at Alzheimer disease and the impact it has on the familial dynamics
  - casting was strong with generational representation
  - specifically, explores guilt and shame caregivers might feel when caring for loved ones, wrestling with obligation, love, and the desire to be free from the service/perceived life constraints.

“Running Scared” a short film by Brittany New
  - explores the social construction of race/ethnicity and challenges ideological narratives regarding young black males, calling for media literacy

“Conscious” a short film by Matthew Ontiveros
  - explores mental illness from a young adult male perspective

“Pink Bicycle” a short film by Richelle Chen
  - featured an adolescent wrestling with sexually
  - features generational representation with compassion
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History Program Review

I. Introduction

“The History degree program at Seaver College offers a student-centered program that supports students’ vocational aspirations and effectively prepares them for lives of service, purpose, and leadership. It does this by providing learning experiences that emphasize global cultural understanding through historical knowledge and ways of thinking, critical skills in inquiry and analytical reasoning, oral and written communication, and consideration of ethical and humane values. The History faculty also provides significant support to Seaver College’s general education curriculum in a variety of ways, but especially through the American History survey requirement and through the Western Culture sequence.”

- The History Program is part of the Humanities/Teacher Education Division of Seaver College. It grants a Bachelor of Arts degree in History and also offers a minor in History. All History majors must choose between a Breadth option or a particular geographic (U.S., European, or non-Western) or temporal (Pre-Modern or Modern) concentration. The History program has been part of Seaver College from its inception. A detailed discussion of changes to the History program since the last program review can be found in the section entitled “Closing the Loop” below.

- The history major is designed to help students develop an understanding of the complex factors that have produced the civilizations of the present century. Such an understanding is necessary for becoming informed and responsible citizens in our society, whether locally or globally. A history major also offers a valuable background for many careers including government service, law, education, business, research, and journalism.

II. Meaning of the Degree

As the following charts show, the History program at Seaver is highly aligned with the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of Pepperdine University. Its curriculum also provides systematic opportunities for students to develop mastery in four of the five Core Competencies required by WASC. As a discipline centered in the Humanities, quantitative skills and analysis is not a centerpiece of the History program, but those skills are developed in other parts of the General Education curriculum at Seaver.
A. Institutional Learning Outcomes - ILOs
Pepperdine University’s Institutional Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>Knowledge/ Scholarship</th>
<th>Faith/ Heritage</th>
<th>Community/Global Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILO#1</td>
<td>Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</td>
<td>ILO#2</td>
<td>Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO#3</td>
<td>Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>ILO#4</td>
<td>ILO#5</td>
<td>ILO#6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO#4</td>
<td>Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.</td>
<td>Respond to the call to serve others.</td>
<td>Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>ILO#7</td>
<td>ILO#8</td>
<td>ILO#9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO#7</td>
<td>Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.</td>
<td>Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.</td>
<td>Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Program Learning Outcomes – PLOs: History Graduates will be able to:

- **PLO #1**: Identify major historical periods, ideas, people and events in more than one civilization/culture, such as North America, Latin America, Europe, Middle East, Africa, Asia and explain diversity within those cultures studied.

- **PLO #2**: Demonstrate historical understanding by constructing interpretations of the past, identifying causal factors, tracing change and continuity, explaining historical development in context, and making meaningful connections between past and present.

- **PLO #3**: Craft and defend coherent and persuasive arguments, in written and oral forms; write clearly and effectively in a variety of genres, consistently formatting written communication in the predominant
style of the discipline (Chicago Manual).

PLO #4 Find, evaluate and use historical primary and secondary sources (information literacy).

PLO #5 Demonstrate ethical standards in research and writing and use sources and craft arguments honestly, fairly, empathetically, and courageously.

PLO #6 Explain how moral, religious, and ethical developments relate to historical study and how historical knowledge and understanding applies to life outside the classroom.

C. Alignment of PLOs with ILOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILO#1</th>
<th>ILO#2</th>
<th>ILO#3</th>
<th>ILO#4</th>
<th>ILO#5</th>
<th>ILO#6</th>
<th>ILO#7</th>
<th>ILO#8</th>
<th>ILO#9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO #1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Alignment of PLOs with Core Competencies

*Place a check mark to indicate which PLOs develop each of the Core Competencies.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
<th>PLO#5</th>
<th>PLO#6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Literacy</th>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
<th>PLO#5</th>
<th>PLO#6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Communication</th>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
<th>PLO#5</th>
<th>PLO#6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Communication</th>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
<th>PLO#5</th>
<th>PLO#6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Skills</th>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
<th>PLO#5</th>
<th>PLO#6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Curricular Comparison with Peer and Aspirational Schools

See Appendix A

III. Quality and Integrity of the Degree

A. Evidence from Annual Reports

The major source of our assessment data is the Senior Portfolios, compiled by the students in HIST 482 (formerly 581B). These portfolios include longitudinal samples of written work (direct evidence) and reflective essays that measure students’ perceptions of their learning and of the quality of the program (indirect evidence). During an annual retreat in May, the History faculty uses the data in the Senior Portfolios to assess our six PLO’s, which were reduced from eleven due to our last five-year review in 2010. We assess all PLO’s every year, though we focus on one in particular each year. Each faculty member assesses each student portfolio individually. We then discuss our assessments among ourselves and assign a final score (based on the average of the individual scores) for each PLO for each student.

Our self-imposed standard is that 80% of our students would achieve Acceptable (2-3) or Exceptional (4-5) ratings in all of the PLO’s, a standard we have used for at least the last decade, since the last major curriculum revision that came from the five-year review of 2005. The 80% standard is not based on any national benchmarks, but rather our own internal standards, so perhaps this would be a good time for the History faculty to discuss how to bring our assessment standards into greater alignment with national standards.

As the chart below reveals, we have successfully achieved our own self-imposed standard: in no cohort have less than 80% of our students achieved an Acceptable or Exceptional rating in any PLO. Because this assessment comes only at the end of a student’s career in the History program at Seaver, we cannot use this data to help students who receive Unacceptable scores on a PLO, though over the years we have used the data to propose and implement curricular changes and come to greater agreement on all assessment standards. There have only been two cases in which students received Unacceptable scores in more than one PLO, and neither of those cases were the unacceptable scores sufficient to prevent them from graduating with a History degree (albeit with mediocre GPA’s), since they had received Acceptable scores in the other four PLOs.
History

Based on comments on our annual reports from other reviewers at Pepperdine and internal discussions among the History faculty, we have decided to revise the wording of PLO 6 so that it can be assessed more consistently and objectively in the future.

Key to numbers above: A/B/C

A = % of graduates receiving Unacceptable average ratings (0-1) on PLO
B = % of graduates receiving Acceptable average ratings (2-3) on PLO
C = % of graduates receiving Exceptional average ratings (4-5) on PLO
*PLO receiving focused assessment that year
@ Oral communication element of PLO 3 received focused assessment this year
$ PLO 6 was not assessed this year because the PLO needed to be revised

B. Co-curricular Activities

1. Our students frequently take part in extracurricular opportunities related to History and/or using skills inculcated by the History program. For example
   a. In 2011-2012, a History major served as Editor-in-Chief for Global Tides, another as the Perspectives Editor for the Graphic, and yet another was a leader in the Volunteer Center and served as Coordinator for Project Serve.
   b. In 2012-2013, a History major served as an Editor for Global Tides, and a History minor wrote for the Graphic. Still others served as Coordinators for Project Serve or as officers in Sororities and Fraternities.
   c. In 2013-2014, History majors served as editors both for Global Tides and for the Graphic. Several History majors served as officers in Sororities and Fraternities and one worked as a ministry intern.
   d. In 2014-2015, a History major served as Humanities Editor for Global Tides. Several of our students participated in or helped with the Conference on Faith and History which was held on Pepperdine’s campus in September, 2014.
2. Increasingly, our students also participate in undergraduate research.
   a. In 2012-2013, one History major presented her research at Southern California Conference on Undergraduate Research (SCCUR) in October 2013 and subsequently had her essay published in *Global Tides*. Another History major presented her research at the Student Research Conference at Claremont Graduate University in January 2013.
   b. In 2013-2014, two students participated in a scholarly conference by presenting a paper at SCCUR at Whittier College in November, 2013. Three students presented papers at the biennial national Phi Alpha Theta Conference in Albuquerque in January 2014.
   c. In 2014-2015, a History major’s research was accepted for publication by *Global Tides*.

3. History majors regularly (2012, 2013, 2014) take part in the Payson Library Archives and Special Collections Internships, and one student won the Library Research Award for Best Use of Special Collections and University Archives in 2014.

4. Many History majors have taken part in SURP’s, AYURI’s, and Keck Research Grants over the years those opportunities have been available.

5. Given the historical topics covered in our courses, it has proven challenging to find service learning opportunities for our students. A number of our students have served as academic mentors in Keck Seminars, but the faculty believes we need to be more intentional about integrating service learning opportunity into the History program.

6. All of these activities are tied strongly to our curriculum because of the History program’s focus on critical thinking and writing, and because of the faculty’s emphasis on and modeling of service to others.

7. More detailed information on these activities can be found in the History Program Annual Reports (2012-2015).

C. Student Satisfaction

On the basis of the OIE Alumni Survey quantitative data, student satisfaction with the History program is high:

- Almost 90% of our graduates are employed on a full-time basis (78.4%) or pursuing graduate education (10.8%), less than 8% are not employed at all. In addition, a whopping 98.4% of our graduates stated that Pepperdine prepared them, either extremely well (36.9%) or reasonably well (61.5%), for their primary post-graduate activity.
- In addition, our students use the historical knowledge and training gained at Pepperdine actively. 85.5% of our students responded that they carefully considered a historical figure, event, or issue during the month previous to taking the survey. In addition, 74.7% said that they used the historical knowledge and understanding gained at Pepperdine during the
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month previous to taking the survey. Only 2.4% of the respondents said they had never used the historical knowledge gained at Pepperdine.

- 98.6% of History students agreed that the faculty supported their academic endeavors (29.2% agreed, 69.4% strongly agreed), and 97.2% agreed that the faculty was devoted to student learning (27.8% agreed, 69.4% strongly agreed). In addition, 91.7% agreed that faculty spent time with them outside of class (25% agreed, 66.7% strongly agreed), and 91.6% agreed that the faculty provided them with prompt feedback (33.3% agreed, 58.3% strongly agreed). 95.8% of History students agreed that faculty created an environment that was both challenging and respectful of student views (26.4% agreed, 68.4% agreed strongly).

- 90.4% of History students stated that the educational resources were adequate to meet their needs, and a whopping 98.5% of History students agreed that Pepperdine met their academic expectations reasonably well (33.3%) or extremely well (65.2%). 92.4% of History students responded that they were satisfied with the way Pepperdine met their academic expectations, with 31.8% satisfied and 60.6% very satisfied.

- 92.5% of History students said they would likely re-enroll at Pepperdine, with 34.3% saying they would probably re-enroll and 58.2% saying they would definitely enroll. In addition, 94% of History students said they would likely recommend Pepperdine to others, with 34.3% responding that they would probably recommend Pepperdine to others and 59.7% saying they would definitely recommend it to others.

- 71.2% of History students responded that they felt connected to the undergraduate program, with 34.0% indicating they felt a strong connection and 59.6% indicating they felt some connection to the undergraduate program.

- Our students also report that they gained valuable skills from their preparation as history majors at Pepperdine. Over 95% of our students responded that their training at Pepperdine prepared them reasonably or exceptionally well to:
  o Write at an acceptable level in their workplace (28.8 and 67.1%, respectively)
  o Act morally or ethically in the workplace (34.7%/ 63.9%)
  o Analyze written texts (26.4%/ 72.2%)
  o Express ideas clearly (27.8%/ 69.4%)
  o Utilize library materials for research (29.2%/ 69.4%)
  o Apply knowledge of American history and institutions to current issues (24.7%/ 72.6%)
  o Demonstrate expertise in the discipline of History (37.3%/ 59.7%)
  o Think clearly and act with integrity (25.4%/ 71.6%)
  o Practice responsible conduct informed by values (38.5%/ 60.0%)
Over 90% reported that their training at Pepperdine prepared them reasonably or exceptionally well to:

- Give an oral presentation (43.8%/ 49.3%)
- Think critically to solve problems (31.5%/ 63.0%)
- Apply facts and theories to solve problems (41.1%/ 50.7%)
- Appreciate the relationship between faith, learning, and practice (37.9%/ 56.1%)
- Apply knowledge to real-world challenges (34.3%/ 58.2%)
- Demonstrate commitment to civic engagement and service (48.5%/ 42.4%)

Over 80% of our students responded that their training at Pepperdine prepared them reasonably or exceptionally well to:

- Think creatively in the workplace (37.5%/ 51.3%)
- Work in a team environment (40.3%/ 47.2%)
- Utilize the assistance of a librarian in research (30.6%/ 55.6%)
- Evaluate the quality of sources (27.1%/ 61.4%)
- Develop a vision that values diversity (34.9%/ 48.5%)
- Respond to the call to serve others (28.8%/ 59.1%)

The data OIE Alumni Survey Qualitative report is also generally favorable to History program at Pepperdine. However, because the data includes responses from graduates spanning a 40-year period without providing any contextual information as to when the alumnus making the comment graduated, it is impossible to use that information to evaluate current practices in the History program.

Annual assessment of student learning and satisfaction by means of the Senior Portfolios (from 2012-2015) has consistently shown high levels of student satisfaction with both the curriculum and faculty of the History, though several students have expressed interest in more social opportunities for History majors and for more course offerings outside the United States and Europe. These are issues that the faculty have discussed and are trying to resolve.

D. Closing the Loop

The major curricular changes we have implemented in the last five years on the basis of previous assessment activities are as follows:

1. We revised our PLO’s in 2011 from 11 to 6 on the basis of our 2010 Five-Year Review. In this revision, we tried to make sure that the new PLO’s could be more consistently assessed as stated.

2. We reduced the number of required upper-division History courses from 8 to 7; we changed the Historiography course from required to optional; and, in order to reflect the amount of student work more accurately, we decided to increase the total number of credits for HIST 481/482 from 2 to 4. These changes were designed to make the History degree more accessible to students at Pepperdine, especially transfer students and
students pursuing a double major. These changes had the additional goal of making the curricular requirements of the History program comparable to the requirements of other majors in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Religion divisions, all of which had a lower number of required credit units for completion than did History. The faculty believed we could accomplish these goals without any significant loss of rigor in the curriculum. These changes were first discussed during our annual assessment retreat in 2012, and the changes were approved in the 2013-2014 academic year and implemented the following year. We have conducted assessment according to the new curriculum from that point forward.

3. Also, during the 2012 retreat we decided to change the required American History survey course, HIST 304, to a lower-level course, HIST 204. We also decided to advocate for the elimination of POSC 104, American Government, as a prerequisite for HIST 204, as it had been for HIST 304. These changes were designed to resolve an anomaly in the existing General Education curriculum since there was no pedagogical reason that the American History survey should be classified an advanced (300+ level) course while American Government (and most other Gen Ed requirements) were only designated introductory (100 level) or intermediate courses (200 level). Before these changes, 13 courses fulfilling GE requirements were 100- or 200-level courses, and HIST 304 was one of the 5 GE courses designated at the 300- or 400-level. Additionally, we advocated for these changes because they would allow Seaver students to develop a personal vision of diversity – a central theme in the American survey at Pepperdine – earlier in their academic careers. These changes were approved in the 2013-2014 academic year and implemented the following year. We have conducted assessment according to the new curriculum from that point forward.

4. During our 2014 assessment retreat, we clarified our expectations for students in the Senior Project class regarding the criteria they should follow in assembling their Senior Portfolios. This was done so that the evidence in the Portfolios would be more germane to what we were going to assess that academic year. This was implemented in the 2014-2015 academic year.

5. During the 2015 assessment retreat, we clarified our expectations for research in HIST 200 and HIST 481, and decided to require more primary sources for the research projects produced in these two core courses. These changes were implemented in the Fall 2015 semester.

IV. Summary and Reflection

A. Given the fact that our students regularly meet our self-imposed standard that 80% of them achieve Acceptable or Exceptional ratings in all PLO’s, and given the data in the OIE Alumni Report indicating a high degree of student
satisfaction, it is fair to say that the History program at Pepperdine successfully achieves its stated goals.

B. With that said, we do not wish to rest upon our accomplishments, and we see a number of areas where we wish to improve the experience for History majors and for all students taking History courses at Pepperdine. Our conclusions are as follows:

1. The History program already serves the General Education curriculum at Seaver in significant ways, through the HUM sequence, a variety of First-Year Seminars, and HIST 204. However, in light of the recent events related to race, racism, and diversity on a number of university campuses in the U.S., including Pepperdine, the faculty feels a renewed impetus to explain that the concept of diversity in the American experience is already the central theme of the required HIST 204 American Survey. We believe that both we and the administration need to do a better job in publicizing and explaining the fact that HIST 204 is a curricular venue for both learning about and discussing cultural diversity for Seaver students and faculty.

2. While more effective publicity of the opportunities that already exist in HIST 204 will be helpful, there are some curricular anomalies that need to be resolved with the help of administration if we wish to fulfill both our desire and our potential to help our students better understand the cultures around them.

First, we believe that our Latin American history course offerings (HIST 335, 336, 433) should fulfill the World Civilizations requirement within the GE curriculum. The faculty is not opposed at all to a discussion about restructuring both that requirement and the HUM sequence in the GE curriculum, but in the meantime, we believe those courses should fulfill the World Civilizations requirement. The fact that they do not has dis-incentivized students from taking those courses, which has had the perverse, though unintentional, effect of making it more difficult for them to learn about the World Civilization geographically closest to the United States. Located as we are in southern California in close proximity with Mexico, the imperative to provide our students with greater opportunities to learn about the history and culture of Latin America should be obvious.

a. Second, because of a lack of qualified instructors at Seaver, the History program can rarely if ever, offer our existing courses on Pre-Columbian Civilizations (HIST 320), Native Americans (HIST 400), California (HIST 426), the Westward Expansion (HIST 427), or Modern Africa (HIST 450). Dr. Hart has agreed to prepare a course on Modern Africa, but we need additional faculty support to provide our students with the opportunity to learn about this state and this region along with the many cultures of the American West.

b. Finally, we believe that, in order to help our students better understand the deep roots of Western culture, and hence the nature of its interaction with other cultures, we need additional faculty support for an ancient historian, a classicist, or a specialist in patristics. Because any new faculty member in these fields would have considerable responsibilities in the HUM sequence (i.e. HUM 111), we believe that administration
History

should open another tenure line to fulfill these needs both in the History program and in the Humanities curriculum.

3. In our 2015 assessment retreat, the faculty agreed to revise the wording of PLO #6 so that it would be easier to define and assess Historical Engagement. We realize that we have not taken as much initiative as we should to help our students (whether majors or not) to utilize the historical insights they have gained through our instruction to understand contemporary issues more fully. We believe we should be more proactive in finding opportunities, such as service-learning and co-curricular activities, to help our students engage in discussion about the issues facing our campus, our nation, and our world. In particular, we intend to become a better resource to facilitate productive discussions of cultural diversity at Pepperdine.

V. Addenda and Response to External Review

A. In response to the Associate Provost’s request for more analysis of the effects of the recent curricular changes to our program, the faculty fully agreed on the necessity of analyzing and assessing those changes, and request an extended time frame in which to do so.

1. Since most of the curricular changes listed in Part III.D. above have only become fully implemented this academic year (2015-16), and because the sample size of each cohort of History majors is so small, we did not feel we had sufficient data to see how the changes have affected either student learning or recruitment and retention of students to the History major.

2. Fortunately, because of our long-standing practice of reviewing senior portfolios, the faculty believes we will be able to assess the effects of those changes once we obtain a sufficiently robust data series in the next two or three years.

3. The one effect we have noticed in the limited time period in which the curricular changes have been implemented is that the enrollment in our upper-division classes has been reduced. We believe this is a consequence of reducing the number of upper-division courses for majors from 8 to 7 (see III.D.2 above). We hope that, over the long term, these changes in the curriculum will cause more students to consider History as a major at Pepperdine, and that an increased number of majors will ultimately offset the reduction in enrollment in our upper-division classes due to this curricular change.

B. In response to point 1 of the Proposed Changes in the External Review, the faculty fully agrees with the external reviewer’s recommendations. The faculty realizes that we need to promote what we already do in our curriculum in regard to diversity, especially in HIST 204 more effectively.
1. To that end, we agree with the external reviewer’s suggestion that HIST 204 be renamed to better reflect the centrality of diversity to the curriculum of that course.

2. The faculty also agreed that we need to do a better job providing/incorporating more opportunities for social activities, especially those that highlight the rich diversity of the Los Angeles area, for History majors and other interested parties.

3. The faculty agreed that we need to be more active in pursuing partnerships with other programs in the University, such as the Library or the Center for Faith and Learning, to spread the word on how history and the History program at Seaver can help facilitate informed discussions and interactions on the crucial issues of ethnic and social diversity.

C. In response to point 2 of the Proposed Changes in the External Review, the faculty feels that Seaver College already does offer considerable opportunities to discuss the relationship between faith and learning, faith and reason, faith and science, etc., though, admittedly, not always via the History program.

1. The faculty felt some of the external reviewer’s comments on this point may have been due to the fact that he was unaware of what other divisions, such as the Religion Division, or other programs, such as Great Books and the First-Year Seminars, do related to this topic. This is certainly due to the fact that he was not given the curricular materials from those programs to review, nor did he ask for them.

2. Given some of our other programmatic needs, the faculty was not convinced that the next tenure line in History should be in Pacific Missions, since a number of faculty deal with religion extensively in their courses and in their scholarship, and that three faculty members (Corrado; and Reilly and Sugimoto in ISL) cover the West Pacific/East Asia extensively in their courses.

3. Our higher priorities are for a classicist/ancient historian to help in the HUM sequence, and for faculty with specialties in California, the American West, and/or Native Americans, who can help us engage our local and regional communities more effectively.

D. In response to point 3 of the Proposed Changes in the External Review, the faculty was sympathetic to the intent of the external reviewers suggestions, and did agree to consider further ways to make history classes (as opposed to the curriculum of the major as a whole) more accessible to non-majors. While we will continue to consider new ways by which to engage non-majors, we believe that allowing appropriate History courses to count for some segment of the General Education curriculum will incentivize more Seaver students to take History courses than would do so without such credit. The most pressing area where such a reform is needed is our sequence of courses dealing with Latin American history. We urgently need administrative support that those courses fulfill the World Civilizations GE requirement, as they do in our peer schools.
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E. In response to point 4 of the Proposed Changes in the External Review, the faculty fully agrees with the external reviewer’s emphasis on the importance of internships. However, since most History majors do participate in internships (though not necessarily History internships), the faculty realized that it needs to record and assess opportunities like internships in which history students participate more systematically. In a later, follow-up discussion among some of the faculty, it also became clear that the history program would benefit from tracking the post-baccalaureate plans and accomplishments of our graduates as additional data for assessing the quality of our program. The history faculty needs additional administrative support to achieve this goal.
2016 Program Review:
Department of History, Pepperdine University

Report of External Reviewer

Having received the materials for an external review in a timely manner, I visited Pepperdine University on January 27-28, 2016. My experience for this review comes from having served as an external review at other small Christian universities such as California Baptist in Riverside, Vanguard in Costa Mesa, Biola in La Mirada, San Diego Christian, and Wheaton in Illinois. I have also served for twenty years in the history department at Point Loma Nazarene University, including three years as chair. Overall, I think the department excellent and doing great service to the students and curriculum goals of Pepperdine University.

I. Program Learning Outcomes:

The PLOs of the department reflect the most important skills, knowledge, and values that are normal to university history departments and meet all disciplinary and professional standards. The departmental emphasis on writing papers serves excellently to promote PLOs #2, #3, and #4. Mentoring the production of students research papers involves large time commitments from the faculty. I found all the faculty that I talked to deeply involved in this important core of the PLOs.

Each of the students I talked to voiced to me their appreciation that research and writing were at the core of their education in the history major, and each gave me examples of extra time given them by professors in order that their work be better.

PLO #1 includes the line "explain diversity" and this is a major strength of the department. All of the faculty expressed a distinct concern for this important matter in education. This commitment is
History especially clear in the department's American survey course (HIST 204). This is also clear in the department's commitment to the Humanities general education core courses. I have a recommendation about HIST 204 at the end of this report.

PLO #6 which relates to moral, religious, and ethical development fits within the values of Church-related universities similar to Pepperdine. In the alignment of PLOs to ILOs (section II.C in the report) it is clear that PLO #6 and ILO #7 are the two intersections where institutional and department goals meet most clearly. Indeed PLO #6 and ILO #7 looks to be where the history department can best serve the university and also find the best arguments for expanded institutional support. The department faculty are in the process of reviewing the wording of PLO #6, and I make recommendations on this PLO at the end of this report.

Overall, the History Program Review supplied to me shows that the PLOs are well-aligned with the ILOs and Core Competencies of Pepperdine. This is to be expected given that the discipline of history is traditionally one of the core disciplines of any university, and a high-quality university is expected to have a high-quality history department.

II. Assessment

The section in the report on gathering evidence (section III.A) is excellent. The system of Senior Portfolios analyzed during an annual departmental "retreat" was further explained to me on my visit, and I think it a better system than I have seen at any other university. When talking about assessment with the faculty it became very clear that the historians have been campus leaders in this area. Such leadership can be frustrating. My experience, in general, is similar to theirs in that the goals and methods of assessment have been moving targets over the last fifteen years. In such a situation where frustration and recalcitrance can easily set in, the history faculty at Pepperdine have been good citizens of the university. All the faculty agreed that Dr. Rivas had led them well through the ups and downs of assessment. They were quick to affirm that the all worked well together as collaborators in assessment. I affirm the report's note that the department might want to look to aligning the department standards with national standards, but I would not want to mess up what is already in place. As to assessment, the department excels.

III. Curriculum

The curriculum content and design is good. I saw no problems concerning the requirements nor with the flow through four years of study. Students in the program are being offered a high quality degree.

Of the matters discussed in the History Program Review, I talked with faculty about the American History survey that was 304 and became 204. This course has "diversity" as a central theme and should be promoted more. I have a recommendation on this at the end of this report. The making of the history degree more accessible to transfer students and students pursuing a double major is consistent with what is going on at other universities. Behind these changes is more than a mere
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attempt to get more students, history is the kind of subject that enhances everything it touches—the sciences, math, engineering, languages, anything. It is appropriate to make it as easier for more students to have more extensive historical knowledge, especially in the context of other majors. I make a recommendation about this at the end.

The Curriculum Maps (Appendix A) show aspiration to model the curriculum of higher-quality history departments. The sad fact is that the Pepperdine history department is under-staffed in comparison to such aspirants. It is a sadder fact that Pepperdine's reputation, as a high-quality liberal arts institution, is declining. The health of a history department is always a good measure of an institution's commitment to the undergraduate humanities. Pepperdine's history department has, in general, and give or take extenuating circumstances, six historians for 3100 undergraduates. Westmont, a local college actively promoting its liberal arts reputation, has five historians for a mere 1,275 undergraduates. Pepperdine's numbers are even a little behind its nearest neighbor Cal Lutheran where there are five historians for 2888 students. Pepperdine's percentage of history majors to undergraduate population is 50 to 3100 or a little over 1.6%. Again, this fits the norm for schools with declining emphasis on humanities and liberal arts.

These numbers do not put Pepperdine's history major in a good light given the college's aspirations. The department is doing good work for the GE humanities core, for teacher education, and for its own majors. They have as good and a curriculum as can be expected given their resources. The university, if it wants to be what it says it is, should have a larger undergraduate history department with an expanded curriculum. Pepperdine is a dynamic institution with high aspirations and an expanding undergraduate student body. It has placed heavy emphasis on its humanities general education core courses, along with a Great Books track, in hopes of reviving its dwindling reputation as a strong liberal arts program. Pepperdine needs to put more effort into recruiting top-level undergraduates interested in humanities majors. Pepperdine needs a history department that fits its aspirations. I make a recommendation at the end of this report concerning what the history department can do, but I heartily affirm the History Program Review's call for a new FTE faculty line (section IV.B.2.b-c). If Peppedine wants to have a strong reputation for its undergraduate liberal arts, it needs to increase its support for its already good history department. If Pepperdine wants an core academic reputation that rivals the University of San Diego rather than Cal Lutheran, then it needs to fund and support its history department better.

IV. Student Experiences and Learning Environment

I talked for an hour an a half with three history students and randomly with other students I encountered during my stay on campus. All the comments I heard indicated that students are well-satisfied with the overall quality of their learning experience. Asked about the academic reputation of the history major, all agreed that the major was held in high esteem by non-majors. The students attributed this high reputation to the research and writing requirements in the major. This was consistent with the emphasis on writing and use of primary sources discussed in sections III.B.2 and III.D.5 of the Report.
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One student reported that she had no interest in a history major when she came to Pepperdine being especially fearful of the extensive writing required, but she eventually transferred into the history program because of its obvious quality and the people in it.

Asked what are the weakest aspects of their major, the three students I talked to stated that their was not enough non-Western and pre-Modern history. It was odd to them that Pepperdine sits on the edge of Latin America and the "Pacific World" (East Asia, Japan, and Pacific Islands) but offers very little dealing with those subjects. One student who was also in the Great Books track bemoaned the lack of Latin. Overall, however, they were not critical. They appreciated the faculty doing the best they could with the resources at their disposal.

Overseas programs were much praised by the students. They knew less about internships, and it seemed that the department could do more to promote them. Each was excited about their undergraduate research and obviously enjoyed the process of writing a serious research paper. Students also said to me what was reported in History Program Review (at the end of section III.C) that they want more social opportunities. I make a recommendation about this at the end of this report.

V. Faculty Quality
I met the six full-time faculty directly involved in the history program. To a varying extent I got to talk with each. They are all high-quality scholars dedicated to both teaching, service, and research. All had appropriate—even prestigious—Ph.Ds. and scholarly publications. They each said that they believed Pepperdine was supporting their research and teaching with adequate resources. Tenure and promotion, while not a perfect system, did reward their work. When talking about a subject such as assessment, most all the faculty were engaged in the conversation. They reported that they were a collegial group and worked well together. I had no indication otherwise. At dinner with four of the faculty there was a pleasant conversation among them about a couple of students. The students were named, their work discussed, personal matters about their lives were know by the professors. Such a discussion seems to me to be strong evidence of a healthy relationship between faculty and students. The next morning in class I observed a similar ease between the professor, Dr. Givens, and students. Names and situations were known. A healthy friendliness during questions and answers was evident among all in the room as Dr. Givens proceeded through his lecture.

VI. Diversity
The make-up of the history department faculty shows appropriate diversity. Of the six, central, faculty, two are male, four are female. The age range is spread wide. There is one black faculty member. Other less-evident aspects of diversity I did not inquire into.

A recommendation about diversity in the curriculum is at the end of this report.

VII. Program Administration Support
In general, the faculty, day to day, are happy with their jobs and appreciate the administration. Over-the-long term they have a sense of frustration with the way humanities fits within Pepperdine's goals and reward structure; however, they are clearly devoted to their work.
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When I went fishing for problematic issues, the faculty did give me a list of some of their immediate concerns. The division is large and historians don't always think their issues are being addressed within the division as well as other departments. The evaluation systems for teaching and step increases are not appropriate to traditional humanities-style faculty. Business and scientific models of rating performance increasingly predominate in the university. When describing these evaluation systems I think the historians are right to be frustrated. Inconsistencies were also noted in the way research was judged along side teaching and service. Supposedly teaching is 50%, service is 25%, and scholarship is 25%, but these percentages were not applied consistently in actual situations. Scholarship has a sort-of trump card position in the process that makes it much more than a mere 25%.

Another problem with administrative support is the way the history department is apportioned full-time faculty positions based on the number of their majors when their service—and their success—is much bigger. They serve an important role not only administering a major, they also are an essential part of general education curriculum and teacher education.

The most important faculty concerns are not merely about themselves and their department. I noted increased passion in their voices as they agreed among themselves that Pepperdine University promotes the value of general education, especially in its Humanities core classes, but it administers them with too much of an eye on keeping cost down. The teaching assistants are inadequate, too many adjuncts are relied upon, classes are over-sized. General Education is treated too much as a poor step-sister to the majors even as the university says they are giving it emphasis.

VIII. Proposed Changes

1. Diversity in PLO #1

It was very apparent to me during my visit that the department feels a distinctive call to teaching diversity. This makes sense because the history of the issue is deeply entwined with the present reality and hoped for better future of this issue. I think that the department should do more to promote themselves in this role for the whole campus. One way to do this, one that ties in with the students' desire for more social occasions and the department's need to grow its major classes, would be history faculty to offer field trips to students of all majors to such places as the Los Angeles Plaza Historic District (El Pueblo de Los Angeles) and the Japanese American National Museum. Showing and discussing movies dealing with diversity would also be another idea. Dr. Givens, in the past, offered regular movie-viewing and has a passion for film. Offering field trips and a film series are ways for the history department not only to promote the study of diversity but are also opportunities to reach potential students for classes, possibly potential new majors.

The department should also change the name of its HIST 204 class so that it reflects to all reading the catalog that it encourages "Seaver students to develop a personal vision of diversity" (section III.D.3). Given the importance of diversity to the campus (ILO #3), the department should make every effort to show that this course is specifically designed to serve Institutional goals.
History

2. Religion in PLO #6 and ILO #2, #5, #8

During my visit I was told that PLO #6 was thought to be a little vague and should be strengthened. Given the campus commitment to Christian faith in its mission and vision statements and the emphasis on it in ILO #2, #5, #8, the history department should look to promote itself better as a place where religion and faith are particularly studied from a historical viewpoint using historical methods. Dr. Davenport has been involved with campus discussions of faith. I suggest the history department faculty becoming more involved in campus discussion of faith-reason, faith-science, and faith-practice. The American Historical Association has noted that religious history is a growing field in the profession, and the department's offerings could emphasize it more. As a general rule, it is good for history departments at Christian universities such as Pepperdine to not simply let people think that religion is a topic owned by the Religion department or specialists in Faith & Learning. When asking for a new faculty line in the department, I think a very strong argument can be made for a historian of Christian mission-work. The American Historical Association has noted that this kind of history is on the rise in universities because of its obvious boundary-crossing perspectives and its inter-continental perspectives. I suggest the obvious next hire to make the department not only better but also more distinctive in relation to Pepperdine's mission and vision statements, is a historian of missions in the "Pacific World," a perspective that includes western Latin America with Pacific Islands and East Asia.

Note that Dr. Hunnicutt has served in the leadership of, hosted meetings for, and will be editing the journal of The Conference on Faith and History. This work by Dr. Hunnicutt and the work of that organization in general serves the core values of Pepperdine. The department would do well to promote its role with this organization and journal, possibly funding student internships to help with editing, thus adding more opportunities to promote student writing. The university should see this as good publicity, nationally within the history profession, of fulfilling its mission and vision.

3. Expanding numbers in the program beyond just majors.

I praise the changes reported in section III.D.2 of the History Program Review that "were designed to make the history degree more accessible to students at Pepperdine, especially transfer students and students pursuing a double major. I encourage more of this kind of reform. As much as the department should be praised for its emphasis on writing assignments, I think it good that the department has begun offering less writing-intensive ways to be in the history program. I also encourage the department to look for more ways to attract non-majors to take history classes. Students with a focus on another major might be encouraged more to double-major or take a minor if they had more ways of taking history courses without writing a paper. The history department could make a policy in its classes that non-majors are not required to write a paper. Alternative requirements for non-history in history classes might be developed. The goal would be to attract more non-majors while keeping the core students, the history majors, proud of the rigor of their own program. As stated above, history is the kind of subject that enhances everything it touches—the sciences, math, engineering, languages, anything. It is appropriate to make it as easier for more students to have more extensive historical knowledge.

4. Internships

It appears to me that the history department might better promote internships and better use the historical resources of its region. There are world-class museums nearby along with many other opportunities where students could learn the many careers available to them. Tourism is one of
History
California's largest employers of history majors. National, state, and county parks often offer historical interpretation and need interns. Local historical societies and archives can offer first steps into library careers. The Adamson House owned by the Malibu Historical Society probably could use a steady stream of college interns. Again, student interns as assistant editors of the CFH journal could be very beneficial to a student bound for graduate school. I encourage the history department to put one of their faculty in charge of developing a more dynamic internship program.
History Program Quality Improvement Plan

C. Given the fact that our students regularly meet our self-imposed standard that 80% of them achieve Acceptable or Exceptional ratings in all PLO’s, and given the data in the OIE Alumni Report indicating a high degree of student satisfaction, it is fair to say that the History program at Pepperdine successfully achieves its stated goals.

D. With that said, we do not wish to rest upon our accomplishments, and we see a number of areas where we wish to improve the experience for History majors and for all students taking History courses at Pepperdine. Our conclusions are as follows:

1. The History program already serves the General Education curriculum at Seaver in significant ways, through the HUM sequence, a variety of First-Year Seminars, and HIST 204. However, in light of the recent events related to race, racism, and diversity on a number of university campuses in the U.S., including Pepperdine, the faculty feels a renewed impetus to explain that the concept of diversity in the American experience is already the central theme of the required HIST 204 course. We believe that both we and the administration need to do a better job in publicizing and explaining the fact that HIST 204 is a curricular venue for both learning about and discussing cultural diversity for Seaver students and faculty. This was a point strongly reiterated to us in the external reviewer’s report on our program, and the faculty is strongly considering the reviewer’s suggestion that we rename HIST 204 to better communicate the centrality of the theme of American diversity.

2. The faculty agreed that we need to be more active in pursuing partnerships with other programs in the University, such as the Library or the Center for Faith and Learning, to spread the word on how history and the History program at Seaver can help facilitate informed discussions and interactions on the crucial issues of ethnic and social diversity.

3. The faculty also agreed that we need to be more active in providing/incorporating opportunities for social activities, especially those that highlight the rich diversity of the Los Angeles area, for History majors and other interested parties.

4. While more effective publicity of the opportunities that already exist in HIST 204 will be helpful, there are some curricular anomalies that need to be resolved with the help of administration if we wish to fulfill both our desire and our potential to help our students better understand the cultures around them.

   a. First, we believe that our Latin American history course offerings (HIST 335, 336, 433) should fulfill the World Civilizations requirement within the GE curriculum. The faculty is not opposed at all to a discussion about restructuring both that requirement and the HUM sequence in the GE curriculum, but in the meantime, we believe those courses should fulfill the World Civilizations requirement. The fact that they do not has dis-incentivized students from taking those courses, which has had the perverse, though unintentional, effect of making it more difficult for them to learn about the World Civilization
geographically closest to the United States. Located as we are in southern California in close proximity with Mexico, the imperative to
b. provide our students with greater opportunities to learn about the history and culture of Latin America should be obvious.
c. Second, because of a lack of qualified instructors at Seaver, the History program can rarely if ever, offer our existing courses on Pre-Columbian Civilizations (HIST 320), Native Americans (HIST 400), California (HIST 426), the Westward Expansion (HIST 427), or Modern Africa (HIST 450). Dr. Hart has agreed to prepare a course on Modern Africa, and Dr. Hunnicutt has agreed to develop a course on the History of California, and we request that administration support these efforts concretely, and especially in terms of the release time needed to develop new courses. We may need additional faculty support to provide our students with the opportunity to learn about the many cultures of the American West, but we believe these commitments on the part of our existing faculty will, if properly supported by administration, help plug some of the gaps in our curriculum.

5. We also believe that we need additional faculty support for an ancient historian, a classicist, or a specialist in patristics. Because any new faculty member in these fields would have considerable responsibilities in the HUM sequence (i.e. HUM 111), we believe that administration should open another tenure line to fulfill these needs both in the History program and in the Humanities sequence, since both programs are vital to the General Education curriculum of Seaver College.

6. In our 2015 assessment retreat, the faculty agreed to revise the wording of PLO #6 so that it would be easier to define and assess Historical Engagement. We realize that we have not taken as much initiative as we should to help our students (whether majors or not) to utilize the historical insights they have gained through our instruction to understand contemporary issues more fully. We believe we should be more proactive in finding opportunities, such as service-learning and co-curricular activities, to help our students engage in discussion about the issues facing our campus, our nation, and our world. In particular, we intend to become a better resource to facilitate productive discussions of cultural diversity at Pepperdine.

7. The faculty fully agrees with the external reviewer’s emphasis on the importance of internships. However, since most History majors do participate in internships (though not necessarily History internships), the faculty realized that it needs to record and assess opportunities like internships in which history students participate more systematically.

8. It is also clear to the faculty that the history program would benefit from tracking the post-baccalaureate plans and accomplishments of our graduates as additional data for assessing the quality of our program. The history faculty needs additional administrative support to achieve this goal.

E. In response to the Associate Provost’s request for more analysis of the effects of the recent curricular changes to our program, the faculty fully agreed on the necessity of analyzing and assessing those changes, and request an extended time frame in which to do so.
Since most of the recent curricular changes have only become fully implemented this
academic year (2015-16), and because the sample size of each cohort of History majors is so small, we did not feel we had sufficient data to see how the changes have affected either student learning or recruitment and retention of students to the History major.

1. Fortunately, because of our long-standing practice of reviewing senior portfolios, the faculty believes we will be able to assess the effects of those changes once we obtain a sufficiently robust data series in the next two or three years.
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SELF STUDY

I.  Introduction

A.  The Internal Context

The Liberal Arts major has been in place in one form or another since the founding of Pepperdine College in 1936 as a broad-based degree program designed to provide a breadth of subject matter along with a depth of subject matter in one concentration. Situated in the Humanities/Teacher Education division, the Liberal Arts Major requires a minimum of 100 units, including General Education requirements. Students can choose one of seven concentrations, each one requiring a minimum of twelve units, including at least one upper division course. The major includes three foundational education courses that are required in the professional teacher preparation program. The major is designed to dovetail with the professional teacher preparation program for multiple subject candidates and was deemed an Approved Subject Matter Program by the CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) in 2003 (meaning graduates were deemed “subject matter competent” without needing to pass the California Subject Exam for Teachers or CSET). However, just a few months later, in response to the requirements of No Child Left Behind, the CCTC decided to required CSET passage for multiple subject teaching candidates anyway, whether or not they had completed an Approved Subject Matter Program.

B.  The External Context

In developing the curriculum and overall program, the Liberal Arts faculty placed a high priority on recognizing that there are two distinct groups of students within the major: (1) those who want to become teachers and are simultaneously pursuing a multiple subject credential and (2) those who intend to seek employment or pursue graduate school in fields other than education. Although the necessary knowledge-base of these two groups of students is similar, there are other ways in which the needs of these two groups differ. For example, those not seeking teaching credentials select the major because it provides broad exposure to a variety of intellectual disciplines and skills, and it facilitates the construction of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary connections. For future teachers, the Liberal Arts degree not only provides essential subject-specific knowledge included in the K-8 curriculum (visual and performing arts; human development; physical education; history & social science; mathematics; science; and reading, language & literature), but the curriculum also covers content assessed by the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) and is excellent preparation for successful passage of the Multiple Subjects CSET required of all multiple subject credential candidates.

C.  Mission, Purposes, Goals, and Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes

Students who successfully complete Pepperdine’s Liberal Arts Program should be able to:

1. Demonstrate critical thinking and a broad knowledge base in the disciplines of natural science, fine arts, social science, mathematics, English, and human development.
2. Speak to a variety of audiences in a clear, coherent, and organized manner.
3. Write clearly and coherently for a diverse range of audiences and purposes.
4. Conduct research using a variety of sources, strategies, and approaches.
5. Discern and address the moral and spiritual foundations and implications of teaching and learning.

The Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) for Pepperdine University are formed by two components: Core Commitments (i.e., Knowledge and Scholarship, Faith and Heritage, and Global Understanding) and Institutional Values (i.e., Purpose, Service, and Leadership). The intersections of these three Core Commitments and these three Institutional Values were the basis of the development of the nine IEOs. The following chart shows how the Liberal Arts program reflects the University’s goals and ideals, depicting alignment between the Liberal Arts PLOs and the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>PLO #1</th>
<th>PLO #2</th>
<th>PLO #3</th>
<th>PLO #4</th>
<th>PLO #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILO #1: Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #2: Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #3: Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #4: Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #5: Respond to the call to serve others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #6: Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #7: Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #8: Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO #9: Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PLOs are related to each of the courses taught in the Liberal Arts program. A detailed Program Alignment Map is provided below, identifying the specific course in which each PLO is Introduced (I), Developed (D), and Mastered (M).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>PLO #1</th>
<th>PLO #2</th>
<th>PLO #3</th>
<th>PLO #4</th>
<th>PLO #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 251</td>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 461</td>
<td>Instructional Design</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 462</td>
<td>Educational Foundations</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM 111</td>
<td>Western Culture I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM 212</td>
<td>Western Culture II</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM 313</td>
<td>Western Culture III</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA 313</td>
<td>Materials, Techniques, and Skills in Music</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D, M</td>
<td>D, M</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA 314</td>
<td>Materials, Techniques, and Skills in Art</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 101</td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I, D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM 180</td>
<td>Public Speaking and</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Liberal Arts Assessment Plan is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Schedule</th>
<th>Direct Evidence</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence</th>
<th>Authentic Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO #1: Annually</td>
<td>Multiple Subjects CSET scores</td>
<td>Senior Exit Survey</td>
<td>Authentic evidence of student mastery of these PLOs is collected through our Teacher Preparation Program and is reported in that Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #2: April 2015</td>
<td>Rubrics for 2 presentations in EDUC 461 (presentation skills course)</td>
<td>Senior Exit Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #3: April 2016</td>
<td>Writing samples from EDUC 462 (writing intensive course)</td>
<td>Senior Exit Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #4: April 2017</td>
<td>Research papers from EDUC 461 (research intensive course)</td>
<td>Senior Exit Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #5: April 2018</td>
<td>Embedded test questions in EDUC 251 final</td>
<td>Senior Exit Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The WASC Table 7.1 Educational Effectiveness Indicators can be found below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) What are the formal learning outcomes?</th>
<th>(2) Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</th>
<th>(3) Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</th>
<th>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</th>
<th>(5) How are the findings used?</th>
<th>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Demonstrate critical thinking and a broad knowledge base in the disciplines of natural science, fine arts, social science, mathematics, English, and human development  
2. Speak to a variety of audiences in a clear, coherent, and organized manner  
3. Write clearly and coherently for a diverse range of audiences and purposes  
4. Conduct research using a variety of sources, strategies, and approaches  
5. Discern and address the moral and spiritual foundations and implications of teaching and learning | http://seaver.pepperdine.edu/humanities/undergraduate/liberalarts/learning-outcomes.htm | See Assessment plan above for assessments performed throughout the program to measure achievement of stated outcomes.  
To determine whether graduates have achieved stated outcomes, the following data is collected and analyzed:  
1. Indirect evidence is collected through administering Exit Surveys to all Liberal Arts graduates two weeks before graduation.  
2. Direct evidence of graduate competency in writing (PLO #3) is collected from the Performance for CA Teachers (PACT) Task 2 on Planning. The PACT is a state-approved Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) designed to assess teacher candidates’ knowledge, skills, and abilities as articulated in the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Though not all Liberal Arts majors pursue their teaching credential, most do. This written assignment is the last significant writing assignment completed in the major for those Liberal Arts majors completing their credential.  
3. Direct evidence of graduates’ broad knowledge base in the disciplines of natural science, fine arts, social science, mathematics, English, and human development (PLO #1) was collected from scores on the Multiple Subjects California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) for all multiple subject candidates. | The evidence is interpreted by the Liberal Arts/Teacher Education faculty at Seaver (Drs. Birmingham, Erbes, and Wall). Data are collected throughout the school year, analyzed annually, and included in the Annual Report.  
Means of the Likert scaled data on the Exit Surveys are calculated and open responses are analyzed by looking for key themes.  
The PACT Task 2 writing samples were rated by applying the AAC&U writing rubric to assess writing competency.  
The Multiple Subject CSET was developed by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) who contracted the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson to assist in the development, administration, and scoring. We analyze students’ score reports in light of the Liberal Arts PLOs and note strengths and weaknesses of the program. | Using the process described in column 4, administrators, faculty and staff note areas of strength and needed improvement, create action items to address these areas, discuss these items in meetings, and make changes in the program as necessary for overall program improvement. Annual Reports are provided annual. The last Five Year Review of the Liberal Arts program was submitted in 2009. | Annual Reports are provided yearly. The last Five Year Review of the Liberal Arts program was submitted in 2009. |

II. Analysis of Evidence  
A. Student Success  
To provide an overview of our Liberal Arts students, enrollment data by gender, high school GPA, SAT math and reading scores, and ethnicity are provided below.
## Liberal Arts Enrollment Data by Gender, High School GPA, and SAT scores (2009-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student count</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females/males</td>
<td>68/4</td>
<td>61/9</td>
<td>75/8</td>
<td>70/9</td>
<td>70/6</td>
<td>56/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average High School GPA</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SAT Math/Reading</td>
<td>571/589</td>
<td>570/585</td>
<td>574/583</td>
<td>577/595</td>
<td>583/602</td>
<td>588/607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Liberal Arts Enrollment Data by Ethnicity (2009-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One indicator of student success is graduation data. Four-year and six-year graduation rates disaggregated by Liberal Arts students’ gender and ethnicity are provided below.

### Four-Year and Six-Year Graduation Rates for Students Admitted Between 2004 and 2010 Disaggregated by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admit</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Year Graduation Rates</td>
<td>6-Year Graduation Rates</td>
<td>4-Year Graduation Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85.7 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70.0 %</td>
<td>85.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77.8 %</td>
<td>77.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88.9 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62.5 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79.5 %</td>
<td>88.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to these data, females make up 86% of the Liberal Arts majors (down from 94% in 2009). This percentage mirrors that of the nation in which 87% (as of 2012) of the elementary school teaching force is female (up from 69% in 1986). Since about 60% of the Liberal Arts at majors at Seaver are simultaneously pursuing a multiple subject teaching credential major, this percentage is not surprising. Comparatively, 52% of Pepperdine’s Liberal Arts majors identify themselves as White (down from 75% in 2009), 17% identify themselves as Hispanic, 12% identify themselves as Asian, 8% identify with two or more races, 6% did not identify their ethnicity, and 5% identify themselves as Black. Though there is greater diversity among our Liberal Arts majors as compared with the diversity data from 2009, these numbers do not reflect the nation’s increasingly diverse PK-12 racial and ethnic population. A recent AACTE study stated, “An analysis of the National Center for Education Statistics (2012) data showed that students of color made up more than 45% of the PK–12 population, whereas teachers of color made up only 17.5% of the educator workforce.” This is an on-going challenge for teacher preparation programs and thus Liberal Arts programs, since many prospective elementary teachers are simultaneously enrolled in both.
B. Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of the Degree

1. Meaning of the Degree

The Liberal Arts degree is designed to meet CCTC requirements and address the breadth of knowledge that is important for multiple subject teachers to possess. In addition to conventional academic knowledge, the major includes an exploration of theoretical, psychological, and developmental foundations that includes Christian perspectives and applications to classroom practice. Because the Liberal Arts major overlaps with general education (GE) requirements, the following chart compares the combined unit requirements of Pepperdine’s Liberal Arts major and GEs, with three of our aspirational and peer universities (USD, LMU, and Santa Clara).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pepperdine</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>LMU</th>
<th>Santa Clara*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language (English and World)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, religion, philosophy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Social Science</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math and logic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total without Education units</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*quarter system units converted to semester system units, rounded to the nearest unit

As noted above, the four programs are similar in that they all address the same content areas, but are different in the emphasis that they give to those content areas. For instance, LMU does not have a world language requirement, and it addresses writing skills in its general studies requirements, so its language requirements are a third of what Pepperdine’s are. Because of the common CCTC requirements, it makes sense that the majors are similar in content areas addressed. However, because programs can decide in which courses to address required content areas and skills, it makes sense that the programs differ in units required.

The **WASC Core Competencies** are aligned closely with the Liberal Arts PLOs and are addressed simultaneously with the assessment of PLOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
<th>PLO#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**2. Quality and Integrity of the Degree**

Besides participating in university-wide co-curricular experiences, Liberal Arts students are provided learning opportunities through their involvement in service learning, research, and internships. Students in EDUC 251 participate in service learning by partnering with a local Title I elementary school. The service learning experience allows students to link academic course objectives with real community needs through active participation in a mutually-beneficial service experience. Students in EDUC 461 and EDUC 462 are required to complete a 20 hour internship in a local school. These practical classroom experiences are constructed to allow students to integrate educational theory with K-12 classroom practice. At semester’s end, the K-12 supervising teacher completes an evaluation form assessing the student’s professionalism and quality of work.

**Assessment of the Liberal Arts degree as a whole**

The Exit Survey completed by Liberal Arts graduates consists of 5 Likert items (corresponding to the 5 PLOs) and 4 open-response questions. On the Likert items, students respond by checking one of four boxes specifying the degree to which they felt the Liberal Arts major contributed to promoting, encouraging, and developing skills and knowledge in each of the 5 PLO areas. Response options were: Very much (4), Some (3), A little (2), or Not at all (1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>2010-2011 Mean Score (N=10)</th>
<th>2011-2012 Mean Score (N=10)</th>
<th>2012-2013 Mean Score (N=13)</th>
<th>2013-2014 Mean Score (N=11)</th>
<th>2014-2015 Mean Score (N=11)</th>
<th>2010-2015 Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO #1: Demonstrating critical thinking and a broad knowledge base in the disciplines of natural science, fine arts, social science, mathematics, English, and human development</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #2: Speaking to a variety of audiences in a clear, coherent, and organized manner</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #3: Writing clearly and coherently for a diverse range of audiences and purposes</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #4: Conducting research using a variety of sources, strategies, and approaches</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO #5: Discerning and addressing the moral and spiritual foundations and implications of teaching and learning</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Assessment of PLO #1

CSET scores (direct evidence)

All Liberal Arts majors who plan to earn their teaching credential must pass three subtests in math and science; language arts and social science; and human development, fine arts, and physical education of the CSET in Multiple Subjects. The means for each CSET content area are as follows (4 being the highest score):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content area</th>
<th>‘11-‘12</th>
<th>‘12-‘13</th>
<th>‘13-‘14</th>
<th>‘14-‘15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading, Language, Literature</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Social Science</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual/Performing Arts</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4: Most of the items were answered correctly
3: Many of the items were answered correctly
2: Some of the items were answered correctly
1: Few/none of the items were answered correctly

Assessment of PLOs #2-4

PLO #2 is directly assessed in the presentation of a research report in EDUC 461. PLO #3 is directly addressed in writing a research/professional philosophy paper in EDUC 462. PLO #4 is directly addressed in a research project in EDUC 461. Assessments are conducted in a 5-year cycle. On core rubrics, student work earns a score of 1-4 (4=exceptional; 3 = proficient; 2=approaching proficiency; and 1 = early development):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
<th>2-sample mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#2: Presentation Skills</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject knowledge</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visuals</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity of speaking</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Writing and Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Clarity and style</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization and fluidity</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation and evidence</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanics and usage</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## #4: Research Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013; n=20</th>
<th>New rubric used, making comparisons with previous semesters unfeasible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of research</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing/content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph construction</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of sources</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment of PLO #5

In EDUC 251, an embedded test question asks, “How has this course contributed to your ability to address and discern the moral and spiritual implications of teaching?” Student answers were coded, sorted, and conceptualized. The chart below shows the number of student responses that address each of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall 2012 (N=22)</th>
<th>Spr 2013 (N=18)</th>
<th>Fall 2013 (N=24)</th>
<th>Spr 2014 (N=24)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased my knowledge of human development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge of physical, psychosocial, and cognitive development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of children and teens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge of child and adolescent moral development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helped me understand that teachers must be responsive to the holistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are people of influence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers must model respectful behavior and set good examples</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching must address the whole child, not just his/her mind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each student is unique and teachers must tailor instruction to meet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching is a big responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching requires empathy, compassion, and warmth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are mandatory reporters of child abuse and must pay attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to warning signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helped me view teaching as a ministry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers can share the gospel and the love of Christ through their</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actions without evangelizing them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praying for students is powerful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching is a ministry, not just a profession</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Placement of Graduates in Jobs

Liberal arts majors have earned a good reputation with school districts statewide. The chart below shows the job placement of 51 Liberal Arts teacher education graduates from 2011-2015.
Throughout the last 5 academic years, data have been collected in the form of direct evidence (student work samples) and indirect evidence (graduate exit surveys and focus group interviews) as seen above. At the end of each academic year, the Liberal Arts core faculty meet to analyze the data and construct an Annual Report of assessment planning, assessment results, and goals for the future based on assessment results. We note strengths and weaknesses of our program and brainstormed potential curriculum and/or pedagogical changes. Below is a summary of each year’s “closing the loop” section in these Annual Reports.

**2011-2012**

1. **Construction of core assignments and rubrics aligned with PLOs 2-4:** In examining assignments required in our research intensive (EDUC 461) and writing intensive (EDUC 462) courses, the faculty has decided to adjust the assignments required in both courses. Currently, research projects and papers are required in both EDUC 461 and EDUC 462. However, beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, a research project that includes an empirical component, written report, and presentation will be required in the research intensive course (EDUC 461) and a variety of other writing assignments such as an education philosophy paper will be required in the writing intensive course (EDUC 462) to engage students in writing strategies for a diverse range of audiences and purposes (PLO #3). The faculty will develop a list of required proficiencies in each of the PLO areas and then construct foundational assignments and rubrics that can remain constant in the course despite changes in professors. By requiring these core assignments, our program can be assured that specific criteria are being addressed and assessed each semester and can more easily document trends and compare the results from year to year.

2. **PLO#5 embedded test question modified:** As mentioned above, beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, the education faculty intends to modify the EDUC 251 embedded test question to make visible the course or program components that contribute to students’ ability
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to “address and discern the moral and spiritual implications of teaching.” The question will read, “How has this course contributed to your ability to address and discern the moral and spiritual implications of teaching?” This question will be embedded in the final exam of the three foundational Liberal Arts courses (EDUC 251, EDUC 461, and EDUC 462) to examine course contributions toward development in this area.

3. Revise PLO #1 to include critical thinking: The Teacher Education faculty felt it best to modify the Liberal Arts PLOs to include critical thinking. Because critical thinking is situated in disciplines and is best developed in contexts rather than generally, we decided to add it to PLO #1. PLO #1 now reads, “Graduates of Seaver’s program in Liberal Arts will be able to demonstrate critical thinking and a broad knowledge base in the disciplines of natural science, fine arts, social science, mathematics, English, and human development.”

2012-2013
1. Scheduling of Earth Science Courses: To address scheduling issues concerning the earth sciences courses, Carrie Wall spoke with Rodney Honeycutt and Cooker Perkins about the possibility of offering an earth science every other year spring semester. They expressed their challenge of offering enough courses just for their majors, much less the science general education courses needed by other Seaver students. This conversation will continue.

2. Research Intensive Course Project in EDUC 461: The Liberal Arts faculty discussed possible research projects that would maximize student learning of the research process while also remaining manageable in scope to allow course time to focus on other essential curricular concepts. Assignments considered were a basic literature review, a mini-grant proposal in which students outline the methods for a research study (but don’t actually collect data), and a micro-research project in which data is collected and analyzed.

3. Presentation Skills in EDUC 461: Given that the lowest means from the presentation skills rubric were found in delivery and clarity of speaking, we are considering different methods of providing more assistance or direction to students in how to deliver an oral presentation within a 10-15 minute timeframe with greater clarity. One option is to videotape the student presentations both for self-reflection and so that future students enrolled in the EDUC 461 course can view an exceptional model before presenting their own research.

4. Concentrations: We realize that our concentration offerings may need some revision. However, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) is considering reauthorizing the Elementary Subject Matter programs. In order to apply for this approval, we will need to take a close look at our Liberal Arts program. Therefore, we decided to table this discussion until we hear a final decision from the CCTC.

2013-2014
1. Modify the Assessment Plan: In our SALT review, the assessor stated that they “typically advise against assessing more than one PLO in an academic year.” Therefore, to narrow the scope of our annual assessment activities, we have decided to assess PLO#1 annually and then rotate our focus on each of the other PLOs (numbers 2,
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3, 4, and 5), centering on one PLO each year. Prior to this, our program has assessed 2-3 PLOs per year which lessens our ability to give quality attention to each PLO.

2. Critical Thinking: In order to more intentionally measure students’ ability to engage in critical thinking, the faculty decided to embed “critical thinking” into the writing core rubric (measuring PLO #3). The writing core rubric is used to determine the degree to which the signature assignment (the educational philosophy paper) reflects the essential writing competencies. By requiring these signature assignments and professor-completed core rubrics, our program can be assured that specific criteria are being addressed and assessed each semester and we can more easily compare results from year to year and document trends. We propose both to continue emphasizing critical thinking in the educational philosophy paper and promote opportunities for critical thinking and the building of background information throughout the Liberal Arts coursework.

2014-2015
1. Course improvements and challenges: To address and fine-tune course offerings within the Teacher Education division, Teacher Education faculty spent a retreat day discussing what topics are covered in their respective courses. The goal was to identity areas of repetition in order to free up instructional time to discuss other topics. This first collaborative planning meeting took place May 29, 2015.

2. Writing competency: One area of needed support in writing is in the area of providing sources and evidence. Analysis of the writing from 10 of our recent graduates revealed that our graduates use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the field of education, but that there is room for improvement. Though our candidates have a great deal of experience using academic language to appropriately address writing tasks in the field of education, they have less experience articulating the evidence and theory that informs their instructional decisions. Teacher Education faculty scheduled a meeting on May 29, 2015 and discussed how we can address this aspect of writing in our courses most effectively.

3. Presentation Skills competency: An area of challenge related to research presentations is the tension between giving students ample time to practice their presentation skills and not allowing the giving of presentations to dominate instructional time. For instance, in spring 2015, there were 22 students who needed to give research presentations. Methods of how to spread the presentations over the course of the semester or what an ideal time and/or strategy for students to give their presentations while still allowing time to cover course content will be discussed further. To improve the quality of students’ presentations, the EDUC 461 instructor will video record student research presentations in the fall of 2015, so that future students will have models to study before giving their own research presentations.
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D. Sustainability: Evidence of Program Viability

1. Demand for the Program.

Number of Majors in the Liberal Arts Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majors</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Graduates in the Liberal Arts Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to [http://college.usatoday.com/2015/04/22/15-surprisingly-valuable-arts-majors/](http://college.usatoday.com/2015/04/22/15-surprisingly-valuable-arts-majors/), Liberal studies brings together concepts from numerous academic fields, including political science, cultural studies, education and the social sciences, to help students form an interdisciplinary perspective. The Liberal Arts major also gives students the flexibility to transition to a number of different fields. Forbes magazine also recently published an article reporting that Liberal Arts majors were the most desirable employees who contribute fresh ideas to the workplace. The Association of American Colleges and Universities also published articles in 2014 summarizing the reports of How Liberal Arts and Sciences Majors Fare in Employment, which analyzed data from the 2010-11 U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey. AAC&U President Carol Geary Schneider confirmed that, "the findings in this report demonstrate, majoring in a liberal arts field can and does lead to successful and remunerative careers in a wide array of professions.” Key findings from the report also showed that Liberal Arts majors earn about $2000 more than undergraduates in professional or pre-professional fields, unemployment rates are low for Liberal Arts graduates, and most students go on to pursue graduate or professional degrees and experience increases in their salaries after doing so.

At Seaver College, while 40% of Liberal Arts majors do not pursue a teaching credential, the trend is for most Liberal Arts majors (60%) to earn their multiple-subject teaching credential simultaneously. There are many benefits for students to earn their Liberal Arts degrees and their teaching credential at the same time, including an overlap of some course requirements, and the availability of scholarships and financial aid. A report from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing last year at the meeting of the California Council on Teacher Education in San Jose stated that in the last five years, there has been a 30% decline in the number of teaching credentials granted statewide from 23,320 in 2007-2008 to 16,450 in 2011-2012, and that enrollment in teacher preparation programs statewide has declined by 41% in the same time period (see figure 1 below).
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This steady decline in enrollment in California teacher preparation programs is no different at Pepperdine over the past few years. See figure below.

![Number of Pepperdine TPP Completers](chart.png)

However, given that 19% of the teaching force is over age 55 and nearing the average retirement age of 62, it is reasonable to assume that within a few years enrollment in teacher education programs statewide and at Pepperdine will increase, and enrollment will trend upward.

2. Allocation of Resources.

Faculty. Currently, there are 3 full-time faculty in the Liberal Arts/Teacher Education program. A table summarizing this data is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of full-time faculty</th>
<th># of part-time or adjunct faculty</th>
<th># of Liberal Arts majors in 2014-2015</th>
<th>Student to full-time faculty ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Currently none</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that Seaver’s student/faculty ratio is 13:1, the Liberal Arts student/faculty ratio of 25:1 indicates that the Liberal Arts faculty is serving twice the number of students as faculty in other majors. These data indicate that the Liberal Arts program is understaffed and may therefore need additional faculty and/or staff to maintain program quality.

III. Summary and Reflections

Preliminary Quality Improvement Plan: Goals, Actions, and Plans Based on Self-Study

1. Writing competency (PLO #3): One area of needed support in writing is in the area of providing sources and evidence. Analysis of the writing from 10 of our recent graduates revealed that our graduates use credible and/or relevant sources to support their claims, but that there is room for improvement. Though our candidates have a great deal of experience using academic language to appropriately address writing tasks in the field of education, they have less experience articulating the evidence and theory that informs their instructional decisions. After a recent curriculum meeting in which Teacher Education faculty discussed the content of their courses (trying to identify areas of overlap), one assignment was eliminated from the EDUC 461 course, freeing up more time to discuss how to locate relevant research articles and how to use them to construct their research papers.

2. Presentation Skills competency (PLO #2): An area of challenge related to research presentations is the tension between giving students ample time to practice their presentation skills and not allowing the giving of presentations to dominate instructional time. For instance, in spring 2015, there were 22 students who needed to give research presentations. To address this pedagogical dilemma, we have decided to cap the course at 18 students. Additionally, the EDUC 461 course instructor will video record student research presentations, so that students...
can review and improve their presentational abilities and so that future students will have models to consider and study before giving their own research presentations.

3. **Curriculum challenges:** We realize that our Liberal Arts core program as well as our concentration offerings need revision. We are tabling that effort until the CCTC makes its decisions about new requirements for multiple subject subject matter programs so we can revise the Liberal Arts major once to meet these new requirements.
THE EXTERNAL REVIEW

The External Review was conducted on January 21-22, 2016 by Dr. Bernadette Musetti, Associate Professor and Director of Liberal Studies at Loyola Marymount University. Her report follows.

The external review of the Liberal Arts program at Pepperdine University took place January 21-22, 2016 and included a dinner meeting on the 21st. Dr. Bernadette Musetti, Associate Professor and Director of Liberal Studies at Loyola Marymount University served as the external reviewer and is the author of this report. Meetings and interviews were held with five faculty members (from Liberal Arts/Education, Science and History), a Divisional Dean in Seaver College, and twelve Liberal Arts students.

I-II. Program Learning Outcomes & Assessment

The Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are clearly stated and appropriately linked to skills, knowledge and values of the program and adequately match the professional standards. Learning outcomes are adequate for the degree and the discipline. The program is further guided and indeed driven by the university’s mission of “service, purpose, leadership”. Indeed, Professional Learning Outcomes are closely aligned with Institutional Learning Outcomes (which consist of Core Commitments and Institutional Values). PLOs are mapped carefully to more than 20 Liberal Arts courses and identified as being introduced, developed or mastered.

The program is clear about serving two distinct groups of students within the major--those seeking a multiple subjects credential and those who are not. Because Pepperdine’s undergraduate Liberal Arts program serves both teaching credential candidates and non-credential track students, it is complex in terms of assessing program learning outcomes. For example, standardized subject area tests are one of the methods by which learning outcomes are measured and determined to have been met by students. However, this applies only to the 60% of the program’s students who are doing the Multiple Subjects teaching credential. Similarly, for WASC accreditation, these (CSET) test scores are used, as are the PACT 2 samples, which only teacher credential candidates write. However, other forms of (authentic) data are gathered and reported on in the Annual Report. Additionally, seniors take part in an exit survey, the data from which is analyzed and serves to inform the program about student learning, among other experiences. Given the large corpus of possible courses from which PLO assessment data could be drawn, this may be advisable, especially in the case of PLO 1--critical thinking and broad knowledge across the disciplines. In the internal five-year review report the program itself identified plans for quality improvement in the areas of presentation skills and writing (PLOs 2 and 3 respectively), which are important goals to pursue and competencies on which to focus.

There are large scale changes in Liberal Arts and teacher education at both the national and state levels and Pepperdine’s decision to wait for further guidance (e.g. in the area of concentration revision) and until these new requirements are established at the state level makes very good sense--especially given the institution’s history of aligning its program to meet standards for Approved Programs, only to have the requirements change soon thereafter.

III. Curriculum

The current curriculum content is appropriate to the level and purpose of the program and students are held to high standards. The design of the curriculum is good and in general enables students to
Liberal Arts acquire the knowledge and skills required for the outcomes needed for graduates of the program. Program requirements are clearly outlined and with minor exceptions students are able to enroll in required classes. Students complete the program in a timely manner and there are few to no curricular or scheduling hindrances preventing four-year graduation. Each student meets regularly with her assigned advisor who is continually updating the course matrix and graduation plan. Faculty are aware of and highly responsive to student curricular needs, which are seen as primary. Repeatedly students spoke of the expertise and passion the faculty bring to their courses, especially the education faculty, where it is clear to students these faculty are teaching people, who are also students. This approach enhances and deepens the curricular experience for students. When asked about the curriculum, one student reported that the program changed her in “mind blowing ways—my mind has been blown wide open...it’s about the big questions and becoming open minded…it changes you.” Alternately, one student reported that she felt she missed out on taking the type of rigorous, upper division courses her friends in other programs were required to take.

Several students report that the curriculum “stretches” them and helps them to develop their thinking. Most students appreciated the breadth of the program and the opportunity to learn across the disciplines. Liberal Arts by its very definition is broad-based and not specialized, which is important, as it reflects what many employers report wanting in new hires. However, as mentioned, students fulfill a concentration, which allows for a level of specialization. Indeed, many students do more than one concentration. It is not uncommon for Pepperdine’s teacher preparation students to go on to earn multiple credentials--for example, adding a Single Subject credential to the Multiple Subjects. Pepperdine is doing an exceptional job in this area of making students aware of the ability to add onto one credential. Pepperdine does not offer any bilingual authorizations, which may be something to consider going forward, especially considering the numbers of bilingual students in the state the demand for bilingual teachers.

An area for improvement in the curriculum as reported by both faculty and students is offering the Family Studies concentration, which is on the books and listed as an option, but not always offered. One of the complexities for the coordinators of the Liberal Arts program is relying on colleges and departments across campus to offer required courses for Liberal Arts students, where the Family Studies concentration is one example. A suggestion is to either remove it as an option in the bulletin or ensure that the required courses are offered regularly enough that students can earn the concentration without undue inconvenience in their schedules.

Students report that their Education coursework prepares them to understand issues of diversity, multiculturalism and teaching English Learners. However, many reported wanting more and deeper experiences of diversity, especially linguistic and cultural diversity, which they said must be experienced and cannot be deeply understood in the context of a university classroom. Pepperdine does a good job of consciously placing students in the credential program in one “diversity placement”; however, students reported being willing to travel further to have more diverse experiences, including in their student teaching placement(s). The Liberal Arts program works hard to balance what is possible and doable for students (and the constraints of local Malibu area schools) with the need for as deep and diverse an experience as possible. Pepperdine is among the highest-ranking universities for percentages of students who study abroad, which includes Liberal Arts students. Certainly this contributes to some extent in providing students with experiences of linguistic and cultural diversity (albeit from a dominant language and cultural perspective). Liberal Arts students expressed a shared interest in the university’s commitment to social justice and it is clear that most students participate in multiple activities with this focus.
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Faculty teaching courses taken by Liberal Arts students are aware of the issues with which future teachers will grapple, especially in terms of teaching curricular content in age appropriate ways. For example, one instructor of California History stated that teaching about history and diversity is a big theme for him and pondered how it is one teaches fourth graders about the state’s history, which he described as a “revolving door of discrimination--a meeting place of peoples and conflict and cultures.” He helps students connect what is going on in California with the larger world as an intersection of contemporary global issues with history. His focus is the multicultural classroom and he asks students to think about linking to their diverse future classrooms. This type of across the curriculum commitment to students, especially future educators, is a hallmark and a strength of Pepperdine’s Liberal Arts program.

One area in which students suggested specific changes in the curriculum was in the required Humanities courses. In general students felt these courses could be improved in terms of the pedagogy employed, where lecture is common. Students reported seeing these as just additional history courses. Indeed, Liberal Arts students take approximately 20 credits in Humanities and History combined. Students suggested incentivizing Humanities-linked out of class experiences such as museum visits, whereby the greater LA area could serve as an expansion of the traditional classroom and lecture. It was suggested that even changing the names of the Humanities courses to reflect their content would be helpful (rather than just being numbered Humanities I etc.).

IV. Student Experiences and Learning Environment

One of the somewhat unique features of Pepperdine’s Liberal Arts degree is the wide range of students attracted to the degree and for a variety of reasons. The reviewer met with 12 students in four small groups over a period of several hours. Students represented all classes--freshmen through seniors and both students who were earning a teaching credential as well as those not earning a credential as part of their undergraduate program. Students interviewed included those earning a Multiple Subjects teaching credential, a Single Subject (secondary) credential, students in their fifth year earning a credential, and students not earning any credential, but for whom the degree provides an excellent background and broad-based education, such as pre-med students. Because Liberal Arts students must declare and fulfill a concentration area, this allows for specialization within the degree, thus offering students both a broad based liberal arts education, as well as an area of specialization (such as science in the case of pre-med). Overall, students report being very satisfied with their experience and the learning environment.

Students are highly supported throughout their program and through the curriculum, from mandatory advising to dedicated library support for research. Faculty meet with students regularly and students report faculty availability as one of the things they most appreciate from the program. Students reported that even while studying abroad, faculty members were always available to advise on coursework and update four year plans. Students reported feeling that their learning experience was deeper and better than that of their friends at other institutions, because of the interest and passion their professors have to engage them in the learning process. Students report that their experience at Pepperdine is distinguished by the ongoing opportunity for discussion and dialogue with caring, expert faculty members. Indeed, students repeatedly shared that they felt faculty care about them as people, not only as students, thus speaking to the whole person approach characteristic of the Liberal Arts experience at Pepperdine.

Class sizes are small and students receive a great deal of personal attention. Students reported that small classes require them to be accountable during class and to contribute to class discussions, but in an environment of low stress and high positive affect that promotes sharing within a community.
Liberal Arts of learners. Because of the small class sizes and time spent with individual students, faculty know who students are, what they are studying and why, and special circumstances or needs students may have. Again, this distinguishes the program and promotes success.

The program provides excellent opportunities for co-curricular programs. Students complete approximately 250 field hours across four courses, in addition to student teaching, which for Liberal Arts students on the teaching track serves as their “internship”. Students do not do formal undergraduate research presentations, but conduct and share case studies and other research. In addition, teacher preparation students complete a Capstone course. Many Liberal Arts students take advantage of education related summer opportunities, such as working at camps for children. Faculty members make students aware of numerous opportunities to engage in pre-professional work (volunteer and paid) beyond the formal program requirements.

Student support services are generally very good, including excellent tutoring, counseling, and library support services. Faculty often hold events in their homes and students generally report feeling they are part of a cared about and cared for community at Pepperdine. Possible exceptions to this and an area for further attention is Resident Life and housing, which students report could be more responsive to student issues and problems (for example when requesting a different roommate, housing is unaccommodating). Several students reported that they know many students who feel lonely. One student said, “If you’re not in Greek life, you feel like you don’t belong here.” Other student suggestions included increasing cultural sensitivity on campus and “offering more structured support for all different kinds of students”, including international students.

V. Faculty Quality

Faculty quality is excellent and faculty hold credentials appropriate for the discipline and degree. For example, all three full time Liberal Arts Education faculty hold doctoral degrees from a research institution—the University of California Santa Barbara and all have taught for many years in grades K-12. Their areas of specialization vary and collectively include bilingualism, educational psychology, mathematics, and pupil personnel services. History faculty also hold PhD degrees as well as regional specializations—for example, the faculty member teaching History of California is an Americanist. The faculty member who teaches the lab science course NASC 156 for Liberal Arts students is an astrophysicist who holds a Doctor of Philos degree in Space Science from Norway. These typify the type of instructor credentials Pepperdine students enjoy as Liberal Arts majors.

Liberal Arts faculty members come from various colleges and departments across campus. However, they are keenly aware of the Liberal Arts program and who the Liberal Arts students are in their courses. There is cooperative synergy that exists across Liberal Arts faculty for the benefit of students, due in large part to the efforts of the Program Director, Dr. Carrie Wall, who has made a distinct effort to ensure this is the case. This translates into care and cooperation in terms of course scheduling and communication regarding Liberal Arts courses and student needs. When the Liberal Arts program next makes wide-scale program changes (possibly in the coming year or two), it may be advisable to create a Liberal Arts Advisory Committee composed of key stakeholders and instructors across disciplines who meet every year or even every semester as needed, in order to maintain the synergy and channels of communication that currently exists.
VI. Diversity

It appears that Pepperdine as an institution and Liberal Arts as a degree program both engage in sincere attempts to increase diversity in all aspects. Currently Liberal Arts students are predominantly female—86%, which is down from 94% in 2009. However, this is not unusual for programs that include teacher preparation and can be seen at Pepperdine’s aspirational institutions and at the national level. Pepperdine’s Liberal Arts program is showing significant progress in terms of recruiting an increasingly diverse student body, where 34% of students identified as White-Non Hispanic in 2014, compared to 54% in 2009. Nonetheless, an effort to attract and support an even more diverse student population is an important goal, especially in terms of teacher preparation, where there is a distinct mismatch between the student and teacher populations in terms of race/ethnicity, language, religion, culture and social class (as acknowledged in the internal five year review report). Importantly however, issues of diversity are discussed at length in courses, including issues of poverty and the consequences and implications of such for future teachers and their students.

Diversity among faculty is also an issue for institutional and program consideration. Faculty themselves acknowledge that it is possible for a Liberal Arts student to go through her program and have very few faculty of color. Others may experience one Latino, Asian, and/or African American faculty teaching their courses. However, most students go through their program experiencing almost all white instructors. And in the case of Liberal Arts students, their classmates are also overwhelmingly white and female. Again, Pepperdine is not alone in this need for increased diversity in the Liberal Arts degree program.

VII. Program Administrative Support

Library, laboratory, administrative, and other support services are adequate, and in many cases exemplary (as is the case with Liberal Arts advising). At the university level the profile of Liberal Arts could be enhanced, where several students currently in the program reported not knowing about the degree as freshmen and as a result, came late to the program. The program is more stable than many others even within the same Unit and has good recruitment and retention processes and outcomes. In general the needed program administrative supports are in place, with the most glaring exception being in the area of field placement coordination. Five required courses have 20 or more hours of field placement. For several years, Seaver shared a Placement Coordinator with the Graduate School of Education and Psychology (GSEP), but when the Placement Coordinator left suddenly in the middle of the academic year, Seaver scrambled to find someone to make their clinical placements. Currently, a retired principal and former Seaver adjunct professor is making the placements for minimal compensation, which is not sustainable. As immediately as possible, Seaver College needs to hire its own dedicated field placement coordinator. Funding and hiring this person is the program’s top need and priority at the time of this review.

The overall administration of the Liberal Arts program is another area where the administration support that is already in place should be acknowledged and understood. The duties and responsibilities fulfilled by the Liberal Arts faculty of Education, in particular by the Program Coordinator, Dr. Carrie Wall exceed those of most programs. It is the reviewer’s understanding that the program director receives no additional compensation for performing the duties of this position. The heavy administrative load and the time and attention that goes toward individual students is difficult to calculate, but contributes significantly to the quality of the student experience, which then feeds into retention and completion rates. It also requires time, energy and resources that could
be used elsewhere or for other purposes, such as research and publication. However, the program’s stability overshadows the ongoing need for this type of labor-intensive attention to students and the program. Students thrive but faculty productivity suffers in this scenario (which in this reviewer’s experience is not unusual among Liberal Studies/Liberal Arts program directors/coordinators). Because these faculty members do not have the same workload as others, it is recommended that release or other time (course remission) should be considered so that scholarship can be meaningfully pursued. An additional burden the Liberal Arts faculty of Education assume is “covering” for one another when one of the three of them is away for a period of time (for example on maternity, sabbatical, or other leave), which results in yet more responsibilities and time demands. During such times it is recommended that an Adjunct or Visiting Faculty member be hired. A review of workload and compensation for these faculty is recommended, such that all are given an equitable opportunity for promotion and tenure, in particular as that pertains to the position of Program Coordinator.

The three core Liberal Arts faculty (Wall, Erbes, and Birmingham) are each serving twice the average number of students as other Seaver College faculty. In 2014-2015 Liberal Arts had 76 students, for a student faculty ratio of 25:1, in comparison to 13:1 for Seaver’s other programs. This indicates rather clearly that Liberal Arts is understaffed and needs at least one additional faculty member going forward.

VIII. Summary & Proposed Changes

In general, the strengths of the Liberal Arts program at Pepperdine far eclipse any weaknesses or challenges. Primary strengths include the overall student experience of the program, institutional and faculty dedication to students, and continuous program improvement. Students repeatedly used the word “fantastic” to describe faculty and students feel that faculty care about them both as individual persons and as students. The program continues to attract large numbers of students where it remains a stable and thriving program within the Humanities and Teacher Education Unit of Seaver College. The curriculum is very strong and faculty are highly qualified to teach in their respective disciplines.

The most immediate challenge is in the area of administrative support. Liberal Arts is in very real need of a fairly compensated and Seaver College dedicated Field/Student Placement Coordinator, as previously explained. One of the strengths of the Liberal Arts program is the numerous field experiences required of students. The Teacher Preparation Program has five courses in which students do field placements of one type of another, many of these requiring 20 or more hours in the field. This is a massive undertaking to coordinate and requires a great deal of collaboration and communication with Liberal Arts faculty teaching these courses. Hiring for this position is a pressing need and top priority.

The other main area of concern and challenge is the workload of Liberal Arts faculty, where looking at teaching hours alone does not account for the amount of work done. The quality of the program, especially in terms of the student experience requires large amounts of time and attention to students outside of actual class hours. The work of teacher preparation is unique in its duties and responsibilities, particularly when done especially well, as is the case at Pepperdine (for example knowing and seeing first hand where teachers are doing student teaching). These additional responsibilities require time and energy that others outside of Liberal Arts can and do put toward scholarship, which leaves the faculty providing this additional support at a decided disadvantage in terms of scholarly productivity. In addition, when one of the three core Liberal Arts faculty
members is away from campus for whatever reasons (e.g. sabbatical), the other two “cover” for her, thus further increasing their workload. In these cases visiting or adjunct faculty should be hired. Even without a full time faculty member being away from campus, Liberal Arts faculty have twice the number of students as other Seaver faculty. For this reason alone, additional faculty should be hired in order to establish equity and maintain program quality.

Other areas for possible additional attention are in the area of diversity. The three core Liberal Arts faculty all received their doctoral degrees from the same (albeit excellent) institution—UC Santa Barbara. In this case a diversity of institutional preparation and perspective may benefit students. Additionally, as noted above, it is possible for students to go through the Liberal Arts program with almost no faculty of color teaching their courses. Increased diversity is recommended among the faculty to which Liberal Arts students are exposed across disciplines and across campus.

In terms of policy around the teacher preparation portion of the program, refinements in Pepperdine’s program will follow forthcoming recommendations and requirements for changes at the national and state levels. It is wise that the faculty in Liberal Arts are waiting to see what these changes are before implementing significant program reforms at this time.

In general, the Liberal Arts program at Pepperdine is very strong and faculty are doing an excellent job, given available resources and support.
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FINAL REPORT: QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR LIBERAL ARTS

1. Proposed modifications to improve faculty support

“Liberal Arts is understaffed and needs at least one additional faculty member going forward.”
- Dr. Bernadette Musetti, p. 20

In 2009, Seaver’s Teacher Preparation Program (TPP) and the Graduate School of Education and Psychology (GSEP) TPP were mandated to become “one program.” As a result, Seaver was forced to dismiss their Credentials Analyst, Placement Coordinator, and Assessment Coordinator in order to share these 3 positions with GSEP. Though Seaver’s TPP has functioned fairly well by sharing a Credentials Analyst and a Director of Assessment and Accreditation, our program has felt the void of a Seaver-dedicated Placement Coordinator who served as an additional team member available to help carry the administrative, teaching, and supervisory load of our program. With 75 students in our program, we need assistance with coordination of placements, supervision of student teachers, advising, Master Teacher training and support, and covering courses when faculty take sabbaticals, course releases, etc. Additionally, in order to be responsive to the California teacher shortage, we need to be adequately equipped to not only meet the needs of partner school districts, but also to serve the growing number of students who will most likely take advantage of CA incentives to earn teaching credentials. Therefore, we propose the following.

A. Replace the existing part-time Placement Coordinator with a full-time, non-tenure track Placement Coordinator: Dr. Musetti stated in her External Report, “Liberal Arts is in very real need of a fairly compensated and Seaver College dedicated Field/Student Placement Coordinator” (p. 20). For a couple of years, Seaver shared a Placement Coordinator with GSEP, but when the Placement Coordinator suddenly left in the middle of the academic year, Seaver scrambled to find someone to make our clinical placements. Currently, Mrs. Betty Glass, a retired principal and former Seaver adjunct professor, is making the placements for minimal compensation which is not sustainable. Funds need to be allocated for this position once Mrs. Glass retires. The Liberal Arts faculty recommend expanding the current part-time Placement Coordinator position to a full-time position. This full-time Placement Coordinator’s job description would include additional duties such as advising, Master Teacher training and support, and teaching courses when faculty take sabbaticals, course releases, etc.

B. Reflect student teacher supervision in faculty units: Because Liberal Arts/Teacher Education faculty are required to meet standards and requirements of the CA Commission on Teacher Credential (CCTC), they have additional responsibilities related to writing and compiling accreditation documents, overseeing submission of program applications and paperwork, and meeting monthly with GSEP to maintain program unity and alignment. Additionally, Liberal Arts faculty have responsibilities related to the Clinical Placements embedded within their courses. Because students are completing fieldwork hours in public school classrooms, course professors must oversee the submission of forms and evaluations necessary for CCTC reporting and address issues between Master Teachers and students which is often very time consuming. In more advanced Teacher Education courses, Drs. Birmingham, Erbes, and Wall voluntarily visit every teacher candidate in their placements (some multiple times and some in distant schools). This is a best practice of teacher educators, allowing instructors to link theory and practice throughout class discussions and applications. Because these visits to teacher candidates are time consuming and uncompensated, the Liberal Arts faculty propose that student teacher supervision be built
into their teaching loads by reinvigorating a former practice in which faculty are given 1 unit for every 8 site visits. This may mean that faculty teach 2 courses each semester and fulfill the remaining 4 units of their teaching load observing and supporting students in schools. This would underscore the importance of hiring a fourth instructor/Placement Coordinator. Other proposals for alleviating faculty workload in Liberal Arts/Teacher Education are willingly accepted.

2. Proposal for curriculum modifications
   A. Revise concentrations: The Liberal Arts faculty realizes that the Liberal Arts concentration offerings need revision. We are tabling that effort until the CCTC makes its decisions about new requirements for multiple subject subject matter programs so we can revise the Liberal Arts major once to meet these new requirements. Once that effort is underway, we will consider adding a “Diversity” concentration that could draw upon courses offered across the university related to diversity. Once the revision is underway, we intend to revitalize the Liberal Arts Advisory Committee composed of key stakeholders and instructors across disciplines in order to maintain synergy and channels of communication.

   B. Add Capstone course: It has become increasingly apparent that the Liberal Arts major would be well-served to add a Capstone course (taken students’ senior year) in which we could capture data related to our PLOs and Core Competencies as well as provide advanced instruction in research, writing, and presentations. This requires further discussion and may not be acted on until the CCTC makes its decisions.

3. Proposed modifications to improve Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
   A. Presentation Skills competency (PLO #2): An area of challenge related to research presentations is the tension between giving students ample time to practice their presentation skills and not allowing the giving of presentations to dominate instructional time. For instance, in spring 2015, there were 22 students who needed to give research presentations. To address this pedagogical dilemma, we have decided to cap the course at 18 students. Additionally, the EDUC 461 course instructor will video record student research presentations, so that students can review and improve their presentational abilities and so that future students will have models to consider and study before giving their own research presentations.

   B. Writing competency (PLO #3): One area of needed support in writing is in the area of providing sources and evidence. Analysis of the writing from 10 of our recent graduates revealed that our graduates use credible and/or relevant sources to support their claims, but that there is room for improvement. Though our candidates have a great deal of experience using academic language to appropriately address writing tasks in the field of education, they have less experience articulating the evidence and theory that informs their instructional decisions. After a recent curriculum meeting in which Teacher Education faculty discussed the content of their courses (trying to identify areas of overlap), one assignment was eliminated from the EDUC 461 course, freeing up more time to discuss how to locate relevant research articles and how to use them to construct their research papers.
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1. INTERNAL CONTEXT

During the time period under review (Fall 2010–Spring 2015), the Philosophy Program was part of the Humanities & Teacher Education Division of Seaver College. We offer a Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy and a Minor in Philosophy.

The Philosophy major has been a part of the curriculum since the founding of Seaver College in 1973. Prior to 2007, Philosophy at Pepperdine was taught by Dr. David Gibson and Dr. Russell Gough. Dr. Caleb Clanton arrived in fall of 2007, having been hired to replace Dr. Russell Gough and to serve as the director of the Philosophy Program. Dr. Gibson moved toward retirement in 2008, and the Program hired Dr. Mason Marshall in the fall of 2008. The number of majors grew sharply under Drs. Clanton and Marshall, which led to the need for a third faculty member: Dr. Garrett Pendergraft, who was hired in a visiting capacity in the fall of 2010 and then hired as a tenure-track philosopher in the fall of 2011. Dr. Clanton left late in the spring of 2012. The Program hired an adjunct to cover his fall courses and then was able to hire Dr. Tomas Bogardus in the spring of 2013. Thus Drs. Marshall, Pendergraft, and Bogardus are the current full-time tenure-track philosophers, and are responsible for the vast majority of the teaching within the Philosophy Program.

In addition to the hires mentioned above, the most important program changes since the last review have been curriculum changes, which are described in §10.

2. EXTERNAL CONTEXT

The Philosophy major at Pepperdine is designed to offer students a broad education in historical and contemporary philosophical explorations of various regions of human experience—including the nature of knowledge and reality, the theoretical foundations of morality and ethics, and the distinction between cogent and fallacious reasoning. Philosophy examines the fundamental assumptions and problems implicit in human experience, critically assesses the assumptions, and seeks to articulate and defend different ways of addressing the problems. Philosophy is undoubtedly an important and historically significant part of liberal arts education. Most colleges and universities have departments of philosophy, and many require philosophy courses as part of their general education curriculum. Given the nature of the discipline, philosophy is relevant to a number of fields of study outside of the humanities, including political science, law, religion, and the arts, as well as the various areas of ethical concern in a number of other disciplines (including business, technology, and medicine).

3. MISSION, PURPOSES, GOALS, AND OUTCOMES

The mission of the Philosophy Program is to provide the education described in the first two sentences of §2 (“External Context”). This mission is embodied in the learning outcomes described in §4.

Meaning of the Degree:

4. Learning outcomes and support for the institutional mission

A student who graduates with a major in Philosophy should be able to:
1. Clearly communicate both orally and in writing.
2. Think critically.
3. Exhibit knowledge of the history of philosophy.
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4. Exhibit knowledge of ethical theory and of how it applies to various situations.
5. Produce a paper informed by relevant philosophical research.

These five Program Learning Outcomes align with Pepperdine University's Institutional Learning Outcomes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>PLO 1</th>
<th>PLO 2</th>
<th>PLO 3</th>
<th>PLO 4</th>
<th>PLO 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to the call to serve others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How the degree embodies institutional values, commitment, and traditions

The Philosophy degree (and the study of philosophy in general) not only embodies, but is vital to the Christian mission and values of Pepperdine University. The official mission statement of the University reads as follows: “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.” First, students of philosophy are uniquely equipped to refine their sense of purpose and meaning, especially insofar as philosophical training is pivotal for developing a systematic Christian worldview. Second, major areas of philosophy concern how to be of service to other people, while philosophical reasoning in general enables us see the world from other people’s perspectives, helping us to grow more compassionate and broad-minded. Third, studying philosophy does a great deal to enhance a person’s capacity for leadership—particularly insofar as philosophy teaches us to think critically about the world and thus make wiser and more rational decisions.
6. A coherent, aligned sequence of learning opportunities
The coherence and alignment of learning opportunities in the Philosophy Program are represented in the following curriculum matrix for core courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students should be able to:</th>
<th>PHIL 200</th>
<th>PHIL 290</th>
<th>PHIL 300</th>
<th>PHIL 310</th>
<th>PHIL 320</th>
<th>PHIL 480</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly communicate both orally and in writing.</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Mastered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think critically.</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
<td>Mastered</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Mastered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit knowledge of the history of philosophy.</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
<td>Mastered</td>
<td>Mastered</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Mastered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit knowledge of ethical theory and of how it applies to various situations.</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mastered</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce a paper informed by relevant philosophical research.</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td>Practiced</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mastered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Breadth and depth of learning
The Philosophy degree offers sufficient breadth and depth of learning. As demonstrated in §6, the degree offers breadth by introducing every learning outcome and giving students to practice each learning outcome in at least two core courses; and it offers depth by giving students an opportunity to master each learning outcome in at least one core course.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Pepperdine</th>
<th>Calvin College</th>
<th>Pomona College</th>
<th>USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Philosophy</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Logic</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>060</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Logic</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>102, 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Logic</td>
<td></td>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Philosophy</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>251, 312</td>
<td>005, 040, 047, 187C</td>
<td>270, 470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>251, 322</td>
<td></td>
<td>271, 471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Philosophy</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>252, 331, 336</td>
<td>042, 186H, 186K</td>
<td>272, 472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
<td>043, 115</td>
<td>274, 474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-American Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td>273, 473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Political Philosophy</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>202, 334</td>
<td>033, 039, 185S</td>
<td>321, 462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td>338, 344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Theory &amp; Ethical Issues</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>205, 365</td>
<td>002, 031, 032, 035, 185P</td>
<td>330, 336, 341, 360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Figures</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Ethics</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>038</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death &amp; Dying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>334, 335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics of War &amp; Peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Political Thought</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>081, 185L</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Philosophy</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphysics</td>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
<td>283, 120, 185A, 185L, 410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>378</td>
<td>121, 414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Rationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>208, 070, 071, 185T, 480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Philosophical Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>395, 494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Mind</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>318, 080, 185L, 413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Love</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>527</td>
<td>204, 333, 412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Natural Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>007, 103, 104, 106, 415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>039, 046, 343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>034, 185B, 460, 461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>007, 114, 345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>004, 112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Through Science Fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian History &amp; Theology</td>
<td></td>
<td>532</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. Comments on the curriculum
For the purposes of this review, let’s define an essential course and a superfluous course as follows: An essential course is one whose course type is offered by all three of the peer institutions considered in the curriculum map in §8. (A curriculum that is lacking an essential course has a curriculum gap.) A superfluous course is one whose course type is offered by none of the peer institutions considered in the curriculum map in §8.

According to the curriculum map in §8, the Philosophy Program offers no superfluous courses. However, it does have a few curriculum gaps. In particular, it lacks five essential courses: Philosophy of Language, Philosophy of Natural Science, Biomedical Ethics, Philosophy of Gender, and Continental Philosophy.

10. Curriculum changes over the last five years.
• The previous review also identified curriculum gaps, and as a result the Philosophy faculty added three courses to the Program’s curriculum: Aesthetics, Epistemology, and Metaphysics. These were the three courses that met the following two criteria: they would fill a curriculum gap and they were within the area of expertise of at least one faculty member. (Note also that those three courses all count as essential according to the definitions above.)
• In order to minimize the budgetary impact on the Program as a result of adding these three courses, two courses were removed from the curriculum: Traditional Chinese Thought and Society, and Existentialism. (Note also that Existentialism would count as superfluous according to the definitions in §9.)
• Several courses were renumbered from the 500 level to the 400 level to better reflect their place in the sequence of courses within the major.

11. Pedagogy: measures of teaching effectiveness
Here are the average student evaluation numbers for all courses taught by current full-time faculty between Fall 2010 and Spring 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The course has increased my knowledge or understanding of the subject.”</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The course is excellent.”</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The professor is an excellent teacher.”</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2013, we began administering an annual survey of graduating Philosophy majors. Here are the average results on selected questions from that survey (i.e., questions that pertain to student satisfaction and thus provide indirect evidence for teaching effectiveness):
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2013 avg*</th>
<th>2014 avg</th>
<th>2015 avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#9: Please rate how much you’ve enjoyed your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program:</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10: Please rate how likely you would be to recommend majoring in philosophy at Pepperdine if a first-year student were to ask you which major to choose:</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “[year] avg” covers the responses given by majors who graduated in spring or fall of [year].

**QUALITY**

12. **Practices that enrich our students’ learning experiences**

The Philosophy faculty engage in numerous practices that enrich our students’ learning experiences, including (but not limited to) the following:

- **Undergraduate research.** Our efforts to facilitate undergraduate research have been quite fruitful over the past five years, as evidenced by the 24 published philosophy articles written by students while at Pepperdine. (See §16 for a complete list.) In addition to these published efforts, the Philosophy faculty have completed various collaborative research projects with students. Some of these projects have been informal, but most have been funded by the Summer Undergraduate Research Program, the Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative, or the Cross-Disciplinary/Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Research Program. (As a faculty, on average, we participate in two of these programs each academic year.)

- **Writing-intensive courses.** Although only one Philosophy course is officially listed as writing-intensive, rigorous analytical writing is one of the essential practices of philosophy as a discipline. Thus, almost every course offered by the Program requires students to engage in rigorous analytical writing.

- **Capstone course.** The Major Philosophical Problems course is our capstone course (and also our writing-intensive course). In this course, our students integrate and apply what they have learned over the course of their philosophical studies by writing a substantive senior thesis.

13. **Co-curricular experiences (and their integration into the curricular plan).**

Because Seaver College faculty serve as advisors for the majors within which they teach, every Philosophy faculty member engages in extensive advising with Philosophy students regarding academic schedules and career plans (including graduate school plans). The success of our students in getting into graduate programs (see §16 for detail) is partial evidence of our commitment to advising.

We also offer supplemental instruction in the form of visiting speakers. The following is a list of visiting philosophers who have given talks at Pepperdine over the past three academic years:

- Dr. Andrew Cullison, Associate Professor at DePauw University, Spring 2013
- Dr. Timothy Pickavance, Associate Professor at Biola University, Spring 2013
- Dr. Andrew Bailey, Assistant Professor at Yale-NUS College, Spring 2013
The Philosophy faculty regularly participate in the spiritual mentoring program offered by the convocation office, as well as the “Club Convo” program (in which we discuss issues in philosophy of religion and philosophical theology).

And finally, the Pepperdine Philosophy Club (which is open to both majors and non-majors) serves as a forum for discussion of issues that students are interested in, and also for peer evaluation and assistance on papers and other writing assignments. This is a student-led group that meets on a weekly basis in-person and also has an active Facebook group consisting of contributions from both current and former members of the Club.

14. Profile of students in the program

Although our overall enrollment numbers have declined since 2010, the most recent number of majors for which we have OIE data (41 majors in Fall 2014) is strong. The number is high when compared to the history of the Philosophy program at Pepperdine, and also when compared to similar institutions. For example, between 1996 and 2007, the average number of Philosophy majors at Seaver College was between 12 and 13. And our ratio of philosophy majors to faculty members, 11.67, is significantly higher than it is at similar schools (cf. § 21).

The table below represents the diversity of the Philosophy program. We have been pleased to see an increasing proportion of women in the program, and our hope is that we can produce a similar trend when it comes to ethnic diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>F11</th>
<th>F12</th>
<th>F13</th>
<th>F14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of female Philosophy majors</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of female Philosophy minors</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of non-white Philosophy majors</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of non-white Philosophy minors</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Results of student and alumni survey data

We were happy to note the following results from the 2015 OIE alumni survey:

- All Philosophy graduates responded positively to the question, “How well did your Pepperdine education prepare you for your primary activity?”: There were 24 responses, and 100% of them responded “Reasonably well” (54.2%) or “Extremely well” (45.8%).
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- (Film Studies, which had 4 responses, was the only other major for which all respondents gave positive answers.)
- In the “utilization of HuTe experiences and knowledge” category, 71% of Philosophy graduates said they had “Thought seriously about a philosophical issue” in the past month; and 90% said they had “Drawn on the critical thinking skills I developed in Pepperdine’s philosophy program” in the past month.
- 71.4% of Philosophy graduates said that the Philosophy program prepared them “Extremely well” to “Act ethically and morally in the workplace.”
- 89.3% of Philosophy graduates said that the Philosophy program prepared them “Extremely well” to “Be able to comprehend and analyze written text.”
- 96.4% of Philosophy graduates said that the Philosophy program prepared them “Extremely well” to “Think critically to solve problems.”
- 85.7% of Philosophy graduates said that the Philosophy program prepared them “Extremely well” to “Express ideas clearly.”
- 80% of Philosophy graduates said that the Philosophy program prepared them “Extremely well” to “Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity,” which is an Institutional Learning Outcome.
- 78.6% of Philosophy graduates “Strongly agreed” that the Philosophy faculty “were devoted to student learning.”
- 85.7% of Philosophy graduates “Strongly agreed” that the Philosophy faculty “created an environment in which challenging and thought-provoking issues were explored in ways that were respectful of student views.”

We were disappointed in the results of the responses to the “Working with faculty on research”: only 33.3% said that working with faculty on research contributed “Very much” to personal development and only 27.8% said it contributed “Very much” to professional development. However, we have done quite a bit of research with students over the past few years (as evidenced by #16 below), and our hope is that if the survey were restricted to more recent graduates, those “Very much” numbers would be considerably higher.

16. Evidence of student accomplishment

Graduate School Placement of Pepperdine Philosophy Students: These rankings are drawn from the Philosophical Gourmet Report—by far the most prominent and trusted ranking of philosophy graduate programs—for the year each student entered the graduate program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Program Attended</th>
<th>Rank of Program Attended</th>
<th>Rank of Highest Program Admitted</th>
<th>Highest Program Admitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Alan Reynolds</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Alex Swob</td>
<td>University of Warwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Andrew Forcehimes</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Blake McAllister</td>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Devon Bryson</td>
<td>University of Tennessee, Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Justin Clardy</td>
<td>University of Arkansas, Fayetteville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Caroline Mobley</td>
<td>University of Tennessee, Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Peter Zuk</td>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ian Irwin</td>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Chad Marxen</td>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Gerard Rothfus</td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Anna Brinkerhoff</td>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Landon Hobbs</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Published Philosophy Articles Written by Students while at Pepperdine*

16. Chad Marxen, “Yes, Safety Is in Danger” (with Tomás Bogardus), *Philosophia* (forthcoming)
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17. Achievement of student learning outcomes
Prior to 2009, the philosophy program focused on assessing one PLO per year, across every course offering. Since 2009, and as a result of consultation with WASC representatives, the philosophy program has focused instead on assessing one course per year, gauging the extent to which the course achieves all the intended PLOs. In previous years, the philosophy program has assessed the Capstone course—which students take at the end of their careers—as well as the Introduction to Philosophy course—which students take at the beginning of their careers. Since then, the program has assessed courses that students take in the middle of their careers in the program.
Before the program assesses any course, a portfolio is compiled, typically consisting of the final exams that the students wrote in the course, the final papers that the students wrote for the course, and all comments from the professor on these. All the faculty then assess how well students performed on the PLOs for that course. For an integrated analysis of this direct evidence of student learning, please see § 19 below.
In 2013, we began administering an annual survey of graduating Philosophy majors. The bulk of the questions on the survey relate directly to our Program Learning Outcomes, and thus provide indirect evidence that those outcomes are being achieved. We have determined that we would like our average responses to be above a 3.5 threshold (on a 5-point scale) for the relevant questions. Here are the average results on those questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2013 avg</th>
<th>2014 avg</th>
<th>2015 avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#2: Please rate how much you’ve learned, through your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program, about arguments and views in the fields of ancient philosophy and modern philosophy [cf. PLO 3]:</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Please rate how much you’ve learned, through your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program, about ethical theory and how it applies to various situations [cf. PLO 4]:</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Please rate how much you’ve learned, through your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program, not just about the history of philosophy or ethical theory but about philosophy in general [cf. PLO 3 &amp; 4]:</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5: Please rate how much your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program have improved your critical-thinking skills [cf. PLO 2]:</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6: Please rate how much your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program have improved your ability to communicate clearly in your writing [cf. PLO 1]:</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7: Please rate how much your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program have improved your ability to communicate clearly when you’re speaking [cf. PLO 1]:</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8: Please rate how much your years in the Pepperdine philosophy program have improved your ability to write a paper informed by philosophical research that is relevant to your topic [cf. PLO 5]:</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “[year] avg” covers the responses given by majors who graduated in spring or fall of [year].

Although we haven’t yet compared our expectations to national standards or benchmarks, we hope to identify some standards that we can compare with as we continue to enhance our assessment efforts. (One reason for this lack of comparison is that the American Philosophical Association has been slow to embrace assessment. That seems to be changing, so we’re hoping that the APA will begin providing some of these benchmarks.)

**18. Assurance that students consistently meet standards of performance**

In every class, Philosophy faculty members utilize various assessment methods to evaluate direct evidence of student performance, distributing grades according to performance. Students who don’t meet our program’s standard of performance, on the basis of this evaluation of direct evidence, receive low grades, and we attempt to correct the problem by giving low-performing students extra instructional attention.
19. Analysis of data collected from assessment of direct and indirect learning

In § 17, we described the annual process of accumulating student work from a single course and evaluating that direct evidence of student performance vis-a-vis the intended PLOs for that course. In this section, we’ll summarize the findings from the last comprehensive program review. Last year, we assessed Philosophy of Religion (PHIL 527), and we evaluated students’ written communication by investigating the clarity, organization, polish, and citation practices within the students’ work.

Of the 17 students, 4 (24%) fully displayed the desiderata indicated just above, 10 (59%) performed well, and 3 (18%) were weakest. The most common strengths were high degrees of lucidity, obvious theses, and diligent editing. The most common weaknesses were improper or incomplete citations. Dr. Bogardus, who teaches this course, resolved to emphasize in future courses the importance of proper citation practices.

We also evaluated how well students developed their critical thinking skills, by investigating the argumentative rigor of the students’ work. Of the 17 student performances, 5 (29%) were excellent, 9 (53%) were good, and 3 (18%) were weakest. The most common mistake was attempting to do too much, to cover too much ground. This resulted in incomplete or poorly supported arguments, and often the inclusion of irrelevant material or quotations.

In addition, we evaluated how well the student developed their research skills in philosophy, by investigating whether students cited the appropriate number of sources, and whether these sources were relevant to their projects. Out of the 17 students, 6 (35%) performed excellently, 5 (29%) performed well, and 6 (35%) were weakest. Students rarely cited irrelevant sources. But the most common weakness was failing to cite a sufficient number of sources. Students also struggled to use proper citation practices, especially within the text. To address these and other issues, Dr. Bogardus has resolved to provide more guidance to students regarding proper citation practices.

The program intends to continue this annual process of evaluating PLOs for a single course—each year rotating which course is evaluated—and updating our teaching practices in light of the direct evidence that we uncover.

For data relating to student surveys, please see §§ 11, 15, and 17 above.

20. Ensuring that graduates meet the WASC Core Competencies

We design our courses in order to introduce, develop, or produce mastery of four Core Competencies: Critical Thinking (CT), Information Literacy (IL), Oral Communication (OC), and Written Communication (WC). Below, we have indicated whether, in each course offered, students are Introduced to the Core Competency (I), Develop their skills related to the core competency (D), or demonstrate Mastery of the core competency (M).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 200</td>
<td>Intro. to Philosophy</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 290</td>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 300</td>
<td>Ancient Philosophy</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below, we indicate which of our Program Learning Outcomes develop which of the Core Competencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
<th>PLO#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These relations between the PLOs and the Core Competencies, together with findings and measurements presented above (especially in §§ 11, 17, and 19), provide evidence of the Philosophy Program’s development of the Core Competencies.

**SUSTAINABILITY**

21. **Demonstrating financial viability and planning of their long-term stability**

According to the American Philosophical Association, “Bachelor’s degree completions in philosophy more than doubled from 1987 to 2009, and the percentage of bachelor’s degrees issued
in philosophy as a percentage of all bachelor’s degrees awarded, though small, rose slowly but steadily throughout that same time period.” Data are available here.

According to those data compiled by the APA, in 2009 philosophy degrees were 0.498% of all bachelor degrees conferred that year. (This comports with data from the Institute for Education Sciences, which puts the percentage of Philosophy degrees and Religious Studies degrees at 0.706%.)

In the table below, you’ll see that Pepperdine’s percentage of philosophy majors at Seaver College (1.01%) is more than double the national average (0.498%), despite our relatively high ratio of philosophy majors to philosophy faculty (11.67 students for every 1 tenured or tenure-track faculty member), as well as our limited presence on the GE curriculum (no philosophy courses are required of all students, and only one philosophy course counts toward a GE requirement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Minors</th>
<th>Total Undergrads</th>
<th>% of Phil. Majors</th>
<th>Philosophy Faculty*</th>
<th>Majors to Faculty Ratio</th>
<th>Number of Philosophy GE Requirements or Electives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>0 required, 1 elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2 required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8,855</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2 required, 6 elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin College</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1 required, 3 elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Norbert College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1 required, 7 elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Marymount</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1 required, 3 elective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tenured or tenure-track

22. FACILITIES
Some of the classrooms we use on a regular basis aren’t set up well for the type of group discussion that philosophy courses typically require. In some cases this is due to the room layout, and in some cases this is due to furniture issues (e.g., a shortage of easily movable desks). Other than that, the facilities are adequate for our purposes.
FACULTY AND STAFF

23. Qualifications and achievements of faculty in relation to program goals
We have three full-time faculty members. Each one holds a Ph.D. in Philosophy.

Faculty specialties:
- **Dr. Tomas Bogardus**: AOS: Epistemology and Philosophy of Mind. AOC: Ethics, Logic, Philosophy of Religion.
- **Dr. Mason Marshall**: AOS: Ancient Philosophy. AOC: Modern Philosophy, Aesthetics.

Every course one of our faculty members teaches is within either his AOS or AOC, which produces a favorable alignment of our specialties with our curriculum.

Record of scholarship:
**Dr. Tomas Bogardus:**
- “Only All Naturalists Should Worry about Only One Evolutionary Debunking Argument,” forthcoming in *Ethics*

**Dr. Mason Marshall:**
- “Is Clarity Essential to Good Teaching?” (with Seaver student Aaron M. Clark), *Teaching Philosophy* 33.3 (2010): 271-289
- “The Republic’s Ambiguous Democracy” (with Seaver student Shane A. Bilsborough), *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 27.4 (2010): 301-316
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**Dr. Garrett Pendergraft:**

- “Does the Consequence Argument Beg the Question?” (with John Martin Fischer), Philosophical Studies 166 (2013): 575-95

**Faculty participation in development opportunities:**

**Dr. Garrett Pendergraft:**

- Spring 2016 American Association of Philosophy Teachers Workshop: Teaching and Learning in Philosophy (Jan 2016).
- Spring 2015 TechLearn Faculty Professional Development program on Gamification.
- Teaching Professor Conference in Boston (May 30–Jun 1, 2014).
- “Assessment 101” in Pomona in October of 2013.
- A WASC assessment workshop in Anaheim in September of 2012.
- Teaching Professor Conference in Atlanta (summer 2011)

All three faculty members consistently read a significant number of recent issues of the journals relevant to their fields of research. And they stay up-to-date on all major books published in their fields of interest, focusing on the major academic presses (e.g. Oxford, Cambridge, Routledge, and MIT Presses).

**External funding awarded to faculty:**

**Dr. Garrett Pendergraft:**

- *The Immortality Project*: Essay Prize ($3,000), June 2015
- *The Immortality Project*: Younger Scholars Workshop and Capstone Conference Participant ($1,000 honorarium), May 2015

**Dr. Tomas Bogardus:**

- Fordham Summer Seminar on Understanding Participant, $600 honorarium plus expenses paid, June 2016
- St. Thomas Summer Seminar Participant, $2,000 honorarium plus expenses paid, June 2012
- St. Thomas Summer Seminar Paper Prize (1st Place, $1,000), June 2012

**24. Number of and support for program faculty**

- Distribution of faculty across ranks (or staff years at institution): Dr. Marshall is an Associate Professor. Dr. Pendergraft and Dr. Bogardus are both Assistant Professors each at least halfway to tenure.
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- **Diversity of faculty/staff:** Our faculty members have a suitable diversity of educational backgrounds, research areas, and philosophical views to expose our students to a wide variety of perspectives.
- **Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty):** Three full-time faculty. In recent semesters, there have been no part-time faculty.
- **Student-faculty ratio:** There are approximately 11 majors for every 1 faculty member.
- **Faculty workload:** Our pre-tenure faculty have 3/2 teaching loads. Our tenured faculty member has a 3/3 teaching load.
- **Faculty review and evaluation processes:** Faculty members are periodically evaluated formally by other faculty, Pepperdine’s Rank-Tenure-Promotion Committee, the Division Chair, the Dean, the Provost, the Board of Regents, and the President. Every faculty member goes through a pre-tenure review process after three years of teaching. Then, each faculty member goes through the tenure review process after six years of teaching. After that, faculty members are evaluated every five years. All faculty receive a less formal annual review from the Divisional Dean.
- **Mentoring processes:** New faculty are assigned to a senior faculty mentor as part of the new faculty orientation process.
- **Professional development opportunities and resources (including travel and research funds):** All faculty have an approximately $1,500 travel budget each year. Faculty may also apply for funding through Seaver Fellowships, Dean’s Research Grants, the Summer Undergraduate Research Program, the Academic Year Undergraduate Research Initiative, and through Technology and Learning Grants. And, after tenure, faculty may apply for a course reduction to support an active research agenda (thereby moving from a 3/3 load to a 3/2 load).
- **Sufficient time for research, program development?** Yes, we have sufficient time for research and program development.

25. **Financial Resources:**
Since budgetary decisions take place at the Divisional level and not the Program level, the Divisional Dean is in a better position to discuss the operating budget (and budgetary trends) than are the program director or the individual faculty members.

26. **EXTERNAL REVIEWER**
Our external reviewer is [Dr. Robert Talisse](http://www.example.com), W. Alton Jones Professor of Philosophy and Chair of the Philosophy Department at Vanderbilt University.
I visited Pepperdine’s campus on February 18th and 19th, 2016 to observe and assess the Pepperdine Philosophy Program. Prior to my visit, I read the Five-Year Review document prepared by members of the Philosophy Program; consulting the University’s website, I also examined Pepperdine’s general education curriculum, its Strategic Plan, and its “Mission, Vision, and Affirmation” statement. During my visit to campus, I met twice with the Philosophy faculty, observed two class sessions (Introduction to Philosophy and Philosophy of Religion), interviewed a small group of Philosophy majors, and also had meetings with Lisa Bortman and Michael Ditmore. My on-site and off-site activities have provided an adequate basis for evaluation.

In what follows, I will adhere closely to the “Report Guidelines” provided by Pepperdine’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness. I will also try to minimize repetition.

I. Program Learning Outcomes

1. As outlined in section 4 of the Five-Year Review, the Philosophy Program seeks centrally to instill and develop in their majors the skills and competencies requisite to critical thinking, clear and precise writing, and responsible academic research, all with an eye towards teaching students the major trends in the history of philosophy (including contemporary philosophy) and in moral philosophy. Of course, having reviewed a broad range of syllabi from Philosophy courses at Pepperdine, these ambitions drive the faculty’s teaching at all levels and to all students. The Program’s objectives are quite in line with the discipline’s conception of its role in a liberal arts curriculum, especially within institutions that otherwise have strong programs in other Humanities disciplines. That is, Philosophy programs at institutions with strong programs in, say, Literature (including Great Books), History, Arts, Religion, and Creative Writing tend to emphasize Philosophy’s distinctive focus on formal and critical techniques of reflection. This of course is not to say that Philosophy so construed is non-historical, inattentive to primary texts, or opposed to creative writing and thinking. Quite the contrary. Philosophy in this vein rather observes that just as the greatest minds – for example, Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Descartes, Locke, Spinoza, Hume, Kant, and so on – did not devote themselves exclusively to the close reading and focused study of the great works of their predecessors, but rather aspired to formulate and advance their own original contributions to philosophy, philosophy should be taught as a critical, rigorous, and self-reflective activity. The Pepperdine Philosophy faculty strives to involve students in this activity. And, as the greatest works in the history of the discipline show, successful engagement in this activity requires, inter alia, sharp critical and analytical skills -- these are essential to original and creative thought. Accordingly, the Philosophy Program at Pepperdine has set for itself the right targets for student learning, and its overall approach to the discipline plays a crucial and complementing role within the broader curriculum of the university.
2. The Philosophy Program draws its desired learning outcomes from the discipline at large, and in this sense the criteria and standards it has adopted are on target: the faculty uses the standard instrument (student evaluations) of tracking teaching effectiveness and student learning, and it is worth noting that the Program does very well according to this metric. However, it should be noted that, based on my meetings with the faculty and my reading of the Five-Year Review, it is also evident that the Philosophy Program strives in a refreshingly broad variety of ways to track student progress and enhance each student’s learning experience. To cite only one especially encouraging initiative, there is a culture of faculty-student collaboration within the Program, where students and faculty work together on research and writing projects, some of which eventuate in co-authored publication. The strong record of Philosophy majors presenting and publishing original work in professional venues attests to a kind of pedagogical effectiveness that extends beyond the classroom. Furthermore, the number and quality of the placements of Pepperdine Philosophy majors in PhD Philosophy programs is remarkable – surely this, too, is a reliable indicator of a high level of effectiveness in achieving the learning outcomes. In fact, one should say that these latter two measures (publication and placement) demonstrate that the outcomes are both reliably achieved and are good matches with the discipline’s conception of accomplishment for undergraduate Philosophy students. To wit: Were the Pepperdine Philosophy majors not meeting generally-endorsed standards of excellence in the profession, they would not be so frequently getting accepted to top-notch and highly competitive PhD programs in Philosophy.

3. These same considerations speak to the adequacy of the learning outcomes for awarding the BA degree in Philosophy. Philosophy is an uncommonly broad discipline with an accordingly broad range of conceptions of how its methods, concerns, problems, and relations to other fields is to be understood. No single Philosophy department could possibly embrace the full spectrum of such conceptions; this is true a fortiori in the case of a Program with only three faculty members. Moreover, programs that claim to embrace a “pluralism” with respect to approaches to Philosophy only kid themselves, as the number of conceptions of Philosophy in currency far outstrips what any single department of any size could possibly represent, and as the very project of delineating and individuating the different approaches will itself instantiate the conception of Philosophy favored by the person doing the taxonomizing. Every Philosophy department reflects a narrow conception of the discipline. Choices must be made and emphases must be selected. The Pepperdine Program reflects a strong commitment to the predominant conception of Philosophy in North America and Europe, what is sometimes (though, in my view, problematically) called “analytic” philosophy. “Analytic” philosophy is most commonly contrasted with “Continental” philosophy by those who still see fit to employ such terms. But the distinction is no longer of much use, as what is characterized in the United States as “Continental” philosophy no longer reflects the state of the discipline in continental Europe, and in any case the supposed methodological differences that the distinction was alleged to track never survived scrutiny. Anyway, the Pepperdine Program provides a robust exposure to Philosophy as it is most commonly and widely understood within the profession. This is precisely as it should be. Were a three-person faculty (or even a four-person faculty) to attempt to provide coverage of any of the other leading conceptions of Philosophy, all coverage would suffer because no specific conception would be adequately represented. Furthermore, the attempt to reflect in an undergraduate curriculum deep-seated disciplinary divides over what is properly Philosophy would result only in distracting students’ attention away from Philosophy itself; discussions of Kant would devolve into discussions of how to read Kant, instruction in moral philosophy would devolve into detached excursions into the supposed question.
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of whether moral philosophy is possible. As the professors use their class time to fight internecine proxy wars on behalf of their little piece of disciplinary terrain, the students lose out. (I should mention that one student I spoke with revealed that s/he had been encouraged by a faculty in another Program to criticize the Philosophy faculty for being “narrowly analytic” -- this is really unfortunate, and bad for the students.) Far better for a small department to focus sharply on the mainstream idiom, and provide excellent instruction. And the Pepperdine Program in Philosophy does precisely this.

II. Assessment

1. Since 2009, the Program has been selecting one Philosophy course for assessment with respect to its Program Learning Outcomes. Prior to 2009, the Program had selected each year a single learning outcome and assessed every Program course offering with respect to it. Surely the current procedure makes more sense. The processes outlined in sections 17, 18, and 19 of the Five-Year Review broadly match the assessment procedures in effect in many of the other Philosophy departments with which I am familiar (for example, the Pepperdine procedure is roughly what we do at Vanderbilt). In Philosophy, although the intended outcomes should impact the student’s life, the best object for assessment is the student’s writing, both for in-class exercises (like exams) and term papers. These provide an objective basis for evaluation. But I see also that the Program has initiated an “annual survey” of graduating Philosophy majors, which asks students themselves to evaluate their cumulative coursework vis-à-vis the Program Learning Outcomes. This is also a worthy initiative, as should matter to the Program (and the University) how its majors regard the whole of their training in their major. Data provided in the Five-Year Review suggests a high level of success along both metrics.

2. Again, the assessment processes employed by the Philosophy Program are wholly appropriate and in fact reflect the standard practices in the profession. One suggestion (and this reflects something we’re at present trying to incorporate at Vanderbilt) is the following: Several of the learning outcomes are arguably best measured not by a single piece of student writing, but rather by how a student revises or reformulates her ideas in response to criticisms or objections. The Program might try to devise ways in which to track students’ ability to do this; one idea would be to include within a few of the portfolios early and final drafts of student term papers. Judging from my conversations with the Philosophy faculty, there are several occasions where a student is required to produce a first draft of a paper, and then revise in light of the faculty member’s comments. And in many instances, a student’s degree of facility with reasoning becomes clearer when observed in this context. I emphasize that I am not insisting that the Program must incorporate this into its assessment procedure; I am only suggesting that incorporating it will likely provide valuable insight and data.

III. Curriculum

1. The Philosophy major involves six required courses, including Introduction to Philosophy (PHIL 200) (Introduction to Philosophy may be substituted for the Great Books sequence). Four of the remaining five required courses reflect a standard conception of the core of the discipline: Logic (PHIL 290), Ethics (PHIL 300), History of Ancient Philosophy (PHIL 310), and History of Modern Philosophy (PHIL 320). The final requirement (PHIL 480) is a capstone course on a “Major Philosophical Problem,” whose content changes with the instructor. In addition to these required courses, students must complete three elective Philosophy courses in order to satisfy the Philosophy
major (those who opted out of Introduction to Philosophy by taking the Great Books sequence are required to take a fourth Philosophy elective). I have reviewed recent syllabi for each of the required courses, and they are appropriately substantive, rigorous, and demanding. Students completing the six-course Philosophy sequence will have developed a firm basis in Philosophy from which to build more specific competencies in the discipline. Given the Program’s learning outcomes and its mission (sections 2 and 3 of the Five-Year Review), the six-course core does nicely: Introduction to Philosophy and Logic develop within students the formal critical methods involved in evaluating reasons and arguments, while the two History courses (Ancient and Modern) expose students to some of the major attempts to reach substantive philosophical conclusions on the basis of those methods, while the courses in Ethics and Major Philosophical Problems press on to exercise those same capacities in addressing contemporary issues from the students’ own perspectives. The sequencing makes good sense, and one can see in the course syllabi a clear trajectory of sophistication: The courses with higher numbers are more demanding than those with lower course numbers, and the capstone “Major Problems” seminars are taught at a very high level (approaching graduate level). The same holds for the elective courses whose syllabi I have reviewed (Aesthetics, Epistemology, and Philosophy of Religion): The course numbers reflect the level of demandingness. More importantly, the Program’s elective courses are uniformly rigorous. They invariably strike a suitable balance of historical and contemporary readings, and the coverage of the topics within each topical area reflects a plausible vision of the current state of the area within the profession. That is, the most current syllabi for Epistemology, Philosophy of Religion, and Aesthetics not only expose students to the background of these topical areas, they also faithfully reflect the topics and problems that occupy the professionals working in them today; hence students emerging from these courses will be au courant with fields. If the Philosophy Program’s aim is to provide students with an education in historical and contemporary problems and trends in the discipline of philosophy, while providing the tools requisite for thinking one’s own way through the human experience, these courses do nicely.

2. Many of the considerations relevant for addressing the curriculum design have been mentioned in III.1. Having reviewed the Program’s course offerings for the past several years, they seem to do nicely in offering the necessary courses on a regular schedule, and it seems likely that a philosophy major would be able to progress through the major in a timely and reasonable manner. It is also worth noting that the Five-Year Review spells out clearly the ways in which the courses in the major successively builds the core skills and competencies identified in the learning outcomes. Again, this is all as it should be.

3. Yes, the courses required for the major are offered regularly and the full sequence of courses is offered on a schedule that allows students to complete the major. I was not able to find online a clear statement of the Program’s major requirements, but I then looked at other Programs and found that many of them do not include on their websites a clear expression of their major requirements. I’m not sure why this is so. So I am not able to speak directly to whether the Program clearly outlines the requirements to their students, except to say that in my meeting with Philosophy Majors, all seemed to have a firm grasp of the requirements. If there is a Program document outlining the major requirements, the Program should consider putting it online.

4. It is difficult for a three-person faculty to cover all of the desirable bases – it must focus on covering the necessary ones. And the Program is doing that; in addition to Ancient and Modern Philosophy, the Program offers Logics, Ethics, Epistemology, Metaphysics, Aesthetics, and
Philosophy of Religion, which are the core topical areas of the discipline (and which reflect closely the research expertise of the faculty). It seems to me, though, that adding a few new courses would be a good idea. In particular, the Program should consider developing a course in The Ethics of War. As a selective Christian institution that aims to prepare students for leadership in a diverse and international world, it seems that such a course would be a most welcome addition, especially given the rich history of Christian philosophical exploration of war. The Political Science Program offers a course titled “Ethics and International Politics” (POSC 449), which aspires to examine the just war tradition among many other topics (including human rights and humanitarian intervention); but a proper philosophical investigation of moral questions occasioned by war takes an entire semester. A similar rationale recommends the addition of a Philosophy course on Global Justice. Again, the Political Science Program offers courses that touch on questions of global poverty, immigration, resource hoarding, and such. But a philosophical examination of whether (citizens of) rich countries owe money or other forms of support to (citizens of) impoverished countries takes an entire semester. These two courses are especially fitting given the University’s mission; moreover, the existing expertise among the Philosophy faculty suggest that these courses could be developed easily. I would make the same case for adding a course in Bioethics.

I should also mention that I was struck by the fact that the Philosophy Program does not have a course required in the current GE system at Pepperdine. Nothing that Business Administration and Public Relations do have a role in the GE rendered this omission all the more puzzling. Given that the University’s Mission Statement and other expression of its self-conception overtly emphasize the importance of values, service, and the search for truth, it is indeed odd that the Philosophy Program has no role in the general education curriculum. Philosophy is, after all, the search for truth about value. And this is especially the case with Pepperdine’s Philosophy Program – the Program’s courses are aimed explicitly at developing the reasoning skills that are intrinsic to responsible investigation into value. The Program’s Introduction to Philosophy course, or some newly developed introductory-level course in Philosophy (perhaps an introductory course in moral philosophy), should be added to the GE requirements immediately. I see no other department with such a strong claim to centrality to the University’s mission that is excluded from the GE. And, even more importantly, no existing introductory-level course required in the GE teaches the distinctive skills of critical and formal reasoning that the Philosophy Program emphasizes. Finally, as noted in Section 21 of the Program’s Five-Year Review, Pepperdine is unique among peer and aspirational-peer Christian universities and colleges in excluding philosophy from the General Education sequence. Units in Sociology, Psychology, Communications, Economics, and Business Administration have no greater claim to centrality to Pepperdine’s mission than Philosophy; indeed, many have far less a claim than Philosophy.

IV. Student Experiences and Learning Environment

1. The philosophy majors I met with were uniformly enthusiastic about the Philosophy Program and the training they have been receiving in their philosophy courses. In fact, many independently offered the judgment that their courses in the Philosophy Program are the “most challenging,” “demanding,” and “rigorous” they’ve had at Pepperdine. They were especially appreciative of what they see as a distinctive pedagogical strategy that is embraced by the entire Philosophy faculty, namely, the careful attention given to extracting and analyzing arguments. This emphasis, they said, makes the courses in the Philosophy Program unique in the University, and a few expressed the wish that courses in other Programs would adopt a similar emphasis. Of course, I was speaking with
a self-selected group of students, and I’m sure that the Program’s pedagogical emphasis is not so deeply appreciated by all students taking Philosophy courses; but, importantly, the students I spoke with claimed that the emphasis the statement and evaluation of arguments was extremely valuable to them, and that the skills developed in their Philosophy courses have been particularly helpful in their other (non-philosophy) courses. All claimed that they “learn more” in their Philosophy courses than in any other courses.

2. Again, the Program’s results speak for themselves. Philosophy majors go on from Pepperdine to highly competitive graduate programs (including of course PhD programs in Philosophy), as well as to law school and business school. It should be mentioned that the Philosophy Program’s record of placing students into Philosophy PhD Programs is especially impressive – Pepperdine Philosophy students are now pursuing PhDs in many of the most selective and distinguished PhD Philosophy departments in the country (including Stanford, Brown, Rice, and UC Irvine); these departments receive roughly 300 applications each year for 3 to 5 admission slots. At Vanderbilt, we receive 300 applications for 4 slots, and one of our most recent PhDs came to us from Pepperdine, and was easily the best prepared student we’ve had in the Program in a decade. I looked closely at the webpages of several other Programs, and I could find no other Program that has been so successful at training undergraduates to pursue graduate and post-baccalaureate education. The process of applying to PhD Programs in Philosophy is arduous and requires a great deal of advising and help: a writing sample must be up to professional standards, recommendation letters must be sought, a personal statement stating one’s research ambitions must be carefully prepared, and so on. There is simply no way Pepperdine’s Philosophy Program could have achieved these impressive results were it not for the faculty’s dedication to advising and supporting their students.

3. I observed two class sessions during my visit: Pendergraft’s Introduction to Philosophy and Bogardus’s Philosophy of Religion. Both classes had roughly 20 students in attendance. This seems an appropriate size for a philosophy class, I should think that very many more would be problematic, especially given the way the instructors conduct the class meetings. To explain: In both of the sessions I observed, the instructors began the meeting with a concise overview of the class plan for the day, and then used Powerpoint to work through an outline for the class discussion. Both class discussions began from a formulation of the central argument in the day’s reading, with regular invitations from the instructor for criticism and questions. Both sessions involved a nice balance of lecture and discussion. In the Introduction to Philosophy session I observed, more than half of the students made substantive contributions to the discussion of the day’s topic (Hume on miracles and a contemporary reconstruction of Hume’s argument), and all seemed to be attentive and engaged. In the Philosophy of Religion course, students were similarly engaged, though fewer spoke (still, there was a good deal of discussion). This may have been due to the fact that Bogardus’s class on that day was devoted to introducing a new kind of argument concerning God’s existence (moral or axiological arguments), and so the instructor needed to provide a good deal of background regarding the philosophical terrain in meta-ethics (varieties of moral realism and anti-realism in particular) in order to place the class material for the day (evolutionary debunking arguments for moral realism) in proper context. This material can be a tad dry and intricate, but Bogardus did a fine job of working through the issues, and he was careful to pause at crucial junctures to invite questions (often even soliciting input, with a special invitation to students who “have not yet spoken”). Both instructors explicitly affirmed that their Powerpoints and other materials were available to students on a course website. In both session, students emerged with a
firm grasp of the material under discussion, and a clear sense of how the day’s topic fit into the broader arc of the course.

4. The Program is designed to be easily coupled as a second major with several other Programs, and has recently started a joint major with Computer Science. This flexibility is crucial. The Program is also obviously devoted to supporting student research and collaboration, as is evident from Section 16 of the Program’s Five-Year Review: Since 2010, Pepperdine undergraduate philosophers have published 24 articles (single or jointly-authored). This is a stunningly impressive record of student/faculty collaboration, and indicates a high level of dedication on the faculty’s part to student academic success.

5. Student support in Philosophy amounts to availability of faculty outside of class time. My meetings with philosophy majors and the Program faculty suggest a good level of availability and support.

6. My conversation with the philosophy majors raised the suggestions that the Program might do more to build community among the faculty and majors. To be sure: there is a significant degree of faculty involvement in the intellectual development of the majors, both in class and out, and faculty have participated in meetings of the Philosophy Club. But the students expressed interest in a more social occasion to interact – perhaps an annual majors luncheon, perhaps attached to the awarding of an annual prize for the best undergraduate philosophy paper, or some such event, would do nicely. A relatively minor event of this kind can go a long way towards building community.

V. Faculty Quality

1. The discipline standard for full-time tenured or tenure-track teaching at the University level is a PhD from a high-quality institution. In addition, it is normally expected that Philosophy faculty at the University level will be actively pursuing a program of research and publication; this includes presenting original work at major professional conferences (such as the American Philosophical Association meeting), as well as participation in workshops and colloquia. Each of the Philosophy Program faculty has a PhD from a high quality Philosophy Department, and each also has a strong record of research and publication in selective and visible professional venues. Indeed, the Philosophy faculty are especially active in their research areas, and each has published at least one article in a top journal for his area. Each easily clears any reasonable credential and productivity threshold for full-time University faculty status.

2. As I mentioned in I.1, the Philosophy Program reflects a commitment to the dominant conception of the discipline. The faculty’s central specializations in Ancient Philosophy, Modern Philosophy, Epistemology, Metaphysics, Ethics, and Logic suits well this kind of program. Other popular areas of philosophy -- including, for example, 19th Century Philosophy, Phenomenology and Existentialism, Critical Theory, and Deconstructionism -- are not at all represented in the Program faculty’s expertise or course offerings. But, again, this is as it should be. A smaller department cannot hope to provide coverage of an entire discipline, and, more importantly, the coverage the Philosophy Program does provide at present reflects the mainstream of the discipline. Far better for the Program to present a coordinated vision of the discipline than try to fill gaps and cover bases, especially when the coordinated vision being presented reflects the prevailing vision in the broader discipline.
3. The Program’s system for self-study and assessment is standard among Philosophy departments. The Program uses student evaluations and an exit survey, both of which provide helpful data about individual course instruction and the overall effectiveness of the Program. The Program faculty do very nicely on these metrics, and the assessment tools seems adequate for providing the information necessary for continuous improvement.

4. There are also instruments of evaluation involving the Divisional Dean and other faculty, all of which is standard and certainly sufficient.

5. As I mentioned in V.1, the Program faculty are all active in their research areas: each has at least one publication in an “A-list” journal for his area, and each is actively engaged in scholarship (including attending and presenting work at conferences, workshops, and colloquia). The Program also sponsors a series of visiting speakers, which provides additional occasions for keeping current. In addition, faculty are granted an annual $1,500 travel budget for conferencing and research travel, and have opportunities to apply for additional funding. As philosophers’ research travel is mainly to conferences and symposia (rather than to dig sites and international archives), this level of support seems adequate, and the Program faculty affirm in Section 24 that they are sufficiently supported.

6. As I have highlighted in various places above, I think the faculty are doing an exceptional job of providing students with a tightly-focused and challenging education in Philosophy. The faculty makes good use of internet and other technology in their teaching, and makes available to students online materials (such as class notes, outlines, handouts, and such). Accordingly, matters pertaining to student learning seem to be well in hand. One suggestion for enhancing the Program would be for the faculty to develop the expertise required for adding the new courses I recommended in III.4 (The Ethics of War, Global Justice, and Bioethics); these courses do not fall far out of the faculty’s existing competencies, and so it should not be difficult for them to develop the required expertise. But the philosophical issues addressed in these courses would speak directly to the emerging moral and social challenges that today’s students will inevitably confront, and would also supply an additional occasion for affirming the University’s Christian identity and furthering its mission.

VI. Diversity

1. “Diversity” is a nearly vacuous term unless there is some specification provided of the kind of diversity that matters. The Program certainly demonstrates a commitment to intellectual diversity in its curriculum; the course syllabi across the major that I have examined all include a broad range of readings from authors representing a broad range of philosophical perspectives. There is, moreover, evidence of a commitment to gender diversity in that each philosophy class syllabus I have examined includes readings from philosophers who are women. There is also intellectual diversity in the Philosophy faculty; Marshall, Pendergraft, and Bogardus specialize in different areas of philosophy, bring to the Program different educational backgrounds and training, and represent a broad range of philosophical viewpoints and commitments. But, of course, the Philosophy faculty is itself not diverse with respect to gender or race. This fact does not entail that the Program is not committed to diversity, but only that it is on these dimensions not diverse. The student make-up in the Program is refreshingly diverse along gender and racial dimensions. The percentage of Philosophy majors who are women has steadily increased since 2011, and is currently at 41%, which more than doubles the percentage of women currently in the profession; and more than half of the Philosophy minors at Pepperdine are women. The percentage of non-white Philosophy majors has remained steady since 2010, but consistently reflects a percentage that is higher than the
percentage of non-whites in the profession at large, as does the percentage of non-white Philosophy majors. The racial and gender diversity among the Philosophy majors and minors helps ensure that classroom discussions allow for the consideration of a range of perspectives and experiences that might otherwise not be represented. And, as I mentioned, the assigned readings in the Philosophy offerings reflect a good range of intellectual / philosophical differences, and a decent diversity along gender lines.

2. I recommend no changes at present. But the university should recognize that next faculty hire in Philosophy should enhance the faculty gender or racial diversity while also contributing to the existing strengths and character of the Program. The addition of a woman philosopher working in, for example, philosophy of language or philosophy of science, with a competence in analytic feminist philosophy or analytic philosophy of race would be most welcome.

VII. Program Administrative Support

1. In my discussions with Program faculty and majors, I got the impression that library and other research facilities are adequate for student and faculty needs.

2. The Program does not need laboratory facilities.

3. The central need identified by the Philosophy faculty is adequate classroom space. The two classes I observed were held in rooms which were not well suited to facilitating classroom discussion. In one classroom, students arranged their desks in a semi-circle, but the room wasn’t wide enough – some students basically had to sit with their backs to the front of the room (which is where the instructor was positions, and where the Powerpoint was being projected to). The other classroom I observed was so narrow that the only way to accommodate the students was to have them sit in rows. For the kind of teaching the Program is most keen to provide, these physical conditions create obstacles. Making available to the Philosophy Program classroom spaces better suited to stimulate open discussion would be a great help. Otherwise, the Program seems adequately resourced.

4. The central recruitment tool for Philosophy is faculty/student engagement, and this is centrally initiated when student enroll in an introductory-level Philosophy course. As I walked with the Philosophy faculty around campus during my visit, we were regularly approached by students wanting to say “hi” to their Philosophy professors. The rapport between the Philosophy faculty and the Pepperdine student struck me as especially healthy and positive – the faculty are clearly going out of their way to be welcoming and supportive of their students. But, again, the absence of an introductory-level Philosophy course in the GE curriculum is an obstacle to the Program’s ability to build interest in the major. This seems a missed opportunity for the University, again given the undeniable centrality of what the Philosophy Program does to the University’s self-conception and mission. In my meeting with Philosophy majors, most said that they were “lucky” to have found the Philosophy Program early enough in their time at Pepperdine to consider it as a major. That such a highly successful, research-active, and mission-central Program should in effect be kept a secret from the student body (something that one has to be “lucky” to learn about the existence of) is astonishing. And there’s no doubt that the unjustifiable exclusion of Philosophy from the GE curriculum contributes largely to this phenomenon: Students do not see Philosophy as part of the GE, and so have no occasion learn of its existence as a major option for them until well after they have already committed to some other program of study. Moreover, the exclusion of Philosophy
Philosophy

from the GE has the communicative effect of declaring to the students that Philosophy plays no role in a Liberal Arts education at a Christian university, which is patently absurd. That the Philosophy Program has sustained a healthy number of majors and minors under conditions of institutional marginalization attests to the effectiveness of the Program faculty’s efforts at recruitment and retention.

5. I did not meet with Program administrative staff, but discussed these matters with the Program faculty, and staff needs seem to be met.

6. My central recommendation is that the University add an introductory-level Philosophy class to its GE curriculum. This will likely involve shifting existing requirements in ways that take a GE course away from another unit. That’s difficult business, I know. But the current allocation under the GE is unfair to Philosophy and arguably out of line with the University’s expressed values and mission. My strong suspicion is that the University would be hard pressed to find another Program that is as active, rigorous, effective, relevant, and successful as Philosophy is. And yet the Philosophy Program has no role in the GE curriculum. It’s a problem.

VIII. Proposed Changes

1. The Program’s Five-Year Review document does not include a separate discussion of proposed changes. There are curricular and resource needs identified, but these latter are modest (and have been discussed and embraced at various points above). As for the curricular changes, the Program identifies a handful of “curriculum gaps” (Section 9): the absence of courses in Philosophy of Language, Philosophy of Natural Science, Biomedical Ethics, Philosophy of Gender, and Continental Philosophy. It does not indicate any plan for filling these gaps, though (as mentioned above) it seems to me that the existing faculty specializations allow them to relatively easily develop courses in Philosophy of Language, Bioethics, and Philosophy of Natural Science. I recommend that they do so (in addition to the courses in the Ethics of War and Global Justice). The remaining gaps (Philosophy of Gender and Continental Philosophy) are less urgent, especially in light of the offerings of other Programs in the college.

2. The Program identifies no specific plans for changes of improvements based on the assessment and evaluation data it has collected. These data suggest ways in which existing practices within the Program are succeeding, and hence provides a way forward (namely, by further enriching the practices that are already successful).

3. My most urgent recommendation for change regards the GE and Philosophy’s omission from it.

IX. Overall Program Summary

1. The Program’s major strength is the fact that its faculty is highly research-active. This enables the faculty to teach courses that reflect the cutting edge of the discipline. As the Program’s syllabi demonstrate, classic and historical readings are paired with the most current research. Students hence come to see Philosophy as a living discipline -- an intellectual activity with problems, methods, and technical vocabularies all its own -- rather than a collection of strange books written by people who are long dead. This no doubt contributes to the Program’s ability to produce majors who go on to highly selective PhD programs in Philosophy; majors emerge from the Pepperdine Program with a solid training in the research processes employed in Philosophy (and also with the
experience of having written a professional research paper in Philosophy). As I’ve noted above, this is a major achievement for a tiny (three-faculty) Philosophy Program.

A second, and related, strength is the Program faculty’s dedication to the Pepperdine’s students (and not only the Philosophy majors). Again, as I mentioned above, during my visit on campus, the Philosophy faculty who were ferrying me to and fro were regularly being greeted enthusiastically by students -- I emphasize that the students were not merely saying “hi,” but wanting to stop to talk with the faculty. It was clear that several of these students were not Philosophy majors, but simply students who had taken a Philosophy course at some point. I got the strong impression that the Philosophy Program’s courses are making a distinctive impact on the student body. This impression is supported by some of the comments made by Philosophy majors in my discussion with them. They told me that Philosophy is considered on campus to be the hardest major, but also the Program whose courses are the most interesting. Apparently Dr. Marshall is regarded among the student body as one of the two or three professors at Pepperdine that one “must take.” A research-active faculty is typically a faculty that cares little for connecting with students (or proves inept at building relations with students). This is not the case at Pepperdine.

One weakness I found came out in my meeting with the Philosophy majors. Some, but not all, of the majors I spoke with planned to go on to a PhD program in Philosophy. Those who did not plan to go on for graduate work expressed the thought that the Program was nearly exclusively geared for students seeking to get into graduate school in Philosophy. Correspondingly slight attention is given, they thought, to students who plan to attend Law School, Medical School, or who just want to study Philosophy (but do not want to continue schooling after earning the BA). My discussions with the Philosophy faculty confirmed this: The tendency is to see the Philosophy major as a kind of preparation for graduate school in Philosophy. One faculty went so far as to claim that the Program’s success in getting its majors into top PhD programs is proof of the overall success of the Philosophy Program. The Program’s success at placing majors in graduate school is, indeed, a kind of success (and an important kind, too). But it alone is no indication of how well the Program is serving its majors as such. The worry is that majors who do not plan to apply to graduate school nonetheless are being trained for graduate school. To be sure, to receive such training is not a terrible outcome. But one wonders what other possibilities there may be, and, in any case, the Program should want to avoid giving the majors the impression that the aim of earning a Philosophy BA is to get into graduate school; surely the Program faculty holds that a Philosophy BA is valuable in other ways (and perhaps is valuable intrinsically). I asked the following questions to faculty, and it was not clear to me that they had a firm sense of the answers:

- Apart from going on to a PhD program, what do your majors do after graduation?
- Apart from the aspiration to get a PhD in Philosophy, what leads Pepperdine students to major in Philosophy?
- How many Philosophy majors simply want to study Philosophy for their BA, and have no plans to continue their education beyond Pepperdine?

It seems to me that the Program needs to learn more about its majors and needs to do more to show that it understands that students majoring in Philosophy need not aspire to earn a PhD in Philosophy in order to be serious and dedicated to the discipline.
2. In light of the Program’s strengths and weakness, I would recommend the following goals for the coming five years (the most important first):

a. Introduce an introductory-level Philosophy class into the GE curriculum, as I think is called for by the University’s mission and values. This would not only help grow the Philosophy major, but would also significantly enrich the Pepperdine students’ liberal arts education.

b. Grow the Philosophy major. Philosophy currently has more than 35 majors (the Five-Year Review claims 35 majors and 27 minors; the number of majors cited in my discussions during my visit was 41). This is a healthy number for a three-faculty Program, but the number of Philosophy majors has been in decline in recent years. Doing more to publicize the major, and to make it clear that the Philosophy major is not strictly a graduate school training program would be a great help in adding majors (I note again that the majors I met with all characterized their discovery of the Philosophy major as a stroke of luck – this needs to be changed). The Program should also introduce new social occasions for building community among majors and faculty – events that are not explicitly tied to academic work.

c. Establish (either formally or informally) mechanisms within the Program by which Philosophy majors could express their aims in majoring in Philosophy; perhaps the Program could do more for those who want to go on to graduate school, and do different things for those who express different aspirations. The Program’s self-study report does not address the issues about majors who do not aspire to earn a PhD in Philosophy – in fact, the Five-Year Review is almost exclusively focused on admission to Philosophy PhD programs as its metric of success; what the Program majors who do not go on to graduate school go on to do is not mentioned at all. Establishing within the Program (even if only informally) a “track” for graduate school, or at least a way for majors to make known what their aspirations are (Philosophy PhD, Law School, Medical School, a PhD in some other discipline, an MBA, a religious profession, etc., etc.) would, I think, help the Program serve its students. I expect it would also help grow the major. If conditions warrant, the Program should develop, along with a “Philosophy graduate school,” track for students interested in Law School and Medical School. The different “tracks” need not involve different degree requirements or any special curricular changes, but it would help with advising students, and may provide the Program with some guidance in developing new course offerings; for example, knowing that, say, 80% of the advanced majors are planning to apply to Law School might help the faculty decide what “major philosophical problem” Phil 480 should be devoted to that year.

d. Develop new courses. As I mentioned above, there is particular need for courses in The Ethics of War, Global Justice, and Bioethics. And, as also mentioned above, these courses can be developed from existing faculty expertise. These courses should be pitched at the intermediate (rather than advanced) level, and their interdisciplinary dimensions (and fit with other majors) should be emphasized.

e. Hire a fourth full-time Philosophy faculty member. Provided progress is made on items a through d, the Program will need an additional full-time faculty member. Ideally, this additional philosopher would complement the existing focus of the Program, while adding
new curricular possibilities. To be more specific, the Program should seek to add to its ranks a philosopher specializing in feminist philosophy along with a combination of several of the following: ethics (normative, meta, and applied), philosophy of language, political philosophy, and some major period of the history of philosophy (other than Ancient), all from an “analytic” perspective. This will add considerably to the curricular scope and diversity of the current Program.

3. Goals a. and b. are top priority, and I’m sure that achieving a. will involve a major discussion across the University. It is unfortunate that the Philosophy Program should need to build a case for inclusion in the GE (alas, it should be obvious that Philosophy is indispensable to general education at a selective liberal arts university), but this is apparently what will be required. The Program should compile data comparing itself to other Programs that are well-represented on the GE. Is there any other Program at Pepperdine with a highly research-active faculty and a robust record of successful majors that has no early role in the GE? Can other Programs that are well-represented in the GE make as strong a case as Philosophy for being absolutely central to the University’s mission and values? What crucial skills, competencies, and insights are developed in Philosophy courses that are missing from courses required in the existing GE? My sense is that a highly compelling and principled case for adding a Philosophy requirement to the GE can be formulated without too much difficulty (though the task will be time consuming); of course, large-scale institutions cannot be counted on to do what it can be demonstrated that they have most reason to do. But, again, the exclusion of Philosophy from the GE is pretty glaring and arguably incompatible with Pepperdine’s mission and values.

As for growing the major, the Program needs to review the strategies it has employed with success in the recent past, when it had very many more majors. Given the absence of Philosophy from the GE, the University is implicitly communicating to the students that exposure to Philosophy is not part of being generally educated at the college level; this is flatly incorrect, and the Program has to invent ways to combat this impression. I think the first step is making the Philosophy Program and major more visible to students as an option. I leave it to the faculty to devise ways that they may pursue this. Strategies for achieving the additional goals fall into place once progress is made on a. and b.

4. The single goal that requires major new resources is e., hiring a fourth full-time Philosophy faculty member. This is a matter of University and College budgetary priorities, so there’s nothing that the Program itself can do to secure the funding. But if the Program grows in the way it should (and given its excellence and centrality to Pepperdine’s mission), there will be need for another full-time philosopher. In my description of b. (Grow the Major), I called for new occasions for community-building within the Program; this might require some minor funding (for a luncheon and a Senior Essay prize), which I take it the Program can applied for with the Division.
Philosophy Program Quality Improvement Plan

Prepared by:
Dr. Garrett Pendergraft, Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Dr. Tomas Bogardus, Assistant Professor of Philosophy

In light of our internal and external reviews, we have reflected on the quality of the Philosophy Program, and whether it is meeting its program goals. There is some compelling evidence in that regard. For example, our external reviewer noted that “the number and quality of the placements of Pepperdine Philosophy majors in PhD Philosophy programs is remarkable; surely this, too, is a reliable indicator of a high level of effectiveness in achieving the learning outcomes.” He thinks similarly of our pattern of student publication: “one should say that these latter two measures (publication and placement) demonstrate that the outcomes are both reliably achieved and are good matches with the discipline’s conception of accomplishment for undergraduate Philosophy students.” Our external reviewer also speaks highly of our curriculum, approaches to teaching, and our faculty research and training.

This external assessment corroborates the results of our own internal reviews, which show that, on the whole, instruction in the Philosophy Program successfully achieves the program’s learning outcomes.

At the same time, we’ve reflected on areas of potential improvement. As our external reviewer noted, it would be good to clarify to our students what else one might do with a philosophy degree. The website that our program developed in 2013 (www.studyphilosophy.org) does include resources to help students realize the variety of careers that philosophy majors pursue. Going forward, our faculty will make a concerted effort to highlight this for students, to dispel any impression that undergraduate training in philosophy is good only for graduate training in philosophy. We will also make greater efforts to track the success of our alumni who go on to law school, medical school, and other careers.

We also resonate with the external reviewer’s opinion that our faculty should create more occasions for social interaction with our students, to further improve the cohesion of the program, majors, minors, and faculty alike. To this end, we will explore and implement some of his suggestions: an annual program luncheon, an essay contest, increased faculty involvement in the Philosophy Club, dinners at faculty members’ homes, and the like.

The external reviewer points out that “no existing introductory-level course required in the GE teaches the distinctive skills of critical and formal reasoning that the Philosophy Program emphasizes.” As a result, his highest-priority recommendation is that Introduction to Philosophy (or some newly developed introductory-level course in Philosophy) be added to the General Education curriculum. Implementing this recommendation will take a Seaver-wide effort, but we are certainly in support of the recommendation and we will do what we can to occasion and facilitate it.

The external reviewer also suggested that we broaden our course offerings—by including courses in Just War Theory, Global Justice, and Bioethics—and that we hire an additional faculty member. These suggestions seem, by our lights, to depend on substantially growing the major, most plausibly through Philosophy finding a place on the GE curriculum. Until that occurs, the Philosophy Program likely won’t have enough demand for courses to sustain broadening the curriculum in this way, or adding another faculty member. (Right now we have roughly 40 majors and 25 minors, and we offer six upper division electives (not counting the cross-listed courses). This would suggest that if we can grow the our program to the point where we have roughly 60 majors and 40 minors, we
would be in a good position to broaden our course offerings.) However, regardless of whether
Philosophy finds a place on the GE curriculum, we will continue our efforts to recruit students and
grow the major.
Master of Arts in American Studies Program
Review
Fall 2010–Spring 2015

Prepared by:

Dr. Dana Dudley
AMERICAN STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

INTERNAL CONTEXT

The American Studies master of arts program is a part of the Humanities and Teacher Education division and is one of nine master's degrees offered at Seaver College. It also receives administrative support from the Seaver College graduate programs office which manages admissions and registrar type functions. There are no emphases or concentrations available in this degree. All classes are offered on the Malibu campus.

Provide a brief history of the program.
The Seaver College M.A. in American Studies is a 36-unit graduate program designed primarily for secondary school teachers within commuting distance in Southern California. It is one of nine master's level programs at Seaver College. The degree consists of seven core and two elective four-unit courses, the program offers evening courses during the regular school term and day courses during the summer sessions. Courses include: Introduction to American Studies, Social History of the U.S. (History), Contemporary American Ideologies (Political Science), American Moral Traditions (Religion), two seminars in English with varying topics, and Capstone Readings course. Students take two electives which are often History or Art History, but can be from a wide variety of disciplines.

Students can complete all coursework in a two-and-a-half-year. The program culminates in a capstone readings course and a comprehensive exam. From its inception, the AMST program was attractive mostly to secondary school teachers rather than to prospective doctoral students. The program originated from twin sources: a year-round M.A. in American Studies dating back at least to the early 1970s and a summer institute in the 1970s; the latter received a financial boost with grants from the W.M. Keck Foundation in 1981 and 1982, and the two merged to become a single year-round master's program in the early 1990s. The primary population continues to be teachers.

Describe the changes made to the program since the last review.
The program has not undergone a 5 year review to the level in which the College now participates. After that last program review the Economics core class was dropped, and an Introduction to American Studies class was added. I don't have any data from that report. But as one can see from the curriculum comparison section, an Intro course is a very common aspect of AMST curriculum. When we first added the Intro class, it was only taught every other year resulting in some students taking it as their first course and others as the first course of their second year. Survey data showed that this inconsistent experience made some students feel that there were at a disadvantage. It also is pedagogically sound to undertake a course of study with the introductory material, and that this be available to every student. Beginning in Fall 2015 the course will be offered every year and will be the first course each student takes.
AMERICAN STUDIES

EXTERNAL CONTEXT

The program makes a contribution to the community by providing graduate education opportunities and generous fellowships to current middle and high school teachers. Their increased understanding of American culture impacts their teaching and thus their students.

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

1. Demonstrate advanced critical thinking in the context of the American experiences while deploying the methodologies of the disciplines represented in American Studies.
2. Identify major social, political, and religious movements in American culture
3. Demonstrate competence in information literacy in an interdisciplinary context and complete graduate-level research
4. Demonstrate the ability to integrate various discipline-specific methodologies in the context of American cultural themes through the successful completion of a capstone readings course and a comprehensive exam.

MISSION, PURPOSE, GOALS

The mission statement of the American Studies program is "to teach students to become cultural critics who use interdisciplinary perspectives to analyze the diverse cultures, groups, and experiences of American life." This is what we hope for our students to achieve. Our primary population is K-12 teachers. For that population, we hope that their teaching will reflect the learning they gain through the program.

Goals: the program hopes to educate students to be adept practitioners of American Studies.

OUTCOMES

Outcomes: the outcomes are reflected in the program learning outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstrate advanced critical thinking in the context of the American experiences while deploying the methodologies of the disciplines represented in American Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify major social, political, and religious movements in American culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrate competence in information literacy in an interdisciplinary context and complete graduate-level research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to integrate various discipline-specific methodologies in the context of American cultural themes through the successful completion of a capstone readings course and a comprehensive exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also please see the discussion on the proposed revised PLOs in question 4.
**AMERICAN STUDIES**

**American Studies Curriculum Map**
I = Introduced  D = Developed  M = Mastered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMST 610</th>
<th>AMST 620</th>
<th>ENG 580</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>HIST 530</th>
<th>POSC 518</th>
<th>REL 635</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate advanced critical thinking in the context of the American experiences while deploying the methodologies of the disciplines represented in American Studies.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify major social, political, and religious movements in American culture</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate competence in information literacy in an interdisciplinary context and complete graduate-level research</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to integrate various discipline-specific methodologies in the context of American cultural themes through the successful completion of a capstone readings course and a comprehensive exam.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE**

**MEANING**

Meaning of the Degree: Describe how the program ensures a holistic experience by answering the following questions about the coherence and alignment within the program:

**4. What are the learning outcomes and how does the degree support the institutional mission and institutional learning outcomes?**

1. Demonstrate advanced critical thinking in the context of the American experience while deploying the methodologies of the disciplines represented in American Studies.

2. Identify major social, political, and religious movements in American culture.

3. Demonstrate competence in information literacy in an interdisciplinary context and complete graduate-level research.
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4. Demonstrate the ability to integrate various discipline-specific methodologies in the context of American cultural themes through the successful completion of a capstone readings course and a comprehensive exam.

Seaver Assessment Learning Team commented that our PLOs had some weaknesses. The faculty agreed that our PLOs needed revision. In particular, the verbs are not ideal and our curriculum does not address PLO#2, as we do not have a survey class in the curriculum. The faculty met in the summer of 2015 and discussed new PLOs which are below. We have not made these our official PLOs because we wanted to incorporate any feedback from the 5-year review process.

Content & Critical Thinking
1. Employ higher order, multidisciplinary, historically informed critical thinking about American culture.

Diversity
2. Critique the cultural diversity of the American experience, especially in terms of class, ethnicity, religion, gender, and race.

Research & Writing skills,
3. Produce persuasive, nuanced, fact-based interpretations reflecting a close critical reading and sustained analysis of relevant primary and secondary sources.

Theory and Methodology
4. Identify, assess, and integrate different disciplinary, methodological, interpretive, and theoretical approaches to the study of American culture.

Our PLOs are tied to the University mission and the institutional learning outcomes in that we are equipping students for lives of purpose, service and leadership. Most of the AMST students are current teachers who are currently leading and making a difference in the lives of the next generation. The program also has a heavy emphasis on diversity as we embark on the study of various cultures within America. Our students are equipped with tools such as critical race theory, feminist theories, and postcolonial theory as they grapple with issues related to the marginalized and the empowered, all within the context of a Christian university. Our students are engaged in academic discovery and often apply those discoveries to the real-world challenges of their classrooms.

5. How does the degree embody the distinct values, basic commitment, and traditions of the institution?

Pepperdine has had a long history of educating teachers. This program continues in this tradition, educating these leaders as they influence the next generation. The interdisciplinary nature of the degree and its emphasis on diversity is in keeping with Pepperdine's commitment to diversity.
6. Is there a coherent, aligned sequence of learning opportunities?
Yes. The curriculum is as follows:

Core Courses

AMST 610, Introduction to American Studies
HIST 530 Social History of the U.S.
POSC 518 Contemporary American Ideologies
REL 635 American Moral Traditions
ENG 580 Seminar in English (topics vary and it is taken twice)
AMST 620 Capstone Readings Course

Sample of Previous Electives Taken

History: Route 66: A Cultural History
Art History: The Local Global: American Art and Globalization in the Digital Age
History: California and the Modern American West: History, Memory and Popular Culture
Art History: Race and Representation in American Art

Students begin the program with the Introduction to American Studies course and end the program with a Capstone reading course and a comprehensive exam. Other core courses are offered every other year. In essence students take the intro as a cohort and then join the other cohort for their remaining courses. The final course is composed again of their original cohort. Since the courses are not scaffolded, this has not presented a problem. Students are then able to synthesize their coursework during the capstone course.

7. Does the degree offer sufficient breadth and depth of learning for this particular major or program? Please explain.

Yes. The core courses in the curriculum are drawn from four disciplines. The intro and capstone courses provide a foundation for interdisciplinary inquiry and a culminating readings course respectively. Our electives are typically History courses. The last two years we've also offered an Art History course as an elective. I believe we could offer a greater variety of elective courses. Scheduling is often the challenge we face that keeps us tied more closely to a narrow selection of electives. Seaver has limited evening classes and students in this program need evening classes during the academic year.
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8. Please present a curriculum comparison with at least three peer institutions and with national disciplinary or professional standards if available.

Seaver's program is unique in a couple of ways: 1) we have a master's degree without a bachelor's program, 2) our primary student population is K-12 teachers. That being said, our curriculum is similar to the programs benchmarked. Our units to degree completion is 36, where the others were 30 and 33. Like the schools reviewed, we begin the program with an introductory course that focuses methodology and theory and then allow the student to select courses from a variety of disciplines. We do require more core courses than the other programs and have fewer electives. Additionally we do not have a thesis option. However we hold true to the interdisciplinary exploration of American culture(s).

CURRICULUM COMPARISONS

California State University at Fullerton: Master of Arts, 30 units, choice of thesis or comprehensive exam

The general objective of the American Studies graduate program is to provide advanced training in the interdisciplinary analysis of American culture as a complex whole in the past and present.

- 6 units of American Studies graduate core courses (500-level courses). One of these is a Theory and Methods course.
- 12 units of elective courses in American Studies (400 or 500-level courses). Note these courses may also include undergraduates.

### AMST Curriculum Benchmarking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Degrees Offered</th>
<th>Total # of units in M.A.</th>
<th># Core Units</th>
<th>Titles of Core Classes</th>
<th>Description of other Requirements</th>
<th>Thesis or Comp</th>
<th>Link to Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>BA, MA, PhD</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Methods and Theories in American Studies</td>
<td>Remainder of classes chosen from a variety of disciplines with no more 15 units from a single department other than American Cultural Studies</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/cultural-and-critical-studies/american-culture-studies/graduate/ma.html">http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/cultural-and-critical-studies/american-culture-studies/graduate/ma.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- 6 units of graduate seminars in related fields (500-level courses). Selected topics course, with choices including selections such as Race in America, Gender and Theory, Visual Culture, Public Memory and others.
- 3 units in a methodological skill course (400 or 500-level courses)
- 3 units for a terminal exercise, which may be either a master's thesis or comprehensive exam based on mastery of the department's core graduate reading list

Major emphases in Cal State Fullerton's American Studies M.A. Program:

- Our graduate program is grounded in a thorough understanding of the concept of culture. It emphasizes cultural pluralism, examining the creative tension between unity and diversity in the American experience.
- It is self-consciously interdisciplinary, requiring graduate students to integrate knowledge from the humanities and social sciences.
- It emphasizes the process of historical change, compelling students to trace the past sources of contemporary issues. It develops advanced research, writing and analytical skills. Through course work, consultation with faculty, and writing a thesis or comprehensive exam, graduate students become familiar with the theories and methods of American culture studies.

Thesis

A thesis in this department is an extended discussion, with a central argument, based on complex analysis of your original research and includes a review of the literature on your topic as well as a historical framework. With the approval of your committee chair, you enroll in AMST 598 in your final semester of coursework You begin by developing an outline or summary of your topic and how you plan to approach your study and then meeting with your committee for their response and advisement regarding your research and writing plan. Once you have completed your research, you submit drafts of each chapter to your committee chair for their review and circulation to the other two members. Chapters are then revised in response to faculty critique and formatted to University guidelines for theses (the Grad Studies office publishes these guidelines). Once your committee has approved the final draft, your thesis is submitted to the University thesis reader for evaluation of compliance with University standards. Theses in American Studies are typically well over 100 pages in length and organized into four - six chapters. You can find a listing of titles of completed theses in American Studies on our website.

Comprehensive Exam

At least one semester before taking their exam, MA candidates must select three of the following categories for their subject fields. Every candidate must also identify three full-time faculty to serve as MA committee members with each faculty overseeing preparation for one of the three subject fields. With the approval of your committee chair, you enroll in AMST 599 in your final semester of coursework As you read through the works on the list, you meet independently with the members of your committee for discussion and guidance.
The subject fields are:

- Expressive Forms
- Gender and Sexuality
- Institutions and Ideals
- The National and the Global
- Natural and Built Environments
- Race, Ethnicity, and Class Formation
- Work, Consumption, and Leisure

Book lists for all subject fields, each arranged in chronological order, can be found here: MA Comprehensive Exam Reading Lists.

In consultation with the faculty members on his or her committee, a candidate must select and read a minimum of ten books from each of the three chosen categories. Also, in consultation with faculty, a student may substitute a maximum of two books outside the list for each subject field. Candidates will have four days (four consecutive 24 hour periods) to write three essays—one essay for each of the chosen subject fields. Each essay must be a minimum of ten double-spaced pages.

The faculty member responsible for each section of the exam will provide two questions for that section. The two questions for each section will be of two types:

**A.** A question asking students to examine scholarly methods of understanding cultural processes. These are questions of theory and method, requiring students to critically evaluate how scholars approach evidence and how scholars have explored this subject field.

**B.** A question asking students to examine cultural processes in history. These are questions of content, requiring students to analyze the dynamics of cultural interaction and changeover time. To insure methodological and historical coverage, students must choose one A-type question for any subject field and one B-type question for another subject field. They may select either A or B for the remaining subject field.

**Baylor: Master of Arts, 30 units, Thesis**

http://www.baylor.edu/American_Studies/index.php?id=33668

The graduate program in American Studies is an interdisciplinary program offering comprehensive study in American institutions and culture. The basic program consists of courses in American history and American literature.

Graduate work in American Studies for the Master of Arts degree consists of thirty semester hours, at least fifteen of which must be in courses numbered above 5000.

Distribution requirements are as follows:

1. Core 9 hours: AMS 5V99 (6 hours) AMS 4385 (3 hours)
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a. 4385 Seminar in American Studies (Studies the theory and practice of American Studies, presents students with the opportunity to analyze written and visual texts, and requires a major paper. Through written work and oral presentations, the course gives students a broad perspective on the American culture.)

b. AMS 5V99 Thesis

2. Three courses cross-listed with English, history, or journalism (9 hours)
3. One research methods class from English, history, or journalism (3 hours).
4. Electives (9 hours). To be chosen from American Studies courses approved for graduate credit.

Bowling Green State University, (BA, MA and Ph.D.) MA 33 units

http://www.bgsu.edu/arts-and-sciences/cultural-and-critical-studies/american-culturestudies/graduate/ma.html

The MA program in American Culture Studies is interdisciplinary, unifying study of the many discrete aspects of our historical, social, intellectual, and artistic heritage, culminating in a scholarly understanding of culture.

It invites students to explore particular themes, issues, and periods from an interdisciplinary perspective and offers a foundation in the study of American culture for students with a variety of interests or goals.

Primarily, we seek to communicate a sense of the complexity and diversity of our national culture based upon a systematic analysis of its elements. While the American Culture Studies component of the curriculum assures a common experience in culture study, the remainder of the courses are selected from traditional disciplines to allow an individualized educational experience.

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE MASTER'S DEGREE

Individual programs are designed in consultation with the Graduate Coordinator and based upon a combination of courses in American Culture Studies and in related fields according to the interests, needs, and background of the student, his/her future plans and goals, and the interdisciplinary philosophy of the program. Thirty-three semester hours are required for the degree, including the required seminar in ACS 6300-Methods and Theories of American Culture Studies. The remaining hours are selected from appropriate courses in American Culture Studies, Art History, Communication Studies, English, Ethnic Studies, History, Philosophy, Political Science, Popular Culture, Sociology, Telecommunications, Theatre,
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Women's Studies, and other related fields. No more than fifteen hours should be taken in a single department or program other than American Culture Studies.

Plan I: Thesis Option:

The candidate must write an interdisciplinary thesis in keeping with the philosophy of the program. Under Plan I, students complete 30 hours of course work and receive three hours of credit for the accepted thesis for a total of 33 semester hours. For most students, completion of the Plan I option requires two years of full-time study in the American Culture Studies MA program.

Plan II: Comprehensive Exam Option:

The basic requirements are the same as Plan I, except 33 hours of course work are required. The student electing Plan II will sit for a four-hour written examination, covering periods in American cultural history, the student's course work, the relationship of American Culture Studies to the traditional disciplines, American Culture Studies methodology, and important themes in American culture. The examination will be based upon each student's individual course of study.

9. How current is the program curriculum?
Our program generally reflects the current state of the discipline. Some programs have less core classes and a larger number of electives. Because of the smaller size of our program coupled with the fact that most of our students are fully employed and require evening classes, it would be difficult to offer the large number of courses from which students can make selections as some schools do. Our larger core requirement is valuable because it ensures a distribution among disciplines.

10. How has the curriculum changed (if at all) over the last five years including the reasons for the change (e.g., the result of a learning outcome assessment) and evidence used as a basis for change?
After the last program review the Economics core class was dropped and an Introduction to American Studies class was added based on benchmarking data from other institutions. However that Intro class was only taught every other year resulting in some students taking it as their first course and others as the first course of their second year. Survey data showed that this inconsistent experience made some students feel that there were at a disadvantage. Beginning in 2015 the course will be offered every year and will be the first course each student takes.

11. Pedagogy: Please present measures of teaching effectiveness (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching or implementing, scholarship on issues of teaching and learning, formative discussions of pedagogy among faculty, survey measures, participation rates, and student satisfaction surveys).
The attached document is a summary of course evaluations. Each course is represented by a code and the score of two questions on the Seaver Course Evaluation form are listed along with the number of responses expected vs received. The two questions are "This course is excellent," and "The professor is an excellent teacher." The averages of sixteen course scores are in the Agree to Strongly Agree range, illustrating that students believe they are receiving instruction from a good teacher in a good course.

There are a couple of outlying low scores. In both cases, the director met with the divisional dean of the Humanities and Teacher Education division to discuss the evaluation, and he met with the faculty member. Neither of the professors with these two lower scores have taught another class in the program.

One is scheduled to teach in an upcoming semester. The divisional dean and the director will review that course evaluation with particular care.

Each summer during our assessment meeting the faculty discuss pedagogy. We've covered topics such as student work load consistency, student learning outcomes, how to increase student writing quality etc. These discussions are fruitful and have impacted the way each of us teaches in this program.

### Course Evaluations Summary, 2012-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Course</th>
<th>Q7: the course is excellent</th>
<th>Q17: the professor is an excellent teacher</th>
<th>Responses / Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>12/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>13/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>16/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>16/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>9/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>11/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE** 4.24 4.35
12. Describe the practices which enrich the learning experiences such as co-curricular experiences (How are they integrated in the curriculum? Are they assessed?)
   a. Service learning
   b. Research opportunities
   c. Internships
   d. High-impact practices

Our students are fully employed either as teachers, at Pepperdine or in positions outside the university. As such internships are not a good fit with our student population. Service learning poses a similar challenge. All of our classes include a research component as a part of the coursework. As a faculty we are encouraging our students to enhance their research and writing opportunities by submitting papers or lesson plans to academic or teaching conferences. Three students have won awards for their lesson plans at the Western History Association. The Seaver Graduate programs are working to add a research presentation opportunity similar to the Undergraduate Research Conference at Seaver College sponsored by the Associate Provost's office. More information on this developing opportunity is in Question 19 in the summary of PLO assessments.

13. Co-Curricular : How intentional are the co-curricular experiences which are provided and how are they integrated into the curricular plan?
   a. Academic and career advising programs and resources
   b. Tutoring, supplemental instruction, and teaching assistants
   c. Orientation and transition programs
   d. Financial support for obtaining scholarships, fellowships, teaching assistantships, etc.
   e. Support for engagement in the campus community
   f. Support for emotional and psychological variables of success
   g. Spiritual development programs and opportunities
   h. Multicultural opportunities which support diversity
   i. Plays, musicals, art exhibits, and lectures
   j. the Sophomore Experience
   k. Study Abroad

Orientation: We provide a New Student Orientation (GNSO) each year for all new Seaver College graduate students. This is a half-day program in which students are introduced to a variety of services and opportunities at Seaver College. Students are also informed about key academic policies, graduate grant opportunities, academic integrity policies, a library orientation, information about parking, health insurance, the health center, counseling center, and a large variety of other student services. The final session is program specific. The director meets with students describes the program, the discipline, the curriculum, and answers any questions. We assess the student's experience with GNSO. The responses are positive. They find the program to be useful to them as their transition to being graduate students.

Financial support: The American Studies program operates at a discounted tuition rate. Additionally, students who are current teachers are eligible for the Keck Fellowship (now called Pepperdine
AMERICAN STUDIES

Supplemental) which provides additional funds toward the tuition. Most students pay approximately 95% less than the standard Seaver tuition.

Support for engagement in the community: Seaver Graduate students are welcome to participate in any Seaver College activity. Students are made aware of these opportunities. I don't believe they participate in these opportunities often. This is not a topic upon which we have collected data.

Support for emotional and psychological variables of success: Seaver Graduate students are eligible to visit the health center or the counseling center. There is general data on if Seaver graduate students use these services, but it cannot be disaggregated by program due to confidentiality concerns.

Spiritual development programs and opportunities: Seaver Graduate students can participate in convocation, club convo, or any other spiritual development opportunity at Seaver College. Students are made aware of these opportunities. I don't believe they participate in these opportunities often. This is not a topic upon which we have collected data.

Plays, musicals, art exhibits, and lectures: Seaver Graduate students are welcome to attend any of these types of events. Often classes encourage students to attend particular performances or art exhibits that are particularly relevant to the curriculum. Unless an event is assigned as a part of the course, I don't believe many students attend these events. Again we have not collected data on this topic.

14. What is the profile of students in the program and how does the profile relate to or enhance the purpose and goals of the program? Please explain your student success data (enrollment and retention data). Evidence should include student retention and graduation rate trends (disaggregated by different demographic categories such as race, gender, first-generation students, etc.).

Our student population is primarily caucasian with the next largest ethnicities being Hispanic and Asian. Our gender distribution is relatively balanced with a larger population of female students. The student success data is positive for American Studies. Out of the past three of five years, we have had a three-year graduate rate of over 85%. Our five-year graduation data is 100% for 2006, 2007 and 2008. Since the program is completed in two and a half years, these numbers illustrate that most students are successfully completing the program on time. Students who take longer have had to take a leave of absence for some life event such as family, health, or employment changes, but the vast majority do return to complete the program.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness does not maintain retention data for this program.
## SAT Score and GPA by Major and Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLL TERM</th>
<th>Fall 2010 (Term:2106)</th>
<th>Fall 2011 (Term:2116)</th>
<th>Fall 2012 (Term:2126)</th>
<th>Fall 2013 (Term:2136)</th>
<th>Fall 2014 (Term:2146)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaver - Humanities and Teacher Ed</td>
<td>AVG GRE VER B</td>
<td>AVG GRE VER B</td>
<td>AVG GRE VER B</td>
<td>AVG GRE VER B</td>
<td>AVG GRE VER B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAMERST D American Studies</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total (Major &amp; Minor - AVERAGE SCORE)</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Students with double majors are counted more than once.
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## ENROLLMENT- Gender by Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLL TERM</th>
<th>Fall 2010 (Term:2106)</th>
<th>Fall 2011 (Term:2116)</th>
<th>Fall 2012 (Term:2126)</th>
<th>Fall 2013 (Term:2136)</th>
<th>Fall 2014 (Term:2146)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaver -</td>
<td>STUDEN</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Ed</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAMER STD</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollmen</td>
<td>t-Major &amp; Minor (Duplicating headcount)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Students with double majors are counted more than once.
## ENROLLMENT – Ethnicity by Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enroll Term</th>
<th>IPEDS ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Seaver-Humanities and Teacher Ed</th>
<th>Major MAAMERST American Studies</th>
<th>Total Enrollment: Major &amp; Minor (Duplicating Headcount)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010 (Term 2106)</td>
<td>Non-Resident Alien</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More Race</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011 (Term 2116)</td>
<td>Non-Resident Alien</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More Race</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>Fall 2012 (Term 2126)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Count</th>
<th>Fall 2013 (Term 2136)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Count</th>
<th>Fall 2014 (Term 2146)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaver - Humanities and</td>
<td>STUD</td>
<td>STUD</td>
<td>STUD</td>
<td>STUD</td>
<td>STUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Ed</td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>ENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAME RSTD American Studies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Students with double majors are counted more than once.
ENROLLMENT NUMBERS BY MAJOR AND MINOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLL TERM</th>
<th>Fall 2010 (Term:2106)</th>
<th>Fall 2011 (Term:2116)</th>
<th>Fall 2012 (Term:2126)</th>
<th>Fall 2013 (Term:2136)</th>
<th>Fall 2014 (Term:2146)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaver - Humanities and Teacher Ed</td>
<td>STUDENT COUNT</td>
<td>STUDENT COUNT</td>
<td>STUDENT COUNT</td>
<td>STUDENT COUNT</td>
<td>STUDENT COUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAMERSTD American Studies</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment – Major &amp; Minor (Duplicating headcount)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Students with double majors are counted more than once.

15. Please present your student and alumni survey data examining student attitudes, satisfaction levels and dispositions. OIE will provide the data in tables and graphs in their Educational Effectiveness Report. Programs are responsible for explaining the survey results. Survey data includes: UCLA/CIRP satisfaction survey data, alumni data.

OIE did not survey American Studies alumni. I have conducted a post-degree survey which is done right after students complete their degree. That survey is included in the appendices of question 19 under the assessment of PLO#4.

16. Please describe evidence of students' research and publications, awards and recognition, professional accomplishments.

This is not something we have consistently tracked and only have anecdotal reports.

INTEGRITY

17. Are the graduates achieving the student learning outcomes at the expected level? How was the threshold determined? How do you know your expectations are appropriate? Do you use comparisons based on national standards or benchmarking? How have your assessment findings supported this?

Yes our graduates are achieving the learning outcomes expected. We use the comprehensive exam as a primary point of evaluation. We review the rubric data of the exam each year and have made several
AMERICAN STUDIES

adjustments to address areas of concern. The exams are graded by a committee of three faculty members who have taught the capstone course, Dana Dudley, Michael Ditmore, and Ed Larson. We have determined the expected threshold through numerous discussions before and after each comprehensive exam. We do not have national benchmarking to compare to. Our assessment supports that students are meeting the expectation. The documents attached and entitled "PLO# 4 Assessment Summary" and "Appendix C PL O#4" detail the assessment of the comprehensive exam.

18. Is there assurance that students consistently meet the standards of performance that the major has established? What happens to students that don't meet the standards?
Standards of performance are assessed through the comprehensive exam. If a student were not to pass the comprehensive exam, they would be given a chance to retake them (new questions). If they didn't pass that time, their degree would not be posted. If a student doesn't meet expectations at the course level, it would most likely be reflected in their grade. Students are required to maintain a 3.0 or higher. Students falling below this are placed on academic probation which can lead to dismissal.

19. Please present an integrated analysis of the data collected from the assessment of direct learning and indirect learning (survey data, focus group, alumni data, and authentic evidence). Please report on the findings from the last comprehensive program review. In summary please explain how the program has achieved a holistic evaluation of the students' educational experience.

The program has not yet assessed PLO#2

**Assessment: PLO #1**

*Demonstrate advanced critical thinking in the context of the American experiences while deploying the methodologies of the disciplines represented in American studies.*

**Note:** Data from 2013-14. Completed in Summer, 2014.

**Critical Thinking is also a core competency.**

**Assessment Outline:** We collected research papers from four different courses from the fall 13 and spring 14 terms. Sixteen papers were chosen representing a balance of males and females, number of units completed in the program, as well as a range of GPAs. The names were removed. Each reader received a group of papers as well as the assignment descriptions. The Seaver critical thinking rubric was used with one minor modification. Since these are graduate students, we added the expectation that the student’s research make an original contribution to the field. A second portion of the rubric was added that assessed other aspects that are markers of good writing such as organization, use of sources, grammar, etc. (see appendix A). The scores were averaged. We analyzed the data by number of units completed in the program and by looking at each category (explanation of issues, student’s position, etc.). This is our first time to assess research papers and hoped that the scores would reflect an average of 3 (high developing).
Direct Evidence – The papers were divided into three groups. Each group of papers were read by three readers. Scores more than one number apart were not included. This only occurred one time in one category.

American Studies 2014 Assessment: Statistics from research paper assessment
PLO#1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 2.5</th>
<th>Composite Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of issues</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's Position</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Analysis</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions &amp; Related Outcomes</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Tone</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jargon &amp; Technical Terms</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; Punctuation</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style Convention</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.93</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings – The findings were distributed to the faculty and discussed. Through our discussion, we noted several observations.

- The weaker papers seemed to struggle with greater thesis problems.
- Most papers used sources well. However, weaker papers didn’t use primary sources as well or sometimes at all.
- Weaker papers lacked strong analysis or a strong central voice/argument of the author.

Overall we had hoped that the papers would have averaged in the 3 range. Instead, the data illustrated that students are performing on average in the high 2 range. We also had hoped that the scores would illustrate a strengthening of critical thinking and writing skills over the course of the program. Instead, this sample of papers pointed to a slight decline. It was noted that the number of papers was small and the one high or low student score could drastically affect the average. Also each admitted class varies in their abilities, which also affects the score.

Indirect Evidence — No indirect evidence was collected.

Authentic Evidence — The text below was written by a recent graduate of the AMST program. She teaches 8th grade at a local school. She sent this unsolicited email to Dr. Ditmore illustrating her learning in the program as well as that of one of her students.

“I wanted to share a paragraph written by one of my 8th grade students. We did a short survey of American History Through Its Writings in preparation for our East Coast Trip (Plymouth Plantation, here we come). His paragraph is an introductory letter to his collection of responses to all the readings. We started the unit with the question, “What is an American?” What fun we had
discussing the topic before and after we read some Bradford, Jefferson, Franklin, Emerson, Longfellow, Lincoln, Kennedy, and King!

Joe’s paper is attached. It made me proud to see him making connections that we learned in the AMST program. Thanks for what you taught me that I can pass on to the young ones. Future American Studies Scholars in the making!”

Below is the paper she references in the email.

“What makes an American, or what is an American; these questions are often asked, but no-one really knows the answer. To scholars an American is, ‘a person born, raised, or living in the U.S.’ (Webster dictionary) or a ‘native inhabitant of North America or South America’ (Webster dictionary). Although technically both of these are right, I would find the second more correct. Although some are not born here they are still American because they do most of the following and have all the qualifications but the birth one. This idea of an American dates back to 1620, when the pilgrims signed the Mayflower Compact and started what would soon become a great Nation where although the whites were free, not all men would have this same advantage. Later in history, Jefferson’s profound, Declaration of Independence which called for quality of men and inalienable rights to the 1863 Gettysburg Address, then John F. Kennedy’s 1961 Inaugural Speech to help include others and ultimately moving forward to the 1963 Martin Luther King Jr.’s March on Washington where he was trying to gain the rights and freedoms for African Americans that had been plagued with inequality for the last 343 years have the same message of unity and freedom. Through the readings of these nine historical and influential speeches and papers, the main messages are that freedom, unity, and diversity are necessary for a successful country. These inspirational messages are effective due to the use of parallel structure because it unites the listeners as well as the speaker to do what the speaker is saying and ultimately take action. While reading through these pieces, I learned that American history is vastly different from other countries in that American people strive for change and do what they can to implement those changes by calling forth people to action.”

Closing the Loop

2014 Action Item: Begin offering AMST 610 Intro course every year. Students who take it their second year seem to be at a disadvantage. They noted this in surveys as did faculty. It is important to offer this course every year so that each student begins with a solid foundation in the field

Update: The director worked with the Chairs of the Social Sciences division and the Humanities and Teacher Education division to develop a schedule where AMST 610 could be offered each year. Beginning in Fall 2015, first year students will take AMST 610, second year students will take POSC 518 and students completing their degree will take AMST 620 the capstone course. We are excited to be able to make this work and expect that our students will be better prepared to be successful in the program.

2014 Action Item: Put greater emphasis on the quality of writing. Intro class will address the importance of advancing writing skills to the graduate level. But each course will address writing, particularly the development of a strong thesis statement and the use of primary sources. This will be implemented beginning Fall 2014.

Update: The director taught the Intro course Fall 2014 and 2015. She increased the amount of instruction about writing and the amount of peer and instructor feedback. More discussions were included on the necessity for students to increase their writing ability in order to be at the graduate level. The students engaged in multiple writing assignments with scaffolding projects to provide feedback at various stages of the writing process. The professor emphasized the development of a strong original thesis statement, use of appropriate secondary sources, and strong argument support.

2014 Action Item: Encourage students to attend and present at conferences. This can be an effective way to improve the quality of writing. Students attending conferences will see the level of scholarship of their peers.
Students submitting papers will be motivated to write at a higher level in order to be accepted. We will gather and distribute information on relevant conferences, location, dates, and fees. There is funding available through the Graduate Programs office to assist with the cost of attendance. These will be distributed to students together.

*Update*: The American Studies Association was in Los Angeles in Fall 2014. All students were encouraged to attend. Students in the intro course were required to attend at least one session. All the intro students did attend and shared in class about the presentation(s) they attended. This generated a fruitful discussion on the breadth of the discipline as well as the nature of an academic conference.

The list of relevant conferences has been compiled and distributed each semester. We haven’t seen an increase in students submitting for conferences. This is most likely because all the students are employed.
2014 Action Item: The director will explore the possibility of graduate students presenting at Seaver College undergraduate research banquet. Similar to the previous action item, the intention is that writing for an event beyond the classroom and the grade will lead to improved scholarship.

Update: We decided that the undergraduate event has gotten so large that it wasn’t a good venue for the graduate students. The Graduate Programs Committee is working to put together a graduate research event where students can present for their peers.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC & WRITING RUBRIC

Adapted for American Studies Graduate Program, Seaver College

Definition: Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work that is not at graduate level, in that it does not meet benchmark-level performance (cell one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper #__________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of analysis and justification for its use in supporting the thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Introducing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student’s informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
<td>Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Argument</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>The organization and logic of the paper enhances the effectiveness of the argument.</td>
<td>The paper is well organized with only one or two minor problems.</td>
<td>There are flaws in organization that are distracting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources</strong></td>
<td>Sources are appropriate in type, breadth, and depth. Includes primary and secondary sources. High-quality research is demonstrated through the sources.</td>
<td>The majority of sources are appropriate.</td>
<td>Several problems with sources. They are inappropriate in type and/or do not represent breadth of research required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Tone</strong></td>
<td>The paper is written in a polished academic tone.</td>
<td>Tone is maintained throughout with only one or two minor problems.</td>
<td>The tone of the paper borders on non-academic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jargon &amp; Technical terms</strong></td>
<td>The vocabulary of the paper demonstrates a keen understanding of the discourse.</td>
<td>The vocabulary of the paper falters in only one or two places.</td>
<td>The vocabulary of the paper does not capture the complexity of the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar &amp; Punctuation</strong></td>
<td>Grammar and punctuation are flawless.</td>
<td>There are minor errors that are minimally distracting.</td>
<td>The number of errors detracts from the argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style Convention (MLA, Chicago, etc)</strong></td>
<td>Conventions are followed consistently throughout.</td>
<td>There are minor errors in the application of style conventions.</td>
<td>Conventions are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment: PLO #3

Demonstrate competence in information literacy in an interdisciplinary context and complete graduate-level research


Information Literacy is also a core competency.

Assessment Outline: We collected research papers from four different courses from the 2014-15 academic year. Eight students (approximately 60% of registered students) were chosen representing a balance of males and females and number of units completed in the program. Assignments from the intro course, middle courses, and the capstone course were included. Student names were removed. The assignments included a research paper, annotated bibliography, and a lesson plan. Readers received the student’s assignment, works cited, and the assignment description. The faculty met and participated in a norming session. The AAC&U rubric on information literacy was modified slightly and applied to each assignment (Appendix A). Each paper was reviewed by three readers, the rubric applied, and the score averaged. We analyzed the data looking at each category as well as the overall score. We expected that 60% of students would score 3 or above and that no one would score a 2 or below.

Direct Evidence: The AAC&U rubric suggests evaluating a collection of work rather than a specific work sample. To comply with this, we selected six students at various stages in the program and performing at various levels. We provided the reviewers with two samples of each students work. In choosing the samples we strove for a variety of assignment type. Reviewers were given the assignment description and the assignment. The AAC&U rubric was slightly modified to more closely align with the PLO and the nature of the assessment activity. The reviewers applied the rubric. The numerical findings are represented below in charts with explanations. We were not able to do benchmarking as this is our first year to assess information literacy.

Findings: Because of the small sample size the rubric results are represented below as a mode score rather than an average. This more accurately represents the students’ performance. The score most often occurring is highlighted in blue.
Rubric Results: Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>1 (benchmark)</th>
<th>2 (milestone)</th>
<th>3 (milestone)</th>
<th>4 (capstone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Determine the extent of information needed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: Evaluate information and its sources critically</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4: Access and use information ethically and legally</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our expectation was that 60% of students would score 3 and above. However, students did not quite meet our expectations instead of 60% at 3 or above, 50% score 3 or above. They did meet the expectation of no one scoring 2.0 or below. The mode offers a more representative picture than the average. One can see that most students are scoring a 3 or higher on all of the categories except in the second category in which more students were scored at a 2. This chart indicates that most students are performing in all categories at the level of 3 or 4. There are still a few students who are struggling in some categories.

Indirect Evidence: We conducted a student survey to discover students’ perceptions regarding their information literacy proficiency (Appendix A PLO3). We sent the survey to the fourteen currently enrolled students. Ten responded. The survey results were shared with the faculty.

Findings: 80% of the respondents were confident or very confident in their research skills. 55% of respondents reported using at least three databases when conducting research. 55% of respondents reported using books as sources in addition to electronic sources. 40% of respondents felt the library orientation offered during Graduate New Student Orientation was sufficient. The other 60% thought that the timing of the library orientation should be right before the first research assignment.

The faculty was pleased with the number of databases most students consult though there is room for improvement in their research skills, such as consulting books more frequently, using the research librarian as a resource, and in general being more tenacious and broad in their search for sources.

It is notable that students confidence in their skills was higher than what the faculty actually rated their skills. When we assess this PLO next time, it would be a good idea to also have students apply the rubric to one of their own papers. This would allow us to see if they perceive that they completed the research with some deficiencies or if their application of the rubric is more lenient than that of the faculty. This would help us
understand if their confidence is high and they perceive their skills to be at the same level or if they recognize their need to improve in this area.

**Authentic Evidence:** The primary student population is K–12 teachers. Students were asked to describe a lesson plan that was founded on research generated through their work in the American Studies program.

**Findings:** Four students responded to this question with comments. All are listed below. Three out of the four respondents discuss a significant impact of research within the program on their teaching. One student’s lesson plan won an award and she was invited to present at a national conference.

- I created a webquest on migrant workers in the 1930 that I use as an introduction to Of Mice and Men by John Steinbeck. This lesson plan was created as a final project for Dr. Loughlin’s 2014 summer history course. I found this assignment which introduced students to both primary and secondary online sources and taught them to evaluate online sources and how to create an annotated bibliography while learning about the Dust Bowl migration and its impact on CA residents to be a highly effective and well received lesson plan among my students. I also received an award from the Western History Association and was invited to present at their 2012 national conference for a research project/lesson plan that I completed as my final project for Dr. Laughlins summer history course in 2012.

- Utilizing the various texts of Zora Neale Hurston to supplement my teaching of Their Eyes Were Watching God where students had to analyze Janie's life through the stages in Hurston's life

- I created a lesson plan where students looked at instances of rioting/rebellion in American history and assessed how media sources covered the act of rebellion

- Not so much lesson plans as tidbits of information

**Closing the Loop**

**2015 Action Item:** Use the intro course to increase information literacy skills

1) The intro course will add an optional second library orientation at the time of the first research assignment. The professor will work with the librarian so that the session will be specific to the assignment and will express the breadth and depth expected at the graduate level. This action will address the students’ idea that having a library orientation closer to the first assignment would be useful. This will be implemented in Fall 2015.

   **Update:** It was difficult to manage the logistics of planning an optional library orientation at a time both librarians and students were available. Instead the professor offered additional instruction in class about research and implemented peer review at the research stage.

2) The professor will also encourage students to evaluate their own information literacy after the assignment is complete. When students turn in their assignment it will be accompanied by their completion of the rubric used in this assessment. The professor can then comment back to them if needed. This is designed to address the disparity between students’ confidence in their research skills and their actual skills. This will be implemented in Fall 2015.

   **Update:** After students had completed their final research assignment they were asked to complete the AAC & U Information Literacy Value Rubric to assess their self-perception as it relates to information literacy. Again the students have a greater sense of confidence in their skills.
# Information Literacy Self-Assessment Intro Class

**Fall 2015**

*Number of students who indicated each performance area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Area</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Milestones 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine the Extent of Information needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Use Ethically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1 When you are assigned a research project, how confident do you feel about the research aspect?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Confident</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Confident</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Confident</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Confident at all</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 What aspects about research contribute to your lack of confidence?

Answered: 2  Skipped: 8
American Studies: Information Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliarity with search...</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty locating...</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear about what sources would be useful</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no responses.

Q3 What are your first steps when beginning a research project?

Answered: 9  Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Writing a draft of the proposal to narrow the research then follow with finding a foundational academic article to use for content and bibliography</td>
<td>7/5/2015 7:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Search the library for papers or books with key words</td>
<td>6/30/2015 6:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I usually use databases that are applicable to the subject of the research project to see what has been published on the topic.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 5:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Choose a topic. I don’t formulate a thesis until research is well under way.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 9:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Writing an outline</td>
<td>6/30/2015 9:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Deciding on the topic I want to research and the types of materials I want to use, i.e. books, online database, etc.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 8:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Formulating a working thesis/research question. Engaging in online database searches (JSTOR then ProjectMuse)</td>
<td>6/30/2015 7:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Research questions, looking at other articles bibliographies</td>
<td>6/25/2015 6:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Using the library’s website to search for sources.</td>
<td>6/25/2015 5:09 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q4 What are some typical roadblocks or challenges you encounter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Time constraints</td>
<td>7/25/2015 7:55 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inappropriate search results</td>
<td>8/30/2015 8:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am not familiar with all of the databases that I could be using to find sources</td>
<td>8/30/2015 3:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Because I graduated from college in 1987, I am unfamiliar with the Pepperdine library and how to use the online databases and library.</td>
<td>8/30/2015 9:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not enough material online</td>
<td>8/30/2015 9:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family time, especially during the school year and reading time. Researching online is also very time consuming and choosing the right materials to use in producing the final product is also tedious at times.</td>
<td>8/30/2015 8:41 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1. Research questions that have not already been exhausted. 2. Books not available in electronic format.</td>
<td>8/30/2015 7:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sometimes the article isn’t in the database. Sometimes my topic is quite narrow and there’s not a lot of research</td>
<td>8/29/2015 6:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Limited availability of desired sources</td>
<td>8/29/2015 5:09 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q5 What strategies do you use to overcome these challenges

- Consult the professor - 33.33% (3 responses)
- Consult a librarian - 11.11% (1 response)
Q6 What databases do you use most often?

Answered: 9  Skipped: 1

- MLA: 22.22% 2
- JSTOR: 88.89% 6
- ProQuest: 0.00% 0
- Academic Search Complete: 11.11% 1
- Project Muse: 55.56% 5

Total Respondents: 9

Q7 How many databases do you typically consult?

Answered: 9  Skipped: 1
American Studies: Information Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no responses.

Q8 How often do you use books as a source?

Answered: 9  Skipped: 1
Q9 What do you believe is your weakness when researching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My research usually takes me down a rabbit hole of more and more research until I'm lost on my objective</td>
<td>7/5/2015 7:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Search terms</td>
<td>6/30/2015 6:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accessing a variety of different media sources.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 5:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accessing all available materials</td>
<td>6/30/2015 9:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Desire for completion</td>
<td>6/30/2015 9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I have a difficult time utilizing the right databases in order to find the materials I am looking for faster. The gathering of information relevant to the research is sometimes a problem for me.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 8:49 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Precedence</td>
<td>6/30/2015 7:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Search terms</td>
<td>6/29/2015 6:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time to look through all available sources.</td>
<td>6/29/2015 5:16 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 What do you believe is your strength?

Answered: 9  Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creative research prompts</td>
<td>7/5/2015 7:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>6/30/2015 6:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Using a variety of search terms to find relevant information.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 3:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>6/30/2015 9:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Desire for completion</td>
<td>6/30/2015 9:36 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can incorporate the information I get from peer reviewed articles and books and incorporate it into my final research product.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 8:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Finding multiple viewpoints</td>
<td>6/30/2015 7:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I read quickly</td>
<td>6/28/2015 6:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Finding good sources</td>
<td>6/28/2015 5:16 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 How valuable do you believe your own research has been in your learning so far in the American Studies program?

Answered: 9  Skipped: 1

![Bar chart showing responses](image)

Answer Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Valuable</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Valuable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Valuable At All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q12 Are you a teacher?
Answered: 8  Skipped: 2

Answer Choices

Yes
87.50%

No
12.50%

Total
8

Q13 Briefly describe a lesson plan that was founded on research generated from the American Studies program.
Answered: 7  Skipped: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Utilizing the various tools of Zora Neale Hurston to supplement my teaching of Their Eyes Were Watching God where students had to analyze Janie’s life through the stages in Hurston’s life.</td>
<td>7/5/2015 7:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I created a lesson plan where students looked at instances of dissent/rebellion in American history and assessed how media sources covered the act of rebellion.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 3:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I created a webquest on migrant workers in the 1930s that I use as an introduction to Of Mice and Men by John Steinbeck. This lesson plan was created as a final project for Dr. Laughtins 2014 summer history course. I found this assignment which introduced students to both primary and secondary online sources and taught them to evaluate online sources and how to create an annotated bibliography while learning about the Dust Bowl migration and its impact on CA residents to be a highly effective and well received lesson plan among my students. I also received an award from the Western History Association and was invited to present at their 2012 national conference for a research project/lesson plan that I completed as my final project for Dr. Laughtins summer history course in 2012.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 10:03 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not so much lesson plans as tidbits of information</td>
<td>6/30/2015 9:31 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## American Studies: Information Literacy

### Q14 Do you believe it positively impacted your students learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7/5/2015 7:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/30/2015 3:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/30/2015 10:03 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/30/2015 9:31 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes it has, I have learned a great deal of information that I will definitely utilize in my teaching methods and in creating lesson plans.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 6:50 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I haven't taught it yet</td>
<td>6/29/2015 6:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/28/2015 5:16 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q15 How did your research impact the lesson plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It provided insight and access to additional materials I would have not used previously</td>
<td>7/5/2015 7:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My research gave me a better understanding of the history of the various acts of rebellion. Additionally, the media sources that I decided to use for the lesson came from my research.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 0:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Both projects were based on the use of primary sources. These helped me to realize the importance of teaching the students the difference between primary and secondary sources and the need to validate online sources.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 10:03 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Added to lecture</td>
<td>6/30/2015 6:31 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My research is beginning to impact my lesson planning because I am developing different perspectives on most themes in American history. I am also better informed to provide my students in less biased discussions about issues related to the course of study.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 6:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It helped me with definitions and student readings</td>
<td>6/25/2015 6:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>That's usually too in depth for my kids.</td>
<td>6/28/2015 5:16 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q16 Are there ways that the research generated from the American Studies program has impacted your work? Or other aspects of your life?

| Answered: 1  | Skipped: 9 |
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Q17 Did you attend the library orientation during New Student Orientation?

Answered: 8  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18 Do you feel that orientation was sufficient?

Answered: 8  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perhapse more time could be spent with the libran during the intro to AS course as a way to help students understand the libran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I was not aware of a library orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No, it library operation should be done when student is required to do a project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In my humble opinion, not as much as I would have liked it to be. It would be more efficient if students were to be taken to the libran with an assigned research prompt and have someone show them how to research and efficiently utilize the resources the libran has to offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q19 How might the program improve your information literacy skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expedite and guide future research</td>
<td>7/5/2015 7:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>More aware of how much effort and imagination is required.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 7:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increased exposure</td>
<td>6/30/2015 9:33 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I understand this is a graduate program, but perhaps providing outside</td>
<td>6/30/2015 8:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tutoring to get students started and to help them learn the information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>literacy skills would be helpful. This in turn, will help future students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be more successful and ready to face the academic challenges this program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provides.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It does a good job. I don't see anything lacking. Lots of practice.</td>
<td>6/25/2015 6:37 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20 How many courses have you completed in this program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q21 Is there anything else you would like to add?

Answered: 3  Skipped: 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The course is excellent for motivated self-learning.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 7:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It would be nice to double up in the May-June Summer session as opposed to going 5 days a week in July for a month</td>
<td>6/30/2015 9:33 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I think this is a great program and it definitely helps those of us (or at least me) in the teaching profession to reflect on what we are teaching and to better inform and engage our students based on what has been learned in the program.</td>
<td>6/30/2015 6:58 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment: PLO #4

Demonstrate the ability to integrate various discipline-specific methodologies in the context of American cultural themes through the successful completion of a capstone readings course and a comprehensive exam.

Note: Original data from Fall 2012 Comprehensive exams. Completed in Summer 2013. Comprehensive

Exam Structure:
One month prior to the exam, the director gave students the exam instructions and a total of six questions, (two sections of three questions each). On the day of the exam the director deleted one question in each section. The goal is that students would prepare for two questions in each section (total of 4 prepared answers). Then on the day of the exam they would answer one in each section.

Assessment Outline: We assessed PLO #4 through the collection and analysis of the comprehensive exams for the Fall 2012 graduating class. A committee of four readers composed of the program director, two faculty members who have taught the capstone class, and a student utilized a rubric to conduct the analysis. In subsequent years, we have not included a student in this process. We felt it gave that student an unfair advantage when they took the comprehensive exam. We have invited alum of the program to participate in assessment, but haven’t had any who were able to participate.

Each candidate wrote two essays that were assessed against five criteria based on the program learning outcomes. The following three-point scale was used:

3 superior graduate-level work
2 acceptable graduate-level work
1 below graduate-level work

The overall average was a 2.36 with essay scores ranging from 2 to 2.75. No essay was assessed as below graduate-level work. In the absence of a national standard to which we could compare our findings, we will use this information in future assessments as a comparative benchmark.

Direct Evidence: PLO # 4 was assessed through the analysis of the comprehensive exams of the graduating class of Fall 2012. We expected that the students would be able to demonstrate at a minimum acceptable graduate-level work in both their essays, which they did.

Findings: Students exceeded the expectation that they would be able to demonstrate acceptable graduate-level work in both comprehensive exam essays. However, some weaknesses were noted. The reviewers’ comments proved to be more useful in identifying these weaknesses that did the numerical scores. Students need to incorporate their learning from the capstone class more fully into their essays. The capstone course is a readings course designed to expose students to a wide variety of American studies seminal works both primary and secondary sources as well as works from the primary disciplines upon which American studies is based. This learning should be reflected more prominently in the essays. Students should demonstrate their understanding of the
American Studies

academic discourse(s) by integrating a wide variety of sources to support the argument of each essay. Students also tended to heavily favor one discipline’s methodology (either History or Literature) in their essays as opposed to integrating the various methodologies learned throughout the program and thus demonstrating their adeptness at the interdisciplinary nature of the American studies field.

Indirect Evidence: A post-degree survey was sent to the graduating students to assess their perceptions of their learning during the program. See appendix A for a copy of the survey.

Findings: Of the three graduating students, two completed the survey. While this is not a large enough data set to provide comprehensive data, it can provide some insights.

Some positive insights include:

1. Students who were K-12 teachers felt that the program was an asset to them in their own teaching.
2. Students felt confident in their learning of graduate-level critical thinking skills.
3. Students were confident in their understanding of American studies as a discipline.

Some areas for improvement noted include:

1. Students did not feel as confident in the methodologies of the disciplines represented in the program or in their ability to create a cohesive interdisciplinary argument. However, they did feel that they understood the methodology of American studies as a discipline.
2. Students did not feel that they have a good understanding of the major movements of American culture as described by the various core disciplines.
3. Students did not feel as confident with their information literacy skills and their ability to write graduate-level research papers (PLO #3).
4. One student did not feel that the academic rigor met their expectations of a graduate program.

Closing the Loop

2013 Action Item: To determine if students are progressing in their abilities to integrate an interdisciplinary approach in their writing, we are going to conduct a longitudinal study of research papers. We are currently collecting all student papers from the 2013 admit class. This will allow us to track the learning of one particular admit class of students over the course of their degree.

Update: This study is in progress. Papers are being collected and will be assessed in the summer of 2016.

2013 Action Item: To encourage greater integration of secondary sources in the comprehensive exams, we first analyzed the capstone course syllabus. It clearly demonstrates that this course provides students with a well-rounded survey of the field’s discourse, suggesting that student should be prepared to succeed in PLO #4. Next we reviewed the essay prompt, which states, “please refer to several of the sources, ideas, and discussions you have studied during your graduate program.” The exam prompt is going to be strengthened to more clearly state the expectation of
using secondary sources to support the argument, to show mastery of the sources, and to
demonstrate the ability to develop an interdisciplinary argument in the American Studies
methodology.

Additionally, as the comprehensive exam is discussed in the capstone course these expectations will
be underscored. Appendix B includes the exam prompts & questions from 2012, 2013, 14, and 15.

**Update: 2013 Assessment of PLO #4.** We implemented the changes above strengthening
both the prompt for the comprehensive and the grading rubric. The question structure remained the
same. In 2012 the prompt was: “In answering one of the following questions from each of the two
sections, please refer to several of the sources, ideas, and discussions you have studied during your
graduate program.”

In 2013 it was changed to: “The comprehensive exam is the place to display your learning
throughout the program. In preparation, you should review all notes and texts from previous
classes. Your essays should be argument driven centered around a thesis statement. Essays should
demonstrate your mastery of the program learning outcomes listed below. It is expected that you
will support your arguments with a breadth of primary and secondary sources drawn from the
coursework including, but not limited to, the capstone course.”

**Update: 2014 Assessment of PLO #4.** In 2014, we unfortunately saw a decline in the
quality of the responses. After looking into the matter we found two primary causes: 1) For years
students were allowed to bring in one page of skeletal handwritten notes. This year in response to
students request, we allowed them to generate these notes on a computer. As always they were
required to submit their notes at the end of the comprehensive exam time. Upon examination, many
students had completely written out their essay and printed it in a small font size. 2) It was clear that
students had not just studied together, but that they had worked together to create what they deemed
“best answers” to the essay prompts. Every student but one used the same texts for their essays.

The committee discussed the decline in quality and the reasons for it. In general we felt that the
comprehensive exam as it was structured did not allow students to demonstrate the breadth of their
learning over the program. We decided to completely remodel the comprehensive exam structure.

**Update: 2015 Assessment of PLO #4.** We benchmarked comprehensive exam structures
from various American Studies master’s programs across the country. We met and discussed
options and concluded to change the structure. See Appendix B for exam prompt and questions.
Students were not allowed any notes. They were specifically instructed that they could not work
together on their answers. They were given the instructions and the questions one month before the
exam. No questions were deleted.

Students were required to analyze and synthesize five to eight primary texts as evidence to support
their answer. These texts were to be drawn from a variety of categories (example: novel, short
story, historical event, religion, political science etc). These selections also had to represent at least
three of the five time periods. The questions themselves were much broader that the earlier
versions of the exam.
The exams were much stronger. We discussed the quality and felt that the new prompt did as we had hoped which was to allow the students a venue to display their learning over the duration of the program.

The rubric scores for each student are represented in Appendix C. In reviewing this longitudinal view of the rubric scoring it is notable that the scores do not dramatically increase. As this is a pass/fail comprehensive exam and because the rubric is based on a score of 1-3, large numerical changes aren’t to be expected. However, one can see that there have been increases in an argument driven essay with a compelling central organizing thesis, using appropriate primary and secondary as supporting evidence, and the demonstration of a comprehensive knowledge expected upon completion of the degree. Additionally the overall average score increased from a 2.0 in 2013 to a 2.2 in 2014 and a 2.4 in 2015.
American Studies Post-degree Survey

Thank you for taking a few moments to reflect on your experience in the American Studies master's degree program. We appreciate your thoughtful feedback as we continually strive to make the program better.

General Information

1. Please list your gender.
   ○ Male
   ○ Female

2. Please list your ethnicity
   ○ Nonresident Alien
   ○ Hispanic
   ○ American Indian or Alaska Native
   ○ Asian*
   ○ Black or African American
   ○ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   ○ Caucasian
   ○ Two or more race**
   ○ Undeclared

3. What was your undergraduate major?

4. While in the program were you employed as a K-12 teacher?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

5. What grade and subject do you teach?
American Studies Post-degree Survey

6. The program was an asset to me as a teacher.
- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

7. Can you give an example of how the program benefitted you as a teacher?

PLO #1

8. I completed the program feeling competent in advanced level critical thinking in the context of American culture(s).
- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

9. The program provided me with a good understanding of the research methodologies of the following disciplines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The program provided me with a good understanding of how American studies scholars integrate various discipline-specific methodologies in their research.
- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
### American Studies Post-degree Survey

#### PLO #2

11. The program provided me with a good understanding of the major movements in American culture as they relate to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PLO #3

12. When more research information is needed, I am comfortable finding research materials in the disciplines covered in the program.

- [ ] Strong agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

13. The program prepared me to conduct graduate-level research and to write research papers.

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

#### PLO #4
American Studies Post-degree Survey

14. I completed the program feeling prepared to integrate various discipline-specific methodologies to create a cohesive interdisciplinary argument about American culture.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

15. The program met my expectations as to the appropriate academic rigor for a graduate program.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Overview

16. Are you considering continuing your education through a Ph.D. or other graduate degree?


17. Is this program helping you achieve career goals? What are they?


18. What do you consider to be the best part of the program?


19. What suggestions for improvement do you have?


**American Studies Post-degree Survey**

20. Would you recommend the program to a friend?

---
American Studies Comprehensive Examination Fall 2013

AMST 620

Instructions: This is the first version of the questions that you will receive. On the day of the exam, you will receive the final version, which will only have two questions under each section. You will answer one question from each section for your comprehensive exam. You will compose your essays on the computer. You have four hours for this examination. You may have one-sided one-page skeletal, handwritten outline for each question. Submit these notes with your exam. No other books, notes, or Internet sources are allowed.

The comprehensive exam is the place to display your learning throughout the program. In preparation, you should review all notes and texts from previous classes. Your essays should be argument driven centered around a thesis statement. Essays should demonstrate your mastery of the program learning outcomes listed below. It is expected that you will support your arguments with a breadth of primary and secondary sources drawn from the coursework including, but not limited to, the capstone course.

American Studies Program Learning Outcomes

Graduates with an MA in American Studies will be able to

• demonstrate advanced critical thinking in the context of the American experiences while deploying the methodologies of the disciplines represented in American Studies

• identify major social, political, and religious movements in American culture

• demonstrate competence in information literacy in an interdisciplinary context and complete graduate-level research

• demonstrate the ability to integrate various discipline-specific methodologies in the context of American cultural themes.

PART 1. Two of the following three questions will appear on the comprehensive exam; you may then select one of the two questions.

1. LAND/ENVIRONMENT/CLIMATE: At John F. Kennedy’s presidential inauguration in 1961, the poet Robert Frost read “The Gift Outright,” which begins “The land was ours before we were the land’s/She was our land more than a hundred years/Before we were her people. She was ours/In Massachusetts, in Virginia.” Assuming that it is virtually impossible to consider America – in history or in culture – apart from its geography, use Frederick Jackson Turner’s “Significance of the Frontier in American History” (1890) and at least one other post-1890 work to discuss land/environment/climate as a shaper and reflector of American consciousness, achievement, and controversy. Turner concluded that “to the frontier the American intellect owed its striking characteristics” but also noted a crucial divide in that “the frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American history.” What were these frontier characteristics and how did Turner argue that they emerged from frontier conditions? Consider especially Turner’s claim that with the closing of the frontier came the end of the “first period” of American history.
2. **AMERICAN IMAGINATION**: The Civil War was a seminal event in American history. The writings of many U.S. literary authors were highly influenced by this crisis while others all but ignored it in their writing. Choose three authors and discuss the impact of the Civil War, or the issues leading up to the war, on one of their works (novels, short stories, dramas, or poetry). Build an argument for each author’s portrayal of the war, or issues related to the war, as embodied in that text. Contextualize the text you chose within the rest of the author’s work. Is it representative or divergent? Use specific examples from the text to support your thesis. You do not need to confine your choices to authors living during the war as long as you can successfully argue that the Civil War or the issues leading up to the war influenced the work. Choose at least one author of color and one female author.

3. **RELIGION/MORAL TRADITIONS.** Discuss the history and continued vitality of American moral thought and practice with respect to one significant figure from each of the past three centuries (see list below). In each case, describe the thinker’s original contribution as well as how his/her influence continues to be felt in contemporary American moral discourse by focusing on a particular problem/issue. 17TH & 18TH century: Anne Bradstreet, John Winthrop, John Witherspoon
   
   19th century: Tecumseh, Alexander Campbell, Sojourner Truth, Noah Porter
   
   20th century: John Muir, Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X, Cesar Chavez

**PART 2** Two of the following three questions will appear on the comprehensive exam; you may then select one of the two questions.

4. **AMERICAN STUDIES**: It could be argued that American Studies has long struggled with an identity crisis and even a crisis over the subject of the discipline itself. In 1974 Stanley Bailis addresses this identity struggle: “[American Studies] has thus emerged not as a discipline, but as an arena for disciplinary encounter and staging ground for fresh topical pursuits. It embraces America in a Whitmanish hug, excluding nothing and always beginning.” Provide an overview of the evolution of the discipline of American Studies by discussing the major chronological categories of the field: myth and symbol, emergence of ethnic studies, rise of postmodern theory, and the transnational turn. Your essay should include the following for each stage of development: 1) define each stage, 2) discuss the values that stage promoted, 3) examine the criticism that ultimately led to the next stage, and 4) discuss a prominent scholar, and his or her contribution to the field, that epitomizes the stage.

5. **GENDER**: In The Feminine Mystique, Betty Friedan states, “It seemed to me that men weren’t really the enemy—they were fellow victims, suffering from an outmoded masculine mystique that made them feel unnecessarily inadequate when
there were no bears to kill.” Gender is a complex system, culturally constructed, and ever shifting. Choose one of the following theorists Judith Butler, Laura Mulvey, or Michael Kimmel and briefly summarize their contribution to gender studies. Then use their lens to analyze either three literary texts (one from the 18th, 19th, and 20th century) or three historical events (one from the 18th, 19th, and 20th century).

6. SOCIAL HISTORY. Provide a working definition of social history and discuss the critical methodology of the field. Using this as a foundation, choose two of the following groups and argue for how examining their history alters the traditional narrative of American history. Reference primary and secondary sources as evidence.

Groups: women’s history in the revolutionary period, labor history, immigration in the progressive era, whiteness in the gilded age, blackness (male or female) during the Civil Rights movement

Appendix B: 3 Comprehensive Exam Prompt and Questions 2014

American Studies Comprehensive Examination Fall 2014
AMST 620

Instructions: This is the first version of the questions that you will receive. On the day of the exam, you will receive the final version, which will only have two questions under each section. You will select and answer one question from each section for your comprehensive exam. You will compose your essays on the computer. You have four hours for this examination. You may have a total of two pages of notes (either one page with text on two sides or two pages with text on one side each). The notes may either be handwritten or typed. Submit these notes with your exam. No other books, notes, or Internet sources are allowed.

The comprehensive exam is the place to display your learning throughout the program. In preparation, you should review all notes and texts from previous classes. Your essays should be argument driven and be centered on a thesis statement that makes a strong claim. Essays should demonstrate your mastery of the program learning outcomes listed below. You may analyze an author, a literary text, historical event, or historical figure only one time in your essays. It is important that you support your arguments with a breadth of primary and secondary sources drawn from the coursework including, but not limited to, the capstone course.

American Studies Program Learning Outcomes Graduates with an MA in American Studies will be able to

• demonstrate advanced critical thinking in the context of the American experiences while deploying the methodologies of the disciplines represented in American Studies
• identify major social, political, and religious movements in American culture
• demonstrate competence in information literacy in an interdisciplinary context and complete graduate-level research
• demonstrate the ability to integrate various discipline-specific methodologies in the context of American cultural themes.

PART 1. Two of the following three questions will appear on the comprehensive exam; you may then select one of the two questions.
1. LAND/ENVIRONMENT/CLIMATE:
At John F. Kennedy’s presidential inauguration in 1961, the poet Robert Frost read “The Gift Outright,” which begins “The land was ours before we were the land’s/She was our land more than a hundred years/Before we were her people. She was ours/In Massachusetts, in Virginia.” Assuming that it is virtually impossible to consider America – in history or in culture – apart from its geography, use Frederick Jackson Turner’s “Significance of the Frontier in American History” (1890) and at least one other post-1890 work to discuss land/environment/climate as a shaper and reflector of American consciousness, achievement, and controversy. Turner concluded that “to the frontier the American intellect owed its striking characteristics” but also noted a crucial divide in that “the frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American history.” What were these frontier characteristics and how did Turner argue that they emerged from frontier conditions? Consider especially Turner’s claim that with the closing of the frontier came the end of the “first period” of American history.

2. AMERICAN IMAGINATION:
World War I was one of the most deadly conflicts in history. The writings of many U.S. literary authors were highly influenced by this crisis while others all but ignored it in their writing. Choose three authors and discuss the impact of WWI, or the issues leading up to the war, on one of their works (novels, short stories, dramas, or poetry). Build an argument for each author’s portrayal of the war, or issues related to the war, as embodied in that text. Contextualize the text you chose within the rest of the author’s work. Is it representative or divergent? Use specific examples from the texts and secondary sources to support your thesis. You do not need to confine your choices to authors living during the war as long as you can successfully argue that WWI or the issues leading up to the war influenced the work. Choose at least one author of color and one female author.

3. RELIGION/MORAL TRADITIONS:
America’s core moral beliefs tend to center around pragmatism, individualism, and capitalist endeavors while also promoting a sense of responsibility for ensuring the protection and spread of human rights and democratic values in the United States and throughout the globe. These beliefs have both religious and secular influences. Select one of the themes below and trace its origins, developments, and evolution from the Puritans through today, showing key contributing thinkers and movements from the 17th, 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries.
Themes: Chosenness, Millennialism, Capitalism, Equality, or Individualism

PART 2 Two of the following three questions will appear on the comprehensive exam; you may then select one of the two questions.

4. AMERICAN STUDIES:
It could be argued that American Studies has long struggled with an identity crisis and even a crisis over the subject of the discipline itself. In 1974 Stanley Bailis addresses this identity struggle: “[American Studies] has thus emerged not as a discipline, but as an arena for disciplinary encounter and staging ground for fresh topical pursuits. It embraces America in a Whitmanish hug, excluding nothing and always beginning.” Provide an overview of the evolution of the discipline of American Studies by discussing the major chronological categories of the field: myth and symbol, emergence of ethnic studies, rise of post-modern theory, and the transnational turn. Your essay should include the following for each stage of development: 1) define each stage, 2) discuss the values that stage promoted, 3) examine the criticism that ultimately led to the next stage, and 4) discuss a prominent scholar, and his or her contribution to the field, that epitomizes the stage.
5. GENDER:

In *The Feminine Mystique*, Betty Friedan states, “It seemed to me that men weren’t really the enemy—they were fellow victims, suffering from an outmoded masculine mystique that made them feel unnecessarily inadequate when there were no bears to kill.” Gender is a complex system, culturally constructed, and ever shifting. Choose one of the following theorists Judith Butler, Laura Mulvey, or Patricia Hill Collins and briefly summarize their contribution to gender studies. Then use their lens to analyze either three literary texts (one from the 18th, 19th, and 20th century) or three historical events (one from the 18th, 19th, and 20th century).

6. POLITICAL SCIENCE:

The ongoing American culture war frames ideology in terms of a heated Left versus Right split. What do you make of the culture war paradigm for understanding American politics today? Is it illuminating or distortive? Both? How so? Do you think the Left/Right split helps explain major cultural and political phenomena? Use specific thinkers, historical, and cultural examples to advance your views.

Appendix B: 4 Comprehensive Exam Prompt and Questions 2015

**Group A**

1. What is the American Dream?
2. Define what it means to be an American.

**Group B**

1. Is America a land of opportunity?
2. Explore individualism as an American value.

**Instructions**

The comprehensive exam is the place for you to display the learning you have achieved throughout the program and to demonstrate your mastery of the program learning outcomes listed below. Your answers should reflect your reading throughout the program including, but not limited to, the capstone course. Your answers must be your own work and not the consensus of a study group. No notes, books, or Internet sources are allowed in the examination room. You will compose your essays on a computer. You have four hours for this examination.

You will choose one question from group A and one from group B. Your answers should be argument driven and contain a strong thesis statement that makes a claim. They should demonstrate graduate-level critical thinking where the complexities of the text are acknowledged and dealt with rather than glossed over or ignored.

Each answer should analyze and synthesize five to eight primary texts as evidence to support your answer. As you analyze these texts you should include supporting evidence from secondary sources that also analyze that primary text. You will choose your texts from the categories below. Each text should be chosen from a different category, and each text can only be used in one answer. Your selections for each answer should represent three of the following five periods: Colonial (1600--1750), Revolutionary (1750--1800), 19th Century, 20th Century, and 21st Century.
AMERICAN STUDIES

American Studies Program Learning Outcomes: Graduates with an MA in American Studies will be able to

- demonstrate advanced critical thinking in the context of the American experiences while deploying the methodologies of the disciplines represented in American Studies
- identify major social, political, and religious movements in American culture
- demonstrate competence in information literacy in an interdisciplinary context and complete graduate-level research
- demonstrate the ability to integrate various discipline-specific methodologies in the context of American cultural themes.

Categories
 Novels
 Short stories
 Poetry
 Drama
 Film
 Historical Events
 Political Science
 Religion
 Visual Art
 Science and/or technology
 Postmodern theory
20. How does the program ensure that graduates meet the WASC FIVE CORE COMPETENCIES? Present your findings of measurements you have done of the core competencies (may be less than 5).

We have assessed two of the core competencies, Critical Thinking and Information Literacy. Data regarding these two competencies can be found in Question #19 assessments of PLO #1 and #3.
21. With the rapid changes in the higher education environment, the University needs to demonstrate how financial viability and planning of their long-term stability are ensured. In order to demonstrate this each program should address

a. questions about the level of student demand for the program and
b. the degree to which resources are allocated appropriately so they are sufficient to maintain program quality.
c. What is happening within the profession, local community, or society that identifies an anticipated need for this program in the future? (If appropriate include market research.)

Student demand for the program fluctuates somewhat each year. We have found it difficult to find effective marketing avenues to reach students who might be interested in this program. We have marketed to California universities who have an undergrad AMST program, but no graduate program. There was little success seen here. We also send marketing each year to area principals and chairs. This is somewhat effective. We also get a good number of applicants via word of mouth from program alum. As one can see from our applications to admits data attached, we have enough interest to maintain the program. However more interest would lead to the ability to be more selective and to assure sustainability.

The financial resources section details the programs financial foundation. In short, the program has sufficient funds to be viable. Our long-term outlook is healthy in part because our primary funding source is an endowment.

Interdisciplinary degrees are experiencing an increase in demand across the country. However enrollment in American Studies programs at all academic levels is not increasing. This is an interesting situation facing many programs in the U.S. How do we communicate the value of this degree to potential students. This same question could be asked by many liberal-arts-based programs. Given that our primary population is current teachers, we do have a smaller group to which we need to communicate this value. Most of our students teach in the liberal arts (literature, history, government, social studies, journalism). We need to continue to be vigilant in communicating the value of this degree.

### American Studies Application and Enrollment Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Admits</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. FACILITIES
Please describe the adequacy of
a. Classroom space
b. Laboratories
c. Office space
d. Programming venues
e. Student study spaces

Courses for this program are typically conducted in either the CAC or AC buildings. We have also held classes in the Great Books room in the library. The classroom space assigned to us each term is sufficient. Faculty offices are within their respective division. The program director is housed in the Seaver Dean's office because she also has responsibilities as Assistant Dean of Special Academic programs. Students have full access to all Pepperdine library space, study spaces, etc. Facilities are fully sufficient for a successful program.

23. What are the qualifications and achievements of the faculty/staff in the program in relation to the program purpose and goals? How do faculty/staff members' backgrounds, expertise, research, and other professional work contribute to the quality of the program?
Evidence in this category should include (this could be collected through faculty CVs):
a. Proportion of faculty with terminal degrees
b. List of faculty/staff specialties within discipline (and how those specialties align with the program curriculum)
c. Record of scholarship for each faculty member, professional presentations for staff members
d. Faculty/staff participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment
e. External funding awarded to faculty/staff

All faculty teaching in the program have terminal degrees except one recent adjunct who is ABD. The specialties of each faculty member contribute to the interdisciplinary nature of the program. We have three full professors, one associate professor, two assistant professors and 2 with staff appointments. The director has a staff appointment. In addition to directing the AMST program, she also has oversight responsibilities for the Seaver Graduate Programs office, the Career Center, Fellowship Advising, the Dean's Lecture Series, and other duties related to her role as assistant dean in the Seaver dean's office.
## Faculty with Full-Time Appointments at the University

### JASON BLAKELY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Ph.D.-UC Berkeley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Specialty</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Record of Scholarship:**


**Faculty/staff participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment**

20

### DANA DUDLEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Ph.D.- Claremont Graduate University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Specialty</td>
<td>American Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of Scholarship:</td>
<td>Scholarship &amp; Professional Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Record of Scholarship:**

- 2015 American Studies Association (ASA) Presentation: "Giving Voices to the Body as Community: Lucille Clifton's Poetry on the Female Body"
- 2014, 2013 Attended ASA • NAFA
- 2014-2015 NAFA (National Association of Fellowship Advisors) Planning Committee Member
- WASSA (Western Association of Summer Sessions Administrators) 2009-2010 President, 2008-2009 President-Elect
- 2009 Presenter: "This? or That? Discovering New Places in Solving Problems" 2008 Representative for Private Institutions, Membership Committee 2006-2008 Chairperson, Program Committee 2006-2010 Member Conference Planning Committee 2004 Roundtable presentation
- Pepperdine Dean’s Council Member
- Graduate Programs Council
- Seaver Academic Council Member
- Seaver Student Discipline Committee Member
- Attended Core Competency Workshop on Critical 2015 FYS Keck Fellowship workshop series Attended yearly College and University Faculty retreats 2015 ASA Program Directors Committee Member Written 3 annual assessment reports for AMST Plan yearly assessment activities with faculty and students
- High Impact Practice Committee member
### Tanya Hart

**Degree**
Ph.D., Yale University

**Academic Specialty**
History

**Record of Scholarship:**

- *Health in the City: Race, Poverty, and the Negotiation of Women's Health in New York City, 1915-1930.* New York University Press. Forthcoming, May 1, 2015. ([Amazon link](#)).


**Faculty/staff participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment**
- Attended New Faculty orientations
- Attended monthly new faculty meetings
- Member of women faculty mentoring pod
- Attended Teaching Professor Conference Atlanta May 2015
- Participated in AMST assessment Summer 2015

### Christina Littlefield

**Degree**
Ph.D., University of Cambridge

**Academic Specialty**
Journalism/Religion

**Record of Scholarship:**


**Faculty/staff participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment**

In 2012-2013:
- Attended numerous orientation events, including New Faculty Orientation, Provost's orientation, monthly orientation breakfasts, mentor meetings and the new faculty spiritual retreat in Buenos Aires.
- Attended the University Faculty Conference.
- Attended Center for Faith and Learning’s special showing of the Tartuffe play, October 2012.
- Attended the American Academy of Religion national and regional conferences, November 2012 in Chicago and March 2013 at Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Attended Quentin Schulze’s presentation on how to get published spring 2013.
- Attended the C.S. Lewis conference paid for by the Center of Faith and Learning, June 21-23, and then led a Lewis-reading group in fall 2013.

In 2013-2014:
- Attended the University Faculty Conference.
- Attended the American Academy of Religion national and regional conferences, in November 2013 in Baltimore and March 2014 at Loyola Marymount University.
- Attended the Glazer Institute’s discussion group on the musical Harmony, March 2014.
- Attended the Investigative Reporters and Editors Computer Assisted Reporting Workshop, April 12, 2014 at University of Southern California.
- Attending the Teaching Professor Conference in Boston, May 29-June 1, 2014, paid for by the dean's office.
- Attended the Harris Manchester Fellowship, June 29-July 6.
In 2014-2015:

- Attended the Association for Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication Conference in Montreal, Canada, Aug. 6-9, 2014.
- Attended the American Academy of Religion national conference in November 2014 in San Diego and I am scheduled to attend the regional conference in March at Santa Clara University.
- Spent December 2014 taking digital courses from Poynter’s News University in Excel, Access, Tableau, and investigative reporting to improve my own knowledge and develop my pedagogy for my Jour 590 class.

- Took Conejo Valley Adult Education class in HTML, CSS.
- Word Press through Lynda.
- Attended Poynter Institute’s Teachapalooza for journalism education and technology training, including an additional two-day intensive video shooting and editing class.

Assessment: In addition to the assessment for my own classes, I have helped with assessment for Journalism, Religion and American Studies.

- Spring 2013, helped assess the capstone class in the journalism major, Jour 561, for skills learned by applying a rubric to final stories, helped write final report.

- Spring 2014, helped code the spring semester of the Graphic to analyze how the student newspaper covered diversity, and reviewed the final assessment report.

- Spring 2015, lead assessment on writing skills in Jour 561; attended workshop on assessing writing in November 2014.

- Spring 2014, analyzed data collected from Dr. Dyron Daughtry’s church history course and wrote the assessment report.

- Spring 2014, Assisted Religion Division Chair Dr. Tim Willis and Dr. Danny Mathews on rewriting the general education learning outcome for religion.

- Spring 2015, helped Willis and Mathews map out GE assessment for Rel 301 and assessed critical thinking/writing in Rel 301 alongside Mathews; attended critical thinking workshop in November 2013.

- Helped assess American Studies research papers for critical thinking spring 2014 and teleconferenced into meeting to discuss results while researching in Oxford, England.
ED LARSON

Degree
Ph.D.-University of Wisconsin
History/Law

Academic Specialty

Record of Scholarship:

Faculty/staff participation in development opportunities related to teaching, learning, and/or assessment

GINA HERRING

Academic Specialty


"The Idealized Mississippian Reality or Fantastical Fable?" Literature/Us Quarterly, 1998.


Patricia Laughlin

Academic Specialty
Ph.D.-University of Kentucky
History

Record of Scholarship:


"First Oklahoma state report of its kind, the UCO research team included faculty and students in partnership with Oklahoma Caesia Project.


An official Oklahoma Centennial Commission project, Hidden Treasures of the American West: Muriel H. Wright, Angie Debo and Alice Muriel (Albuquerque University of New Mexico Press, 2005).

Director's Award and Finalist in Nonfiction, Oklahoma Center for the Book, 2008; Outstanding Book on Oklahoma History, Oklahoma Historical Society, 2008; Finalist, Great Plains Distinguished Book Prize, 2008.

Elsa Caldwell

Academic Specialty
M.A.-UC Santa Barbara
Art History

Record of Scholarship:

"Greetings from Bennington: The Thirteen Hours of 'Tis the Night: Christine Frenery's Serenade,' in Christine Frenery: Serenade, exhibition catalogue, 7 March - 11 July 2013, Mounda Mann, Culver City, California.

"Race-ing Art History: A Case Study in Developing an Online Portfolio to a First Year Seminar," Art History Teaching Resources: Peer-Produced Resources for Art History Teachers, July 2013.


24. FACULTY/STAFF Are there sufficient numbers of faculty/staff to maintain program quality? Do program faculty/staff have the support they need to do their work?
   a. Distribution of faculty across ranks (or staff years at institution)
   b. Diversity of faculty/staff
   c. Number of full-time faculty (ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty)
   d. Student-faculty ratio
   e. Faculty workload
   f. Faculty review and evaluation processes
   g. Mentoring processes
   h. Professional development opportunities and resources (including travel and research funds)
   i. Sufficient time for research, program development

The attached chart shows rank, gender, ethnicity and number of years at Pepperdine. None of the faculty are full time within the American Studies department. Thus their workload, mentoring, review, evaluation, professional development etc are managed through their home division. Our average class size is 11.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty with Full-Time Appointments at the University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Blakely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal degree:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Specialty:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at Institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year at Pepperdine:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Adjunct Faculty:                                   | Gina Herring                   | Patricia Loughlin              | Ellen Caldwell       |
| Terminal degree:                                   | Ph.D.-Auburn University        | Ph.D.-Oklahoma State University | M.A.- UC Santa Barbara |
| Academic Specialty:                                | English                        | History                        | Art History          |
| Ethnicity:                                         | White                          | White                          | White                |
| Gender:                                            | Female                         | Female                         | Female               |
| Years Teaching in Program:                         | 16 (1999)                      | 4 (2011)                       | 2                    |
| Rank:                                              | Professor                      | Professor                      | Staff/ Adjunct Professor |

25. Financial Resources: Please describe your operational budget (revenues and expenditures) and trends over a 3-5 year period.

The program has an endowment from the Keck foundation that dates back to 1982. It pays out approximately $180,000 per year. This is used for program expenses, salary, and a summer housing scholarship. The program also operates at a discounted tuition rate. The tuition rate for the 2015-16 year is $403 per unit.
This discounted tuition rate increases at the same percentage rate as Seaver tuition increases which is typically between 2-4%. Additionally, students who are currently full-time teachers receive a scholarship of $240 per unit. Thus the program is quite affordable for students.

The full-time faculty in this program, teach an AMST course as a part of their regular work load. Their salary is paid through their home division, not from the AMST budget. The two to three adjuncts who the summer are paid through the Summer School budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMST Program Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment Revenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Aid</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Housing Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Staff Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pepperdine University / Seaver College received an endowment from the KECK Foundation which provides discounted tuition for an American Studies M.A. Program for K-12 teachers (although students who have worked in non-University settings such as publishing have also enrolled the program); this program is inherently interdisciplinary and involves Political Science and Religion as well as English and History. The M.A. in American Studies at Pepperdine is a two and a half year program in which students take one four unit course a semester; two summer courses plus a highly effective theoretical introduction as well as a capstone course and comprehensive exam. The coverage in terms of carefully considered content is balanced as well as broad and designed to "to teach students to become cultural critics who use interdisciplinary perspectives to analyze the diverse cultures, groups, and experiences of American life.”

Currently, the American Studies Program Learning Outcomes have been described as follows:
1. Deploy the methodologies of the disciplines represented in American Studies.
2. Identify major social, political, and religious movements in American culture.
3. Demonstrate competence in information literacy in an interdisciplinary context and complete graduate-level research.
4. Demonstrate the ability to integrate various discipline-specific methodologies in the context of American cultural themes through the successful completion of a capstone readings course and a comprehensive exam.

In regard to Content and Critical Thinking in the American Studies Program, the following categories have been identified:
1. Employ higher order, multidisciplinary, historically informed critical thinking about American culture.
2. Diversity: Critique the cultural diversity of the American experience, especially in terms of class, ethnicity, religion, gender, and race.
3. Research & Writing skills: Produce persuasive, nuanced, fact-based interpretations reflecting a close critical reading and sustained analysis of relevant primary and secondary sources.
4. Theory and Methodology: Identify, assess, and integrate different disciplinary, methodological, interpretive, and theoretical approaches to the study of American culture.

During my conversations with the American Studies faculty who are invited to this in this
program, students in this program were described as “mature and responsible,” “intellectually engaged in the courses which benefit their own teaching in the high school classroom.” The American Studies faculty also note that many of these students are deeply "committed to professional development. ” Based on my observations during the campus visit, the faculty who teach in this program are deeply committed to the students in this M.A. program as well as the program itself. Eight to ten students are admitted to the program each year, and faculty members are pleased with the many outstanding students who are enrolled — many of these students teach Advanced Placement courses in high school.

The American Studies faculty noted that although the courses involve a wide range of multicultural materials, additional effort should be made to accommodate the need for more comprehensive coverage of Asian American material comparable to what has been done with Latino/Latina, Native American and African-American courses. In addition, faculty think it would be a good idea to advertise this M.A. program more widely in the public schools as well as to non-teachers.

When I asked the American Studies students how more effective advertising / P.R. might be done, they suggested advertising the Pepperdine M.A. program on social media such as Pinterest; announcements through professional associations like the California Teachers Association, as well as postcards to faculty in a wider range of high schools. Students also suggested guest lectures by Pepperdine American Studies faculty in the high schools in the region to publicize the program; in addition, perhaps Pepperdine could host some professional development seminars with publicity of the American Studies MA program and a more diverse enrollment in mind.

In my meeting with the students who are currently enrolled in the program, I was positively impressed with their professional demeanor; they responded to my questions with an admirably constructive and problem-solving approach. In general, these students are generally very happy with the program, and their suggestions are intended to improve what they think is already a well-organized and effective program. The challenges the students in this program face have to do with managing to combine demanding full time jobs and requirements of the American Studies MA program at Pepperdine. Outlined below are some of the student concerns and suggestions:
1) Seminars are very long and this means a late night drive home after class followed by an early morning schedule for work the next day. Might it be possible to have shorter class time? In some universities, a 4 unit seminar is scheduled for 2 hours and 50 minutes which includes a 20 minute break. Might it be possible to schedule the current seminar for a shorter amount of time? Or perhaps start a bit earlier — at 5:30pm instead of 7pm? Maybe offer some on-line classes for some sessions of a given seminar?
2) Students could begin the M.A. program in American Studies in July instead of September of a given year. Students are especially pleased with the Introduction to American Studies seminar; in addition to this seminar, they would like additional course options/choices, especially in the summer. In addition, students would like a wider range of “elective” courses in the fall and spring semesters. For example, perhaps offer a film studies course in the evenings.
3) Students would like more training in writing conference papers; perhaps build it into the Introduction to American Studies seminar? Perhaps an assignment to write a research paper
for conference presentation in other American Studies courses as well as the Introductory seminar?
4) Students would prefer less literary theory in the Introduction to American Studies seminar; they would prefer to have the literary theory component in the literature seminar.
5) Avoid duplication of texts in different seminars; make sure that faculty check with each other about assigned texts.
6) Although the American Studies Program description states that there is a “coherent, aligned sequence of learning opportunities” provided by the following core courses, students observed that it is necessary to make the connections between and among these courses more clear; they request guidelines in regard to which courses build on other courses listed below:
Core Courses
AMST 610, Introduction to American Studies
HIST 530 Social History of the U.S.
POSC 518 Contemporary American Ideologies
REL 635 American Moral Traditions
ENG 580 Seminar in English (topics vary and it is taken twice)
AMST 620 Capstone Readings Course
7) Address some larger cultural questions across all courses: “What is it to be American?”
8) Involve students in the American Studies program more fully in the larger professional American Studies community; maybe assignments could include attendance relevant lectures in universities in the Los Angeles area
9) More advising/ counseling support; for example, advice on what else in addition to teaching might a student do with an American Studies degree
10) One or two students had concerns lost, or misplaced applications and were unhappy to have to duplicate the work they had already done
11) Exit questionnaire would be a good idea; perhaps an end of the program meeting with graduating students to get feedback about experiences in the program and suggestions for improvement In the American Studies class that I visited, both the professor and students were functioning at an especially high level; the level of preparation for the course both in terms of lecture materials and student assignments were demanding and challenging. Student responses to questions were very thoughtful and the discussion moved forward in a way that covered considerable ground yet was detailed and nuanced. The American Studies Program Learning Outcomes and goals for Critical Thinking were embedded in the lecture and discussion in an organic and very effective way.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Martin

Professor of American Literature and American Studies
Founder and Editor, Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal
Director, Tufts Poetry Awards (2010-2015)
Founding Director, Transdisciplinary Studies Program (2006-2013)
Claremont Graduate University

It was challenging to write this QIP as much of the external review report was anecdotal comments made by faculty and students. There was less direct interaction with the evidence presented in the self-study. The comments below are drawn from the external review report as well as evidence within the self-study.

The curriculum, practices, processes and resources are aligned with the goals of the program and with the institutional learning outcomes. Program goals are being achieved as evidenced by yearly assessments and graduation rates. Each year the program makes adjustments to increase learning by using evidence of strengths and weaknesses found through annual assessment. This is particularly evident in the changes made to the comprehensive exam made in an effort to allow students to demonstrate their learning successfully.

Actionable items:

I. Officially adopt the new PLOs listed in the self-study. We will amend our assessment plan to accommodate these new PLOs.

   Content & Critical Thinking
   1. Employ higher order, multidisciplinary, historically informed critical thinking about American culture.

   Diversity
   2. Critique the cultural diversity of the American experience, especially in terms of class, ethnicity, religion, gender, and race.

   Research & Writing skills
   3. Produce persuasive, nuanced, fact-based interpretations reflecting a close critical reading and sustained analysis of relevant primary and secondary sources.

   Theory and Methodology
   4. Identify, assess, and integrate different disciplinary, methodological, interpretive, and theoretical approaches to the study of American culture.

II. Increase curricular coverage of Asian American culture so it is more balanced with other cultures taught in the curriculum (Latino/Latina, American Indian, and African-American).
   a. The director will discuss this with the faculty and ask them to evaluate the balance of their course content in relationship to cultural identities within the US.
   b. The director will also work to schedule a summer course every other year that engages Asian American culture.
III. Increase advertising to gain greater visibility for the program
   a. Some of these efforts are already underway. We currently send post cards to middle and high schools within a driving distance to campus. We also contact GSEP graduates and area colleges with American Studies BA programs. We reach out to program alum and encourage them to share information about the program with their colleagues.
   b. We began a social media presence in the Fall of 2015. More work continues to be done on this effort.
   c. We are going to advertise on the California Teachers Association website in Spring 2015 & CATE’s quarterly journal California English in Fall 2016.

IV. Increase training in writing conference papers
   a. This year the Seaver College undergraduate research symposium is open to Seaver graduate students. This is an exciting opportunity for students to disseminate their work. The director and faculty members are actively encouraging students to participate. This opportunity should be a good venue in which faculty can increase instruction in writing conference papers and in which students can learn through participate in the conference.

Below is a discussion of some issues that are more nuanced and require greater reflection, and are not directly actionable at this time:

I. Students noted the challenges of managing the program workload while working full time.
   a. This is a difficult challenge. It is of prime importance to maintain the appropriate academic rigor of a graduate program. Each professor has he or her own approach to balancing that rigor in light of the students’ employment. We primarily address this issue by encouraging student to take only one class each semester during the academic year. This puts them at half time enrollment. This schedule is challenging but manageable as demonstrated by the program’s graduate rate.
   b. Class Length: The program is in compliance with Seaver’s credit hour policy and as such the length of the course cannot be altered. Changing courses to 3 units each would result in adding additional courses in order to be at an appropriate unit amount for a master of arts degree. This would also likely extend the program to an additional semester.

II. Some students noted they might like to begin the program in July as opposed to the Fall term.
   a. We recently restructured the program so that every student begins the program by taking the Introductory course (AMST 610). This change came about from student survey data. There is evidence that this has been a positive pedagogical change. If a July start was an option the course offered would need to be AMST 610.
   b. The July schedule requires students to meet 4-5 days per week for 3 plus hours each day. This is a challenging schedule for a seasoned student. First semester students often struggle a bit adapting to graduate school. This is the case with one class meeting per week. It seems that the adjustment struggle would be exacerbated with a 4-5 day a week schedule. Additionally all students would need to begin at the same time which could be challenging for some to begin in July. In short, it doesn’t seem that this is a good option.

III. Exit survey
   a. We currently conduct an exit survey and results are in the self-study.
AMERICAN STUDIES

IV. Encourage participation in American Studies Association and other appropriate associations.

a. Each year, the director invites students to attend the California American Studies Association (CASA). We have travel funding available. It is typically the first Friday and Saturday in May, which is after the Spring term ends, so it cannot be a course assignment. It is a busy time of the term for the students’ own classrooms. I have not yet had students take advantage of this opportunity. The director will continue to encourage this opportunity. Perhaps with the addition of the Seaver Research and Creative Works opportunity, more students will also want to participate in CASA.

b. Each term, the director sends out a list of relevant conferences to all enrolled students.

Professor Martin was complimentary of the program. She was particularly impressed with course she visited. The faculty member was well prepared and was able to bring about a fruitful discussion. She noted that the students engaged and made thoughtful contributions to the class.
MFA Program in Writing for Screen and Television
Program Review
*Fall 2010–Spring 2015*

Prepared by:

**Dr. Leslie Kreiner Wilson**
MFA Program in Writing for Screen and Television
5-Year Program Review
Program Director: Dr. Leslie Kreiner Wilson

Introduction: The Internal Context

The Master of Fine Arts Program in Writing for Screen and Television is situated within the Humanities Division of Seaver College.

Since our last review, we implemented the following changes:
1) We added a “quantitative” element in terms of the core competencies. Students write a business plan as an option in STW 601 Storyteller as Cultural Leader and as a requirement in STW 610 Topics in Writing for the Market: The Documentary Script.

2) We brought in two instructors who excel at “breaking story” to help our students with narrative arc or “turning” a story: Andy Guerdat and Peter Russell.

3) We identified the need for some of the essays written in the program to have a stronger argumentative thesis thus pushing the body of the paper into deeper analysis. We have now developed rubrics and worked with instructors of the courses in which papers are written in order to encourage students in this regard. The rubrics have also been placed on the syllabi. We have noted that students often improve once they see a sort of checklist/rubric in terms of what we are looking for.

4) In response to assessment of our assessment report, we added a third category to our surveys. In the past, we had “yes/no.” An assessor suggested we add another category, we now have “yes/somewhat/no” on our surveys.

5) Lastly, while we are very pleased with the results in terms of last year’s assessment of PLO #4 (A student who graduates with an MFA degree in Writing for Screen and Television should be able to analyze critically, discuss, and write about the concept of “The Storyteller as Cultural Leader” and explain how that concept applies to them personally as writers leading lives of purpose, service and leadership), the course has been taught by program director Leslie Kreiner Wilson since the program’s inception eight years ago. Thus we have decided to rotate another instructor, Tom Provost, in the next time it is taught, spring 2017, so we can get some perspective on other approaches or improvements we might make to the course and student learning outcomes.

Introduction: The External Context

The MFA program serves those who yearn for faith-based education in the field of screen and television writing. We believe storytellers can be cultural leaders and consider Hollywood a mission field. We are the only protestant university in the area fulfilling this need.
Introduction: Mission

The mission of the MFA program is to nurture, train, and support screen and television writers as they work to make a positive global impact. The core value of the program revolves around the belief that storytellers can be cultural leaders. In our cornerstone course, STW 601 The Storyteller as Cultural Leader, students study a different screenwriter each week—artists such as Frank Capra, Akira Kurosawa, Ingmar Bergman, Paddy Chayefsky, and Frances Marion—who have written scripts that inspire and uplift humanity. In addition, we encourage our students to participate in volunteer opportunities—what we call “Citizenship in the Colony”—around the Los Angeles area in order to make Hollywood a better place to live and work. Students have scrubbed sidewalks at Inner-City Arts, fed the homeless in Malibu, and painted classrooms at the Children’s Creative Workshop. In every way, the MFA degree reinforces the Pepperdine University mission of a program “committed to the highest standards of academic excellence and Christian values, where students are strengthened for lives of purpose, service, and leadership.”

I. Meaning of the Degree:

Program Learning Outcomes

The program learning outcomes are as follows:

A student who graduates with an MFA in Writing for Screen and Television should be able to:

| PLO #1 | Write television scripts, feature screenplays, and adaptations displaying best practices in the field |
| PLO #2 | Analyze critically, discuss, and write about Hollywood history |
| PLO #3 | Analyze critically, discuss, and write about film theory – including issues pertaining to ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity |
| PLO #4 | Analyze critically, discuss, and write about the concept of “The Storyteller as Cultural Leader” and explain how that concept applies to them personally as writers leading lives of purpose, service and leadership |

Curricular Map

The curricular map is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>PLO#1</th>
<th>PLO#2</th>
<th>PLO#3</th>
<th>PLO#4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILM 500</td>
<td>Film Theory</td>
<td>I,D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM 501</td>
<td>History of American Cinema</td>
<td>I,D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STW 601</td>
<td>Storyteller as Cultural Leader</td>
<td>I,D,M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STW 602</td>
<td>Great Books and Film</td>
<td>I,D,M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STW 610/ STW 699/</td>
<td>Rotating Topics in Writing for Screen and Television</td>
<td>I,D,M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWR 510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Institutional Learning Outcomes**

The degree supports the institutional mission and institutional learning outcomes in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>PLO #1</th>
<th>PLO #2</th>
<th>PLO #3</th>
<th>PLO #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate expertise in an academic or professional discipline, display proficiency in the discipline, and engage in the process of academic discovery.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the complex relationship between faith, learning, and practice.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and enact a compelling personal and professional vision that values diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge to real-world challenges.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to the call to serve others.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate commitment to service and civic engagement.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think critically and creatively, communicate clearly, and act with integrity.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice responsible conduct and allow decisions and directions to be informed by a value-centered life.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILO #9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use global and local leadership opportunities in pursuit of justice.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degree embodies the distinct values, basic commitment, and traditions of the institution by supporting the Pepperdine mission as seen above in the alignment of our PLOs with the ILOs. In addition, the PLOs appear on all our syllabi, including a statement supporting the PLO alignment with the learning outcomes of the particular course.
MFA Writing For Screen and Television

Curriculum

Our MFA degree requires 48 units in the following curriculum:
FILM 500 Film Theory (4 units; includes script analysis)
FILM 501 History of American Cinema (4 units; includes script analysis)
STW 601 The Storyteller as Cultural Leader (4 units; students can work on act one of a feature screenplay or a short script; includes script analysis)
STW 602 Great Books and Film (4 units; adaptation; students can work on act one of a feature screenplay or a short script; includes script analysis)
STW 610 Topics in Writing for the Market (4 units; 6 times; rotates through feature screenplay, feature screenplay rewrite, the short script, animation, sketch, half hour spec/pilot, one hour spec/pilot, the documentary script, from scene to screen/production; includes script analysis)
STW 595 Industry Internship (2 units)
STW 690 Thesis (2-6 units; students may take one 4 unit elective and only register for 2 units of thesis; the thesis portfolio is 180-240 pages, including an essay and scripts in any combination of the student’s choosing [television, feature, animation, sketch, documentary, etc.])

ELECTIVE (4 units) These units can be in business, production, development, finance, film studies, writing, or industry internships (note: some business and production classes are 2 units; thus the students can take 2)

*The new Institute for Entertainment, Media, and Culture will be offering classes and certificates in business, production, development, and finance.

Our curriculum has not changed since the program’s inception in 2008. We have, however, as a result of student focus groups and industry changes, added more topics to the rotation in STW 610: Television Pilot, The Short Script, The Documentary Script, and From Page to Screen.

The following chart exhibits the comparison of our degree with two peer and one aspirational program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pepperdine</th>
<th>Chapman (peer)</th>
<th>Loyola Marymount (aspirational)</th>
<th>USC (aspirational)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Studies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenwriting</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenplay Rewrite</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Spec One Hour</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Pilot One Hour</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Spec Half Hour</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Pilot Half Hour</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Script</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics/Values Course</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distinctions between Pepperdine’s MFA degree and those of our peer and aspirational institutions are as follows:

1) While other programs are in film schools, our MFA is located in the Humanities Division and has a humanities and liberal arts foundation. Students in the program can serve as teaching assistants in the HUM 111/212/313 sequence, thus enriching their knowledge in the history of the arts. In addition, the four core required classes focus on film and literary history, and all of the courses require students to read as well as analyze scripts in every genre. We believe this liberal arts focus educates and encourages students as they approach a career as storytellers; they learn they are part of a rich tradition.

2) We are the only program with a cornerstone course that focuses on values and ethical concerns in screen and television writing: STW 601 The Storyteller as Cultural Leader. In this course—and indeed throughout the program—we invite and encourage students to consider a life far bigger than they may have yet imagined—a life in which their vision and purpose, courage and conviction dovetail with their work as a writer. This is our defining and most exceptional characteristic, aligning our program with the mission of Pepperdine University and distinguishing us from our competitors.

3) Other programs are primarily comprised of full time faculty who have not written in many years; all of our faculty are full time writers or other Hollywood professionals who cycle through to teach a class with us every third semester or so. Thus our students are exposed to the latest industry information, receiving “hot off the press” instruction. Our recent faculty members include the following:
Sheryl J. Anderson http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0027446/
Dick Blasucci http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0087782/
Chris Cluess http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0167312/
Andy Guerdat http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0345908/
Jim Jennewein http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0421084/
Liz Keyishian http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0450846/
Ken LaZebnik http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0493855/
Tom Provost http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0699103/
Hans Rodionoff http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0118566/?ref_=fn_al_nm_1
Randall Wallace http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0908824/

4) We do not schedule a separate Script Analysis class because reading and analyzing scripts is a component of all our courses.

5) While a Business/Development course is not part of our core curriculum, students may take a course as an elective. As but one example, Nelson Granados at Graziadio has been teaching an entertainment business course for several years now in which our students may enroll. The class is designed to bring together graduate students from Seaver, Graziadio, and the law school. In addition, the new Institute for Entertainment, Media, and Culture will
be creating more interdisciplinary classes—and even certificates—for students with interests in entertainment business and law.

Core Competencies

The program ensures that graduates meet the five core competencies of the WASC standards through an annual review process. This year (2016) we reviewed the oral competency component. Ashton Trumble (MFA graduate student) and Leslie Kreiner Wilson (the program director) applied for a student/faculty mentorship grant so that the student could help with the assessment process. The two attended Lisa Bortman’s assessment workshop and were “normed” through the process of evaluating a sample oral presentation using the Oral Competency Value Rubric. This seminar also helped us establish interrater reliability. We then observed midterm oral presentations given by the MFA students in FILM 501 History of American Cinema. Our results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Supplemental Material</th>
<th>Central Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are very impressed with the results (ranked out of 4), but will do more instruction regarding delivery; unfortunately, some students just looked down and read from a piece of paper—even turning their backs to the class for extended periods, speaking to their PowerPoint.

To assess the writing core competency in the MFA program, we gathered the three thesis essays for the students who graduated in fall of 2014 and spring of 2015. The STW 690 Thesis is the “capstone course” for the degree; thus we consider these students our “seniors.” For direct evidence, we then read through the essays and scored them according to the Written Communication Value Rubric that was given to us during the workshop on writing assessment. The readers included the following: Leslie Kreiner Wilson, Chris Cluess (MFA faculty), Andy Guerdat (MFA faculty), Tom Provost (MFA faculty), and Ted Nitschke (MFA alum). The essays scored an average of 3.88 (out of 4). For indirect evidence, we created a Survey Monkey form and sent it to a student focus group. We asked
To assess the critical thinking core competency, Leslie Kreiner Wilson and Dr. Beverly Graf (MFA faculty) read through the student papers written in FILM 501 History of American Cinema and assessed the work by using the Critical Thinking Value Rubric supplied to us during the workshop on assessment. We found that 100% of the work fell in the 3 to 4 range (out of 4). All of the work displayed the following characteristics: the issue/problem was stated clearly; the position took into account the complexities of the issue/problem and addressed counterargument; sources were used with analysis and/or synthesis; viewpoints and assumptions were questioned; conclusions were logical and displayed students’ evaluation and perspective. We do believe some student work could have a stronger argumentative thesis, forcing the material into deeper analysis. We have revised the syllabi and writing prompts to encourage this improvement in student essays. We also emphasize this point more often in our teaching.

While we have not been asked to assess the other core competencies in the annual assessment process as of yet, the curriculum of the MFA program does emphasize information literacy through the use of research in essays, scripts, as well as oral presentations. In two courses and many of the electives, students write business plans, which address the core competency of quantitative skills. In addition, students can use their elective credits to take entertainment business courses through the Institute for Entertainment, Media, and Culture, the Communication Division MFA in Cinematic Media Production, and the Graziadio school. (They may also audit courses that interest them beyond the curriculum.) The new Institute will be facilitating these interdisciplinary endeavors; Leslie Kreiner Wilson is an Academic Co-Director of the Institute and will participate in growing these opportunities for students. These other opportunities will bolster quantitative skills as well.

**Measures of Effectiveness**

In terms of our measures of effectiveness, we have accrued the following data:

1) Our course evaluations for Fall 2015 averages were very high. On a scale of 5, our screen and television classes earned Professor 4.87, Course 4.66, Overall 4.5. Thus our Evaluation Average was 4.68. These figures are commensurate with our scores every semester. We believe they indicate exceptional classroom instruction.

2) Several MFA faculty members (Beverly Graf, Peter Russell, Liz Keyishian Wilks, Leslie Kreiner Wilson, Tom Provost) are participating in two pedagogical panels at the Association of Writers and Writing Programs Conference March 31st, 2016. This conference is the premier one in our field. We have had several formative pedagogical discussions planning for the event as well. We will be presenting at the University Film and Video Association in the future.

3) Student Satisfaction and Post-graduation Data: In October of 2015, we sent all MFA Program alums a survey designed in Survey Monkey. The questions and responses were as follows:
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a) Do you think the Pepperdine MFA Program accomplished its first learning outcome: A student who graduates with an MFA in Writing for Screen and Television should be able to write television scripts, feature screenplays, and adaptations, displaying best practices in the field? 80% responded “yes”; 20% responded “somewhat”; none answered “no.”

b) Do you think the MFA Program accomplished its second learning outcome: A student who graduates with an MFA in Writing for Screen and Television should be able to analyze critically, discuss, and write about Hollywood history? 80% responded “yes”; 20% responded “somewhat”; none answered “no.”

c) Do you think the MFA Program accomplished its third learning outcome: A student who graduates with an MFA in Writing for Screen and Television should be able to analyze critically, discuss, and write about film theory—including issues pertaining to ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity? 80% responded “yes”; 20% responded “somewhat”; none answered “no.”

d) Do you think the MFA Program accomplished its fourth learning outcome: A student who graduates with an MFA in Writing for Screen and Television should be able to analyze critically, discuss, and write about the concept of “The Storyteller as Cultural Leader” and explain how that concept applies to them personally as writers leading lives of purpose, service and leadership? 100% answered “yes.”

e) Do you work in any aspect of writing, media, or entertainment? 100% answered yes.

f) Do you use skills that you gained in the MFA Program? 80% responded “yes”; 20% responded “somewhat”; none answered “no.”

g) Do you have any suggestions for improvement? Not all responders left comments, but for those who did the comments clustered around wanting the “program to grow” so that alumni have a real voice and impact in Hollywood. A few also want to spend more time with the business side of the industry. We believe the new Institute for Entertainment, Media, and Culture certificate in this area will offer this opportunity for the students who crave it. In addition, students can use their elective credit to take the business courses mentioned above. We will work to make these opportunities more transparent for the students.

h) Do you have any compliments in terms of things you think the program did well? Not all responders left comments, but for those who did the comments clustered around complimenting the “fantastic teachers,” “networking opportunities,” and “scholarship and teaching assistantship work for students less able to afford the tuition.”

To close the loop in terms of our alumni survey data, we are pleased with the 100% response of “yes” or “somewhat” in every category. Nobody responded “no” to any of the survey questions, confirming that we are accomplishing our PLOs. We are working hard to grow the program, having participated in several marketing efforts this year, and we will continue to share with students the entertainment business and law opportunities they have through electives, interdisciplinary classes, and the Institute for Entertainment, Media, and Culture.

II. Quality and Integrity of the Degree: Co-Curriculum

The practices that enrich the learning experiences for MFA students include many co-curricular activities designed to supplement classroom instruction as well as encourage students in service:
1) As mentioned, we engage students in “Citizenship in the Colony” volunteer service such as participation in Step Forward Day, cleaning up Inner-City Arts, painting the Children’s Creative Workshop, or feeding the homeless in Malibu.

2) We have a student-led club, Courier 12; the president and students plan such activities as a new student welcome dinner, “Citizenship in the Colony” activities, studio tours, hearing speakers at the Writers Guild Foundation, fellowship potlucks, and bringing speakers to campus.

3) Every December, we host the Fall Literary Arts Festival: MFA Showcase in which students perform or screen their creative writing and short films.

4) Every February, we host a panel of Hollywood pros who participate in a Q & A with the audience of students who can ask questions about the Writers Guild, festivals, contests, agents, managers, lawyers, the life of a Hollywood writer, writing for film, writing for television, screenwriting membership organizations, craft, etc.

5) Every April, we host a banquet in which we share student achievements, listen to a guest speaker, eat dinner, and fellowship together. This year’s speaker is David N. Weiss, a Pepperdine alum and experienced screenwriter (Smurfs, Rugrats, Shrek 2).

6) Every semester, the dean’s office sponsors the Graduate Colloquium where graduate students and faculty at Seaver College gather for dinner and a lecture from a noted speaker.

7) Annually, we film a documentary in which students and faculty discuss some aspect of technique in screen and television writing. These premiere at the Fall Literary Arts Festival: MFA Showcase and are archived on our YouTube Channel.

8) Students can work as teaching assistants in the HUM 111/212/313 sequence.

9) Students can attend events, take classes, and earn certificates through the Institute for Entertainment, Media, and Culture.

Other Student Support:

a) ACE Writing Lab (also conducts workshops in media production and editing)

b) Scholarships for students unable to afford full tuition

c) The program director serves as the Academic Advisor for all MFA students.

d) The program director writes the booklet and conducts New Student Orientation for all incoming students.

e) The program director conducts the orientation for incoming teaching assistants in the HUM 111/212/313 sequence.

f) The Career Center as well as the Academic Advisor provide career mentoring and help with internship placement.

g) The Volunteer Center coordinates student involvement in “citizenship in the colony” opportunities.

h) The Counseling Center provides small group meetings as well as individual sessions to support the mental health of students.

i) The dean’s office provides forums for students to discuss issues related to diversity and inclusion. In addition, the Multicultural Theater Project presents a show each year and hosts campus speakers; these events also explore issues related to diversity.

In focus groups, students have shared that they find these experiences meaningful, important, as well as supportive of their mental and spiritual health.
Summary of Program Assessment Annual Reviews

In 2016, we assessed the third PLO: students who graduate with an MFA in Writing for Screen and Television will be able to analyze critically, discuss, and write about film theory – including issues pertaining to ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity. Ashton Trumble (graduate student) and Leslie Kreiner Wilson evaluated six student essays from the Fall 2015 Film Theory class. Using a rubric we developed, we scored the work on a scale of 5. The results averaged 4.7.

In addition, we conducted a Survey Monkey survey asking the focus group of six students if they felt they had accomplished the third PLO. 83.33% responded “yes”; 16.67% answered “somewhat.” None answered “no.” While the majority of the students were positive about the course in written comments from Survey Monkey, we are working with the instructor to find the appropriate lecture/discussion balance as well as find readings that are more accessible for students working on an MFA in Screen and Television Writing, not an MA in Film Studies. In general, however, this data shows we are accomplishing our third PLO.

In 2015, we assessed the fourth PLO: students who graduate with an MFA in Writing for Screen and Television will be able to analyze critically, discuss, and write about the concept of “The Storyteller as Cultural Leader” and explain how that concept applies to them personally as writers leading lives of purpose, service, and leadership. To assess the fourth PLO, we collected seven essays from the course STW 601 The Storyteller as Cultural leader. The essay prompt asked what the term “the storyteller as cultural leader” meant to the students. Nine people participated in the assessment: Leslie Kreiner Wilson (program director) and Hans Rodionoff (external reviewer then, faculty now) as well as a focus group of seven MFA students. The faculty member and external reviewer read through the essays and found that they averaged 4.5 out of 5, following a rubric we developed. In addition, the student focus group responded to a Survey Monkey question asking if they believed the MFA Program was accomplishing its fourth PLO. Six or 86% of the students in the focus group answered “yes”; one or 14% answered “somewhat”; none answered “no.” This data shows we are accomplishing our fourth PLO.

In 2014, we assessed the second PLO: students who graduate with an MFA in Writing for Screen and Television should be able to analyze critically, discuss, and write about Hollywood history. Leslie Kreiner Wilson and Beverly Graf (MFA faculty) gathered papers and a short essay final written in FILM 501 History of American Cinema; we then read through the material. All of the essays scored in the 4 to 5 range (out of 5), according to a rubric that we developed. In addition, 100% of the students in the focus group answered “yes” to a Survey Monkey question that asked if the MFA Program was accomplishing its second PLO. The data shows we are accomplishing this PLO.

In 2013, we assessed the first PLO: students who graduate from the MFA program will be able to write television scripts, feature screenplays, and adaptations, displaying best practices in the field. To evaluate this PLO, we collected thesis portfolios of 180 to 240 pages from the STW 690 Thesis class, including an essay meditating on the concept of the storyteller as cultural leader as well as scripts. We formed thesis committees for each student of two faculty members and the program director as chair then read the material, offered the student notes, and asked for revisions. The students revised the work, resubmitted, then defended the material in an oral defense. After the oral defense, the students proceeded to the dean’s office, went through a copyediting process, then worked with Dr. Dana Dudley, Assistant Dean and Director of Graduate Programs, to make sure the thesis was in order before it went to the Dean of Seaver College who read and signed it. All of the
responding committee members scored 5s (out of 5) on all the thesis portfolio scripts following a rubric we developed. This analysis carries with it an element of external review as all of the committee members are currently working in Hollywood. We have no full time faculty—other than the program director—the program is based on a model in which working Hollywood writers and professionals rotate through to teach a class every third semester or so. In addition, students were given a survey through Survey Monkey asking them if they thought the MFA program was accomplishing its first PLO. 100% of the student respondents answered “yes” to this question. This data shows we are accomplishing out first PLO.
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External Reviewer Assessment Summary

Pepperdine University’s Masters of Fine Arts in Writing for Screen and Television is designed to train graduate students for “a vocation as screen and television writers and prepare them to become cultural leaders in television and film.”1 After a due-diligent examination, this external reviewer finds the program to be a conscientious, rigorous and ambitious program for the graduate student dedicated to preparing for a professional career in screenwriting.

The MFA in Writing for Screen and Television is housed in the Humanities Division of Pepperdine University and located in Malibu, California. It is a private, non-profit, co-educational research university affiliated with the Churches of Christ.

This assessment is formed through
- an on-site study, through interviews with those in the leadership position: the Divisional Dean, Humanities and Teacher Education Division (Michael Ditmore Ph.D.) and the Program Director of the MFA in Writing for Screen and Television program (Leslie Kreiner Wilson Ph.D.) as well as a small sample of adjunct faculty and a wide sample of the graduate students.
- a study of the program’s stated goals, measurable achievements of the goals, its class structures and syllabi of core courses.
- evidence of steady enrollment was also taken into consideration in this review.

It is requested that the external reviewer should evaluate:
- curricular offerings in terms of relevance, currency, and quality.
- the appropriateness and effectiveness of assessment methodologies and Program Learning Outcomes and whether changes in response to assessment data reflect the best practices of the discipline.
- the quality of instruction and faculty members’ scholarly activity/accomplishments.
- the program’s ability to recruit and retain successful students.

1 Program brochure 2015, degree program website and 5 Year Review (2015)
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- the program’s strengths and growth areas, based on evidence-based analysis and comparisons to peer/aspirational programs.

As screenwriting is a creative endeavor and future employment, for the most part, depends on individual writer/artist’s motivation, connections, chance and talent, judging the program on quantifiable employment statistics is not suitable for evidence of efficacy of this degree. In addition, given the degree program has been in existence for less than ten years, this makes an already unreliable assessment by employment statistics unsuitable.

However, as with all MFA in Screenwriting programs across the United States, Pepperdine University’s program can be assessed through examination of classroom content as well as students’ work to determine if the graduate students’ scripts/outlines/treatments and other creative output are on par with industry standards as well as point to the participation/recognition of students in the professional industry’s festivals and writing competitions.

The Program:

Pepperdine University’s MFA program was developed in 2008 and launched in 2009. It requires 48 units for graduation with a maximum of 64 units. The core course “Storyteller as Cultural Leader” is of great importance to the program, for it reflects the overriding mission of the degree.

Each class is, on average, held in the evening hours and is three and a half to four hours in duration. The program offers courses in feature film writing, television writing, various topics concerning writing for the professional marketplace, film history and theory and electives in national cinemas, religion in film and women in film.

The program’s initial 5-Year Review (see Addendum #2), written by the Program Director and submitted in 2015 (it includes a yearly assessment/review [2012-2015] of the program), laid out this information:

- The core of the program revolves around the belief that storytellers can be cultural leaders. This is relayed to the students and supported by instruction in the classroom.
  - Result this external reviewer found: Students and instructors understand the mission of the program.

- The MFA student demographics are diverse and wide-ranging.
  - Result this external reviewer found: The program includes international students, and students representing various ethnic, religious as well as economic backgrounds, genders and ages. Enrollment is holding steady at 30 total students (in various stages of the 2 year program) at any given time.

- Students participated in a focus group to assess the MFA program; there were very positive responses regarding the efficacy of the assigned work in class and appreciation of the information about the professional industry in which many students hope to find careers.
  - Results this external reviewer found: There is wide support from the students in the strengths of the program. In Addendum #1, specific student comments (positive comments as well as areas of concern and wishful thinking) are delineated.

- Reports from industry professionals that offered internships to Pepperdine MFA in Writing for Screen and Television students showed positive feedback regarding the students’ knowledge and readiness to be a productive intern.

- In comparison to three well-regarded private university MFA in Screenwriting programs in Southern California, Pepperdine’s program’s curriculum (required courses and elective courses) lines up with other universities’ proffered curricula.
  - Pepperdine’s MFA in Writing for Screen and Television has its unique element in its focus on ‘The Storyteller as Cultural Leader’.

- Working to address WASC program competency assessments, Pepperdine’s MFA in Writing for Screen and Television added thesis essays, critical thinking components and oral presentation assignments. Appropriate growth in students’ work was noticed.
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The continual in-house assessment and appropriate changes (in response to the findings) to improve the program are evident and should be commended. In addition, Pepperdine University’s MFA in Writing for Screen and Television is to be complimented for it continues to grow in its outreach into the professional industry. Case in point: The program has added the benefits of the Institute of Entertainment Media and Culture to its program.

The Institute of Entertainment Media and Culture is under the leadership of John Mooney Ph.D. and takes advantage of the supportive participation of successful industry professionals such as actress Roma Downey and producer Mark Burnett, media business leader Jon Burton, Disney executive Dave Hollis and others (agents, attorneys, filmmakers and writers). It is designed to facilitate the education and development of multi-disciplinary graduates and position them for positions of leadership in the media and entertainment sectors. Students from the Seaver College (where the MFA in Writing for Screen and Television is housed) as well as graduates of the Schools of Business and Law are able to take advantage of the Institute.

External Reviewer’s Outline

This review will concentrate on seven areas and recommendations/suggestions may be included in each section. The sections include:
I. Faculty
II. Curriculum and Program Learning Outcomes
III. Assessment and Reactions to Assessment
IV. Students
V. Facilities, Resources and Equipment
VI. Relationships with Professional Community
VII. Addendum #1: Student Responses to Program
VIII. Addendum #2: Program’s 5-Year Self Review (2015)

I. Faculty

Pepperdine University’s MFA Writing for Screen and Television program is dedicated to employing an adjunct faculty that continues to be relevant in the professional film and television industry but who can also perform at the highest standard in the classroom.

1. What is the make-up of the faculty?

Currently (Spring semester 2016) there is one full time administrator/faculty who also serves as the Program Director of the MFA in Writing for Screen and Television program. Film theory/history classes are regularly taught by full-time Pepperdine faculty who also teach undergraduate courses. Other instructors in the program (those teaching the bulk of the screenwriting courses) are adjuncts (part-time faculty) and each may not teach on a regular basis depending on class scheduling, needs of the students and availability of each instructor.

   a. In conversation with the Program Director, this reviewer was informed that all efforts are made to employ film industry professionals to teach the MFA writing and industry-related courses. Due to the nature of the program (small classes and a two year build of classes), instructors may teach once a year or every other year, depending on the necessity of providing classes in a manageable order so that students can graduate in a timely fashion.
b. The hiring practices are due to the challenges of program size, program design (scheduling), commitment to hiring professionally engaged instructors whose availability changes as well as the current lack of financial commitment by the university.

c. There is some consistency in adjunct hiring, however due to the nature of the program, steady mentorship of the student by a core of instructors is problematic.

i. It may be noted that, due to the volume of students and commitments of running the program and other full-time academic tasks, the Program Director may find it difficult to take on individual mentorship position with each graduate student. Being a mentor to a creative individual who is generating a good amount of original material is a daunting task. It may be suggested that to provide a stronger consistency of quality of instruction and a stronger base of mentorship, a semi-full-time instructor be added to the program - or perhaps a contractual agreement with an adjunct that would span an agreed-on number of years/semesters might be a solution. As graduate students have a higher expectation of strong mentorship, this could prove advantageous to the program.

d. The website of the program lists names of those who have been guest speakers or who have taught in the program and includes links to the Internet Movie Data Base (IMDB) page of each of the instructors/guest speakers/panelists. It is not clear who has been employed as instructors and who has been asked to be a guest speaker or a member of a panel.

i. It may be suggested that the website provide more pertinent information on adjunct faculty and make the distinction as to who has served in guest speaker roles and who has served on the adjunct faculty.

2. What is the department doing to prepare new faculty (adjunct faculty) for success?
   a. There is evidence, from on-campus interviews with Program Director and adjunct faculty, of excellent communication between Program Director and adjuncts. The exchange of information regarding goals and assessment of goals and teaching practices at Pepperdine University is also evident.

3. How does the department assess and support effective teaching?
   a. The Program Director requests student feedback and reacts appropriately to any negative (or complimentary) comments concerning adjunct faculty.
   b. Student evaluations in line with Pepperdine University policies are in place.

4. How is the department encouraging adjunct faculty to develop their work as scholars? What are the program’s expectations for their adjuncts in professional development? Given that tenure and full time employment is not an option, is there motivation for adjunct faculty to contribute beyond the classroom?
   a. Film history and theory classes are taught by full time faculty at Pepperdine who also teach in the undergraduate programs. They, along with the Program Director (part of the full time faculty) are supported by the University in their scholarly pursuits.
   b. The adjunct faculty, having ties to the professional film and television industry, are encouraged to continue their work in this area. It is evident that the employment
opportunities in the MFA program are enhanced with a strong professional resume. In the fields of screenwriting and filmmaking, this continued professional work could be considered comparable to scholarly pursuit. The department has no direct correlation to the adjuncts’ professional opportunities.

1. It may be suggested that encouragement and/or support of adjunct faculty in their endeavors to publish papers and/or present at conferences such as the University Film & Video Association (UFVA) could be beneficial to both student and adjunct faculty. Conferences provide a way to share pedagogy and assessment as well as to promote students’ work.

c. As each adjunct faculty member is not guaranteed regular employment there is no direct incentive to contribute outside the classroom.
   i. In interview, one adjunct stated that he did volunteer his time and energy and talent to review graduate thesis material. The adjunct did not state that this was expected or conditional for further employment, however, to remain a consistent factor in the department and because of a personal interest in students’ progress and work, the adjunct chose to accept this task.
   1. It may be suggested that adjunct faculty be monetarily rewarded for this extra work. There is evidence of many universities that award a monetary fee for thesis review.

5. What measures have been taken to recruit and to retain diverse faculty?

   a. The Program Director identifies the adjunct hires. The focus is on excellence in professional experience and in the classroom. At the time of this review, there is gender diversity in the adjunct faculty.
      i. It may be suggested to broaden the adjunct pool, when possible, to include ethnic diversity.

II. Curriculum

The given purpose of Pepperdine’s MFA in Screen and Television Writing is to develop storytellers as cultural leaders. Courses are designed to ensure the students are in conversation with contemporary culture through the lens of ethics, philosophy, film studies, and religion.\(^2\)

The design of the curriculum is appropriate (required depth and breadth of study, flow of courses, overall coherence, alignment with desired learning outcomes, etc.) to enable students to develop the skills and attain the outcomes needed for graduation from this program.

The curricular offerings are appropriate; they include current and relevant topics concerning screenwriting, filmmaking, narratives that may reflect current societal trends, ethical choices and examine the quality of films and television stories past and present.

\(^2\) Program brochure 2015, degree program website and 5 Year Review (2015)
The curriculum clearly outlines program requirements and offers courses to ensure timely completion of the program for students who are able to commit to the program full-time.

a. Frequency of core/required course offerings is a concern of some students (see Addendum #1).

b. Students expressed interest in online course options as well as courses that could be offered in the summer months. (see Addendum #1)

These questions are addressed in regards to curriculum:

1. *Is the department's curriculum up to date, sufficiently rigorous, and well organized for majors?*

Pepperdine’s MFA Writing for Screen and Television curriculum is creative and rigorously challenging. It is a 48 unit degree. The program is designed for the graduate student to complete the course work in two years, however, the average student graduates in three years. The student, in order to remain viable towards graduation, must enroll in a class entitled Reading for Master’s Thesis (GRST 699) as well as Thesis Project STW 690 so that student progress can be tracked. The maximum number of credits is 64; this gives an end-time to efforts.

2. *Which courses in the curriculum include significant treatment of diversity issues, and multiculturalism as well as global issues?*

There are courses that directly target issues of diversity, multiculturalism and/or global issues in the Film Section of the courses offered.

The courses in MFA in Writing for Screen and Television are, on average worth 4 units. They include:

**WRITING (28-36 Units)**

- **STW 601** The Storyteller as Cultural Leader
- **CRWR 510** Writing for Screen and Television STW
- **STW 610** Topics in Writing for the Market
  - Writing Comedy
  - Writing TV sitcoms
  - The One Hour Drama
  - Advanced Scene Writing
  - Writing Film Genres
  - Writing Adaptation
  - Writing the Documentary
  - Writing for New Media
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FILM (12 Units)

FILM 500 Film Theory
FILM 501 History of American Cinema
STW 602 Great Books and Film

ELECTIVES (Max 16 Units)

FILM 562 Italian Cinema
FILM 531 African American Cinema
FILM 565 Japanese and Asian Film
FILM 551 Religion and Film
FILM 541 Women and Film

INDUSTRY INTERNSHIP (2 Units)

STW 695 Supervised Internship

THESIS (2-6 Units)

STW 690 Thesis Project
(can be repeated until completion)
GRST 699 Reading for Master’s Thesis
(0 units, for those who need extra time for thesis completion)

In addition, Pepperdine University, in 2015, approved a new degree program, a Masters of Fine Arts in Cinematic Production. This degree is expected to be widely active in Fall 2016. According to the MFA in Writing for Screen and Television Program Director, there are plans to encourage participation between the degree programs. This would enable the MFA in Writing for Screen and Television graduate students to learn more about production (very helpful for screenwriters) and provide possibilities to see their own written work brought to life on the screen. An allotment of units that could be used towards MFA graduation is to be determined. This could be a strong addition to the program and one that the students specifically request (see Addendum #1).

The continued adjustment and growth of the MFA in Writing for Screen and Television program is to be commended.

The INDUSTRY INTERNSHIP is an important element of the program. The course requires the student to identify and procure an internship with a reputable film industry company. This allows each student to gain experience and to network in their chosen career path.

The program has forged relationships with a number of production companies, this is of help to the graduate student seeking internship possibilities.

a. Students show great excitement and appreciation of this requirement, however there are some concerns about how it fits into their financial and time responsibilities (see Addendum #1)
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This external reviewer notes two areas in the curriculum that might warrant consideration:

TEACHER EDUCATION/OPPORTUNITY: As of February 2016, the opportunities for teaching experience for the MFA in Writing for Screen and Television student is limited. They are only given the opportunity to work as Teaching Assistants in undergraduate Humanities classes.

a. A good number of students, in on-campus interview sessions, stated their expectations/desires to use the terminal MFA degree to apply for teaching positions at college or university level.
   i. It may be suggested the addition of opportunities to teach modules in classes more in line with screenwriting and/or film may benefit the students in the program.
   ii. The MFA student may find more directly related teaching opportunities in undergraduate Creative Writing classes.
   iii. This could also be an additional marketing tool for the Program.

In assessing the current curriculum, there is no SHORT SCRIPT component in the MFA in Writing for Screen and Television.

i. It may be suggested, because short scripts/short films are considered as calling cards to the professional industry, a class or strong unit in a writing class that focuses on short films could be considered.

III. Assessment

The 5-Year Review, completed in 2015 by the MFA Program Director, is commendable and can set the standard for yearly assessment.

The Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)

1. Write television scripts, feature screenplays and adaptations.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of Hollywood history along with the ability to analyze critically, discuss and write about history of film and television.
3. Demonstrate knowledge of film theory – including issues pertaining to ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity – along with the ability to analyze critically, discuss and write about that theory.
4. Explain the concept of “The Storyteller as Cultural Leader” and how that concept applies to them personally as writers leading lives of purpose, service and leadership.

This external reviewer finds, in relation to the above PLO’s of the MFA in Writing for Screen and Television Program:

- The PLOs reflect the most important skills, knowledge, and values of the screenwriting discipline/profession.
- The criteria and standards of achievement for the PLOs adequately match disciplinary and professional standards.
Based on review of student work samples and student achievement of the PLOs, these outcomes are adequate for the degree and discipline.

1. What assessment mechanisms are in place? How effective are these assessment mechanisms in evaluating students’ skills and abilities?

Assessing creative endeavors, as noted previously, is a subjective exercise. This is particularly true in assessing screenplays, teleplays and other creative writing for media/entertainment. What can be gauged is an understanding of the craft (story structure, outlines, synopses, terms, character arcs, formatting issues etc.).

In student interviews, there is strong evidence of growth in the understanding of the craft of writing for film and television.

This external reviewer, having worked in or had access to student work in multiple graduate programs in the USA and in Europe, read a small sample of Pepperdine graduate student work. It is clear that the level of craft is commensurate with other work in other MFA in Screenwriting programs.

The 5-Year Review (2015) prepared by the Program Director points to student recognition in various festivals and contests that are recognized in the academic and professional film industry.

In faculty feedback of student work, there is reference to growth in craft.

a. It may be suggested that an assessment could be investigated in this area: a survey or “pre-test” of knowledge and ability to form story from ideas and other craft issues and then compare that early work to a student’s final graduate project. If this is of interest to the program, measurable assessment could be determined by the work submitted for application compared with the final thesis project.

2. How does the program serve the needs of its students by accomplishing its learning objectives?

Through discussions with the Program Director and the adjunct faculty, the learning objectives are broken down into smaller goals and are listed as:

- Support the mission of the degree program, supporting the idea of the Screenwriter as Cultural Leader.
- Differentiate critical points of view in the analyses and interpretation of films, television shows, screenplays and other entertainment content.
- Using films and television programs to analyze the principles of writing in the varied media.
- Demonstrate critical reflection and viewpoint in evaluating the work of peers and others.
- Generate original and/or adapted narrative for film and/or television employing the principles of these respective disciplines through various stages from introductory level to mastery.
- Articulate a critical understanding of self in relation to creativity and the influence of cultural...
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and societal issues.
  o Analyze and/or design and generate a marketing plan/pitch using the principles of
    entertainment industry marketing.
  o Collaborate with others in achieving writing and/or pitching goals.

This evaluator sees strong evidence these goals are held at the forefront of the administration of the degree program and are accomplished through the course work.

IV. Students

Pepperdine University's MFA Writing for Screen and Television enrollment program requires students to meet the graduate standards of Pepperdine's Admissions and submit application materials to show their readiness for the rigorous program.

The program’s current curriculum serves students well, imparting knowledge skills and challenging their abilities. After reading a number of student projects the evaluator finds the work to be consistent with other MFA Screenwriting programs. Enrollment is holding steady at 30 total students (in various stages of the 2 year program) at any given time.

In the area of students, the following questions are addressed:

1. What is the process for graduation at Pepperdine’s MFA in Writing for Screen and Television program?

According the program’s website, accessed February 2016: The MFA degree in Writing for Screen and Television will be awarded upon satisfactory completion of classes and approval of a Master's Thesis portfolio which will contain:

  • Ten-page vocational statement with the writer's approach to this vocation, including:
    o A statement of values, purpose, and goals as a cultural leader.
    o An outline/roadmap to accomplish these goals.
  • Thesis Project
    o Screenwriting Emphasis: two full-length screenplays (each 110-120 pages)
    o Television Emphasis: two 60-minute teleplays and two 30 minute teleplays
    o Or any combination of the two emphases above (approx. 180- 240 pages), with the
      approval of the Thesis Director. The Master's Thesis Project and portfolio will be
      overseen by a thesis committee which will include the Program Director, a faculty
      member from Creative Writing, and a faculty member from Film Studies. The approval of the Thesis Project Committee is necessary for the awarding of the degree.

The portfolio is appropriate and will serve the student well as he/she enters the professional arena. In relation to other MFA in Screenwriting degrees, these standards are equal to or above many graduate programs and is to be commended.
1. Does the program provide support for the graduate student?
Students are adequately supported through the curriculum and advising to ensure their learning success.

- Writing labs are available as needed.
- Academic advising is available with the Program Director.
- Class size levels are appropriate to enable student learning.
- The program provides adequate opportunities for co-curricular programs i.e internships, field experiences as appropriate. There is a Career Center to help identify internship opportunities.
- Counseling services are available.
- Volunteer opportunities to become engaged in the community are available.
- Other student support services are adequate.

- What sorts of extracurricular opportunities does the program provide for majors?

The student-led club, Courier 12, is set up to organize networking possibilities, studio tours, fellowship potlucks and more. It is student run.

a. In response to this reviewer’s questions in late January 2016 regarding the efficacy of the Courier 12 club, graduate students in the MFA program expressed the necessity for a strong leader of the entity and that often its mission can be not realized due to students’ schedules (including work and travel conflicts).

Other opportunities include a Fall Literary Festival that can be used as an MFA Showcase, a yearly panel and Q&A with film industry professionals, a yearly banquet to share student achievements, and noted speaker lectures throughout the year.

a. As these events are not required, it is up to graduate students to take advantage of the opportunities. Some (not all) of MFA students interviewed did participate in one or more of the events.

Students are made aware of contests, festivals, symposiums and Writing for Screen and Television workshops.

a. It may be suggested the program might consider web-hosted online conferences with professionals such as International Writing for Screen and Television Association, Final Draft, Movie Magic or the Writer’s Store, etc. throughout the program. Many of these are informative, allow for networking and do not require travel to the classroom for the student.

b. The program might consider mentoring and funding a student or several to attend the UFVA conference. The UFVA has a graduate student contingent that is very active.

V. Facilities, Equipment

In the area of facilities and equipment, the following questions are addressed:

- Is the program able to create effective learning
As screenwriting is not a resource-heavy endeavor, Pepperdine facilities are more than adequate (computer and printer accessibility) and appropriate classrooms and meeting areas.

VI. Relationships with the Professional Community

In the area of relationships with the professional community, the following questions are addressed:

1. What linkages does the program have with the film/television profession?

The greatest linkage to the professional film and television industry is built into the MFA Writing for Screen and Television program: The Program Director has professional industry experience and continues to be active, the adjunct instructors are chosen for their industry experience as well as their teaching capabilities. Some have written produced screenplays for film and television and/or worked with writers in a producer capacity on various creative projects or in the professional industry as a production or development executive. This is a great asset to the program.

Guest lecturers are regularly invited to the Pepperdine University campus to impart their expertise to the students. (Most programs are also open to the undergraduate students at Pepperdine.)

The newly formed Institute of Entertainment Media and Culture (see page 3) is a viable connection to the professional film industry.

a. It may be suggested that the MFA program could benefit from an in-house festival/contest wherein a small number of top scripts could be identified and then sent to industry professionals (writers, agents, script consultants) for feedback.

2. What linkages does the program have with the Writers Guild of America (WGA) – the union of professional screenwriters with headquarters in Los Angeles.

The students are made aware of the existence of the WGA through classroom discussions and guest speakers in the classroom. As of this writing, there is no formal connection or meetings.

a. It may be suggested that MFA students are given specific opportunities for visits, talks with WGA personnel regarding script registration or other professional needs of the screenwriter. As the WGA is very amenable to students attending seminars, talks and information sessions at its headquarters in Los Angeles, this could be added to the students’ requirements or electives. Students would be able to come to an understanding of WGA resources, such as information on contracts, options, minimums, library facilities, mentorships and more. This serves to alert the students to a “community” of screenwriters and a strong support system from the union.
The administrators of Pepperdine University are to be commended for their Masters of Fine Arts in Writing for Screen and Television. The program appears to be thorough in the covering of the craft and art of screenwriting, widening the knowledge of global film narrative and in making industry information and opportunities accessible to its students. During consultation with the Dean of Humanities, the Program Director, adjunct instructors and students, it is clear that the program’s objectives are in place and that, meeting with very high standards, are successful.

VII. ADDENDUM #1: STUDENT COMMENTS/CONCERNS/WISH LIST This evaluator spoke in depth, in person, to groups of students on three different occasions. Their responses, ideas and assessment of program are reported here:

STUDENTS COMMENTED ON THE GROWTH OF THEIR CRAFT/ART AND UNDERSTANDING IN THE FIELD OF SCREENWRITING:

When this reviewer queried the second year students whether or not they felt they were improved writers after one year in the program, the answer was a very solid “yes”. They also felt their knowledge of the professional industry had grown.

When asked by this reviewer, “What do you understand as the meaning of STW 601 Storyteller as a Cultural Leader?” Responses included:
- I understand it as a challenge to consider the affect of my stories; that it is up to me how I portray the world and what choices my characters make in relation to the world. My choices can heal and be uplifting.
- Doesn’t mean our stories have to all be PG, but that it is wise to take responsibility for my words, images and narrative content.

STUDENTS COMMENTED ON THE PROGRAM:
Student reactions to the program are, for the most part, positive. Positive responses and areas of concern/wishful thinking when queried “What do you like/find beneficial about the program and what might you change if you had the opportunity?” include:

i. Appreciate the high quality of instruction
ii. Appreciate the variety of instructors
iii. Appreciate that instructors in the program have current and viable resumes in the professional industry
iv. Appreciate a variety of classes
v. Appreciate the small class size
   1. The number of students in the writing classes varies from 5 to 10
students. A few of the history/critical studies classes (lecture-based) are larger.

vi. Appreciate the networking possibilities with professionals in the industry

1. Students strongly agreed that these opportunities should be increased and stated that, in their minds, the MFA in Writing for Television and Writing for Screen and Television students should have priority over undergraduates if any film industry events are limited in attendance.
2. Students also stated their desire for more interaction (on campus or off) with Pepperdine alums that may be in the professional industry.
3. Students would appreciate field trips to sets/studios.
4. MORE ON STRUCTURE OF PROGRAM:

1. Students noted that the scheduling of the core (required) classes every 4th semester can be problematical for a student who may have reason to not be able to take the course. He/she then has to wait three semesters for it to be offered again and delay graduation.
2. Suggestion of student - more class options that could be used as core requirements to ensure on-time graduation.
3. Students are interested in taking online classes during the year and during the summer.
4. Focus more on the history of screenwriting and screenwriters in the film history and theory classes.
5. Would appreciate more focus on how the film industry works and how a screenwriter can best navigate it.
6. The Portfolio, at the end of the program, gives them a sense of accomplishment.
7. As of the writing of this review, each student is allowed 1 absence per class each semester. At the second absence, the student’s grade for the class suffers by a half (+ or -), or, as some students understand it – a whole letter grade. As each student needs a “B” to pass each class, a student would like the ability to make up classes (or participate via Skype if their attendance is a problem of travel) or other ways to address this situation.

FACULTY AND CLASSROOM:

In the area of instruction enhancement, students noted there is some inconsistency in approaches of the various instructors. There is a request that all instructors give in-depth notes on their work/scripts/ideas. It is the graduate students’ common assessment that some instructors’ notes are too general and not “helpful” and that some instructors overly rely on feedback from other students when the work is read in class. Students appreciate the instructors who give in-depth notes, for they want to hear from the “professional”. Students prefer instructors who will dig into the material in a more detailed fashion. Students suggest re-structuring the class in some fashion so that would be a priority.

STUDENTS WOULD LIKE MORE EXPOSURE TO PRODUCTION:

Students expressed strong desire to learn more about film and television production while in the program.
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a. It may be suggested an addition of an Advanced Scene Study class where scenes of students’ work are shot by the students/writers themselves (with any level of camera) to better understand necessary scene content and very basic production elements.

b. Students look forward to possible interaction with the MFA in Cinematic Production students when that new degree is viable on campus.

INDUSTRY CONNECTIONS:

Students would appreciate any studio tours and/or possibilities to be on set during production to be made available to them.

INTERNSHIPS:

Students would appreciate more aid in identifying internships.

Students appreciate the opportunity to take more than one internship. They also know that many companies that employ interns require the student be enrolled for course credit (for internship) at their University. However, they commented on the repetition of similar essays /classwork that goes along with the second/third internship and would hope that could be adjusted.

Students would appreciate any grants or monetary support as they embark on their internships. Many have to give up or take a break from “day jobs” in order to fulfill this requirement.

ADDENDUM #2 5-Year Self Review of Program (2015)  
[see program review above]
III. Quality Improvement Plan

As a result of our External Review and the analysis above, we have made or will be making the following changes:

1) We have added three courses to the STW 610 Topics in Writing for Screen and Television rotation: The Documentary Script, The Short Script, and From Page to Screen.
2) The program director serves on the leadership team of the new Institute for Entertainment, Media, and Culture, which will be offering certificates and coordinate more interdisciplinary classes for MFA students who would like to take an elective in production, entertainment business, or entertainment law.
3) Although not a part of the assessment above, we have been engaged in dialogue with the Seaver Dean’s Office and have added this statement to the STW 690 Thesis syllabus (co-written with Dr. Dana Dudley) to keep the portfolio in alignment with the university and program mission:

A NOTE ON SELECTING SCRIPTS FOR YOUR THESIS PORTFOLIO

As you choose scripts to submit in your thesis portfolio, please consider the Pepperdine mission of strengthening lives for purpose, service, and leadership as well as our program conviction that a storyteller can be a cultural leader. Our MFA Program in Writing for Screen and Television is not just about screenwriting in general, but exists to train, nurture, and support writers to make a positive global impact. The scripts need not be G rated. They can have the difficulties, even the horrors of life in them, but there should also be some redemption, transformation, personal growth, something that puts those “bad things” into the context of making a positive impact. Consider, as an example, Toni Morrison’s *Beloved*. The horrors of life are profoundly, graphically present in the novel and film, but we also see Sethe’s strength and Paul D’s love for this woman who refuses to break in the end. Even scripts with a tragic conclusion can ask us to examine the truth of what it means to be human. We ask that you meditate on these things as you make your selections.

4) We have added this statement to the application materials for the program—again to keep our applicant pool in alignment with the university and program mission—and, again, as a result of dialogue with the Seaver Dean’s Office in terms of our applicant pool co-written with Dr. Dudley):

NOTE TO APPLICANTS FOR PEPPERDINE’S MFA PROGRAM IN WRITING FOR SCREEN AND TELEVISION

As you write the essays and select the script to submit in your application, please consider the Pepperdine mission of strengthening lives for purpose, service, and leadership as well as our program conviction that a storyteller can be a cultural leader. Our MFA Program in Writing for Screen and Television is not just about screenwriting in general, but exists to train, nurture, and support writers to make a positive global impact. The scripts need not be G rated. They can have the difficulties, even the horrors of life in them, but there should also be some redemption, transformation, personal growth, something that puts those “bad things” into the context of making a positive impact. Consider, as an example, Toni Morrison’s *Beloved*. The horrors of life are profoundly, graphically present in the novel and film, but we also see Sethe’s strength and Paul D’s love for this woman who refuses to break in the end. Even scripts with a tragic conclusion can ask us to examine the truth of what it means to be human. We ask that you meditate on these things as you go through the application process.
5) We continue our work to improve the FILM 500 Film Theory class, which meets with some resistance. For example, we are working with the instructor to find the appropriate lecture/discussion balance as well as find readings that are more accessible for students working on an MFA in Screen and Television Writing, not an MA in Film Studies.

6) We will get students and faculty involved in the University Film and Video Association.

7) Students have expressed a desire for Hollywood field trips, such as studio tours, visits to the Writers Guild Foundation to hear working screenwriters speak, screenings with filmmakers in attendance at a Q & A following, trips to museums, etc. Thus we have added this component in two classes. The students go out in teams, then deliver a midterm oral presentation in which they share what they have learned.

8) As noted by the external reviewer, while we have gender diversity in our MFA faculty, we have not accomplished ethnic diversity quite yet. We have recently interviewed two African American instructors and are working to diversify our instructor pool. Thirty percent of our students identify as a race other than white; we would like to see those numbers reflected in the faculty as well.

Before closing, we must respectfully disagree with the external reviewer’s assumption that adjunct faculty cannot form mentorship bonds with the students. Quite to the contrary, most of our adjuncts have been with us throughout the eight years of the program. They continue to help students develop work long after the course is over; they sit on the students’ thesis committees; they have the students to dinner and meet them for lunch or coffee, etc. They also continue to build relationships through social media. In other words, we have seen continuing relationships among our faculty and students—lifelong friendships, in some cases. Students sometimes even have as many as three courses with the instructor who has become a favorite. Faculty and students also network at our annual events, such as the Fall Literary Arts Festival: MFA Showcase; the Hollywood Industry Panel; and the MFA Banquet.

We also need to publish a correction. It is not true—as reported by the external reviewer—that our thesis committee members are not paid. In fact, they earn a $300 stipend for sitting on MFA thesis committees.

Overall, however, we are very pleased with the review and several comments the reviewer made. At one point, she stated, “After a due-diligent examination, this external reviewer finds the program to be a conscientious, rigorous and ambitious program for the graduate student dedicated to preparing for a professional career in screenwriting.” She also observed, “There is wide support from the students in the strengths of the program.” And concluded by asserting, “The administrators of Pepperdine University are to be commended for their Masters of Fine Arts in Writing for Screen and Television. The program appears to be thorough in the covering of the craft and art of screenwriting, widening the knowledge of global film narrative and in making industry information and opportunities accessible to its students. During consultation with the [Divisional] Dean of Humanities, the Program Director, adjunct instructors and students, it is clear that the program’s objectives are in place and that, meeting with very high standards, are successful.”

In conclusion, we are very happy with the growth and progress of the MFA Program in Writing for Screen and Television and look forward to the supplement of the new Institute for
MFA Writing For Screen and Television

Entertainment, Media, and Culture. Our foundation in the liberal arts and humanities (including teaching assistantships in the HUM 111, 212, 313 sequence), our values-centered approach and emphasis on the storyteller as a cultural leader, our “working Hollywood” faculty—all underscore our unique market position. Lastly, the positive responses we received from the alumni and reviewer reflect the tremendous effort undertaken to transform the Pepperdine MFA in Writing for Screen and Television into one of the premier programs in the world.

---
