



Cal Poly WASC Steering Committee

June 11, 2008
3:00-4:30 p.m.
01-409

In Attendance:

Denise Campbell, Doris Derelian, Bruno Giberti, Brent Goodman, Linda Halisky, Rachel Henry, Angela Kramer, Tom Mackin, Cheryl Ney, Skip Parks, Rick Ramirez, Scott Steinmaus (remotely), Tom Trice, Dan Villegas, Mary Whiteford, Kelley Wigton

Absent:

Integrated Educational Experience

Research Areas

- The group will focus on the interface between the major, GE, and co- and extracurricular experiences.
- Data is already collected on programs, GE, and student life. The group will both look for existing data sources on campus that haven't been tapped, for example data from the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities on students' ethical decisions, and investigate how to collect data on the interface.
- Group members looked at what existing data in their areas can be used to measure integration, and some members of the group will coordinate those results during the summer.

Methods

- The working group did not discuss methods. They plan to use focus groups and data from IP&A. They will work on developing methods over the summer.
- Eliminated section D from the original proposal, which addressed diverse groups. Instead, those questions will be addressed integrally in the other three areas of data collection.

Group Dynamics

- Group represents all attributes of what gives CP student an education but still needs a representative from Residential Life. Whether all the information these constituencies have can be captured remains to be seen.
- If members who represent an important constituency are not attending, please report that to Bruno and David.
- There will be a meeting of the chairs to discuss membership during the summer.

Diversity

- A concern was voiced about how diversity is going to be incorporated into each of the three other sections. The Steering Committee would like to see exactly where the questions that were addressed in part D will be moved to. This will be done in the next draft of the IEE research report. Also, because the type of data this group plans to gather is new, it makes sense to build the diversity questions into the new data.

- The decision not to separate diversity into its own theme was a conscious one when the proposal was written. This decision is consistent with the Inclusive Excellence (IE) model that the Diversity Planning Group is recommending to executive staff for adoption. IE states that diversity and excellence are mutually reinforcing issues. Diversity is also an instrument of integration. The working group should look at IE documents for background.
- WASC is interested in the university in process, and having assessed the state of diversity at CP is what led to IE. IE will affect how CP looks at diversity and captures information, how we talk about what we've done, what we want to do, and what we are and are not satisfied with. The point was raised that CP should wait to assess IE until enough time has passed that useful data can be gathered on its effectiveness.
- There are a lot of pieces that need to be put together, e.g. Strategic Planning and IE.
- ULOs and DLOs are also, by their nature, integrative.

Learn-by-Doing

Working group Report

- To explore the question, “How is LBD currently implemented in different programs/parts of the curriculum?” the working group will analyze current LBD practices campus-wide. Those results will be used in roundtable discussions between colleges. Ultimately LBD practices will be compared to those of peer institutions. The Strategic Planning Project-Based Learning Group did a lot of this type of comparison, and the LBD group will use that information.
- By gathering faculty and students to talk about how LBD is done in different departments, greater community can be created.
- Diversity is addressed in part C with these questions: How can LBD contribute to achievement of DLOs? How can LBD be leveraged to change the demographics of the campus?
- Though the working group has discussed what might be unique about LBD at CP as opposed to other institutions, they are not sure the research process will reveal that CP is unique.

Discussion

- LBD is practiced in the classroom and in course development. It is applying theory to situations.
- Asking whether you can deliver distance learning that includes LBD is one way to think about what LBD is at CP.
- Is being unique the correct goal or is it more important to use best practices that enhance student learning? It might be more important to focus on intentionally incorporating LBD into the classroom, which is a way to lead, not necessarily to be unique.
- Employers say CP graduates come in and go to work, which is important to employers, and that is a result of LBD. Evidence is needed of how CP graduates perform in the work force 5-15 years after graduation. Career services employer surveys collect some of this data but not for all colleges and not longitudinally.
- Other post-graduate data of interest: How does a graduate's association with CLA affect his/her career trajectory? Was LBD instrumental in graduates moving into leadership positions? It may be difficult to determine the cause of students becoming leaders.
- CP doesn't keep good track of graduates compared to private universities. How can we do a better job of that—is it possible?

- Need resources to bolster CS survey so can do it over time and see trends. It will take some time to collect enough data to assess LBD. One possibility is to look at how our peer institutions measure LBD.
- In order to create employer survey questions, we need to articulate what LBD is, how we make it a priority, and what the outcomes of LBD are.
- Polytechnic does not necessarily mean LBD.

Teacher-Scholar Model

Working group Report

- The working group decided not to define the TSM this quarter.
- They focused on the existing questions and worked backward from the outcomes to find methods to assess those outcomes.
- Forms of evidence:
 - Surveys—secondary form of assessment.
 - Primary evidence:
 - Distinguished teaching and scholarship award winner dossiers
 - RPT packages. Maybe Academic Personnel can evaluate since they're confidential
 - Senior projects—should be looking at them in all groups.
 - Undergraduate research
 - Sponsored program data, though this does not include research conducted with outside funding
 - Faculty activity reports (FAR)—we don't know what faculty are doing. Deans know what their faculty are doing, but that knowledge is hard to aggregate. Other institutions have faculty activity reports. One possible place to record this data is the Library's Digital Commons. OCOB uses Digital Measures, so they have some data on this topic.

Discussion

- We need to be concerned with how scholarship enhances student learning. The distinguished scholarship award does look at this aspect. Is there a way to put together programmatic evidence of scholarship and evidence of student learning?
- Faculty availability is one measure of student learning and is measured in NSSE and YFCY.
- Does the work that faculty do that contributes to their disciplines make its way into the classroom? We need evidence to evaluate the assumption that it does.
- How does teaching affect scholarship and vice versa? These questions need to be added to the plan.
- Enthusiasm, which can be measured on student evaluation forms, is one result of scholarship that enhances teaching. Taking the evaluations together with the rest of faculty records shows when enthusiasm is or isn't a result of scholarship. Student evaluations are not standardized across campus so not all students are asked about faculty enthusiasm.
- The scholarship at CP may affect the way we are regarded externally, but that consideration may not be part of TSM.
- Focus groups are a possibility. Qualitative data is also important.
- Marilee Brisciani, an assessment expert at San Diego State, can adapt survey information to be used as a primary source. Denise will check into it.

- What is the capacity to promote TSM? Are programs in place? CPR is about this type of inputs.
- Only talking to the best faculty will skew the results. We need to talk to all faculty.
- Classes sometimes result from research. In those cases, we can use syllabi as primary evidence.
- One possibility is to randomly select faculty and evaluate their RPT packets.

Our Polytechnic Identity

Working Group Report

- All group members had different idea of what polytechnic means, so they looked at peer institutions, though not all are our typical peers. They collected mission and vision statements, as well as demographics and majors.
- Wanted institutions with a broad liberal arts presence and how they value and integrate the liberal arts.
- How did peers integrate student learning?
- 3 successful examples of new initiatives at peer institutions.
- We would like to identify the three best working models for teaching/learning and research that combine science, tech, social, political and and aesthetic concerns. Where have others already stepped outside of the box?
- The committee would like to know the nature of the three biggest gifts our comparative schools have recently received in order to see what the external community is valuing.
- We want to identify metrics to better measure the successful learning of our students as innovators, critical thinkers, insightful doers, fresh-minded creators.

Discussion

- An official set of peer institutions for CP is going to be decided. First Year Experience looked at peer institutions in the past and found that it was more appropriate to consider department or college-specific peers. It is difficult to come up with a set that works for all possible comparisons.
- Comprehensive means granting M.A.
- Universities that embrace the new, integrated liberal education model already value the liberal arts, which is an attitude that has been missing at CP.
- How can we encourage students to value liberal arts and GE?
- We need to define a polytechnic identity that is broad, not exclusive. Understanding the history of polytechnic will help with this definition.
- The working group did look at history of polytechnic at CP.