



## Cal Poly WASC Steering Committee Working Group

October 31, 2008

9:00-10:30 a.m.

01-409

---

### **In Attendance:**

Rick Ramirez, Dan Villegas, David Conn, Scott Steinmaus, Peggy Browneller Paradis, Erling Smith, Doug Keeseey, Skip Parks, Tom Trice, Linda Halisky, Susan Sparling, Bruno Giberti, Mary Whiteford, Anna Gold, Brent Goodman, Craig Schultz, Cassie Carter, Rachel Henry.

### **Absent:**

Angela Kramer, Mohammad Noori, Kelley Wigton, Susan Elrod, Tom Mackin.

### **Update on Self-Study Timeline**

- At the request of WASC, the CPR site visit has been moved up to February 10-12, 2010. Because they requested the date change, WASC is requesting the CPR report only two months before the site visit as opposed to the usual 3. The CPR report is due December 1, 2009.
- The EER report is due in July 2011, and the site visit is in October 2011.
- Bruno reminded the working group chairs that the report, without appendices, is only thirty-five pages long and encouraged each chair to create a draft of the CPR report that their groups can then react to.

### **NSSE & FSSE Overview**

#### Background

- NSSE asks what both freshmen and senior students think they do and what they think the institution does. It is administered in spring term. FSSE asks faculty how they think students would answer the questions. Brent is preparing a side-by-side comparison of how faculty thought students would answer the questions and how students actually answered the questions.
- CP did NSSE in 2001, '03, '05, and '08, and is now on a three year cycle. Over 3500 students took NSSE in 2008.
- CP did FSSE for the first time in '08.

#### Data Availability

- The institutional-level data prepared by NSSE compares CP to three groups: CSU Consortium, polytechnic peers selected by CP, and all of NSSE. This data is already available.
- Brent is working on breaking down the data in three ways:
  - Disaggregated by college.
  - Comparison of student (NSSE) and faculty (FSSE) responses to similar questions.
  - Trends over time—he hasn't seen any trends.

He hopes to have these done in a few weeks.

- Cheryl has prepared a summary of some of the data in which CP varies from its benchmarking institutions by amounts that are statistically significant.
- CP lags behind other CSUs in the questions about including diverse perspectives in class or in a paper. In other areas, CP is ahead of its peers.
- NSSE data can be useful in correlating different aspects of student life.
- Working groups are asked to narrow down the list of NSSE questions they're interested in to five or so.
- One of the areas in which student and faculty perceptions vary markedly is faculty/student interaction. The faculty thinks it's much higher than students do.
- CP has had a great deal of NSSE data that hasn't been used until recently. Brent and Cheryl have been instrumental in digging into it.

### CIRP

- CIRP is a national survey out of the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute. Students take it in fall before they arrive, so it measures the pre-college experience. Like NSSE, it is attitudinal. CP has 10-12 years of past data. CP stopped doing CIRP a few years ago in favor of NSSE because CIRP doesn't offer any longitudinal data.

## **Integration and Student Learning Survey Questions**

### Background

- Working groups are not wordsmithing the questions but focusing on what they want to know and what they want to do with that information. The Chancellor's Office will work on the exact wording.
- Questions focus on different angles on student learning.
- As a result of NSSE data that indicated CP students do more learning in co-curricular environments than their peers, Cheryl Ney, Sue Elrod, and Doug Keesey developed a Venn diagram that illustrates the overlap of student learning. ISL is most interested in finding out where on the diagram student learning takes place.

### Questions

- The demographic questions mirror NSSE for use in comparisons.
- A group of questions target students who are employed both on and off-campus and students involved in co-curricular activities. These questions might also be useful to LBD.
- Where do students learn? This is the core of what ISL wants to know. One way to explore it might be to give an explanation of a ULO and ask, where does this take place? The differences in responses to these questions between students and faculty might give some of the best information.
- Present students with ULOs and DLOs and ask: do you know them? How important is it to you?
- Present people with 20/21 document pairs and ask where on the continuum between the two they see CP.
- Future-looking questions that deal with new liberal education.
- The new liberal education model resulted from discussions at engineering colleges. Students in science and technology need the liberal arts' models of thinking and perception to use in a wide range of educational experiences and in problem-solving, not just to provide breadth.

These disciplines mutually support each other rather than conflict with each other, as has been the perception at CP. CP has yet to formulate its own conception of new liberal education.

- Is individual vs. group learning important to investigate? ISL is unsure whether they can get that kind of detail.
- Do we ask students through their career how they feel about their major? If they're not finding satisfaction in their major, they'll find it in other learning activities or leave. There are 70 music majors and over 1000 students in music ensembles.
- Should we also ask about the satisfaction with having to declare major on entry?
- What would a 21<sup>st</sup>-century polytechnic look like for an undeclared major?

### **Learn-by-Doing Survey Questions**

- The working group is having trouble defining LBD.
- Very little is documented as to what CP means by LBD.
- The group's main focus this quarter has been to investigate how LBD is implemented on campus. In order to find out how it's implemented, they want to ask students and faculty open-ended questions, such as, what do you think LBD is?
- One option is to give people a list of activities or a definition of learn-by-doing and asking them to react to it. One problem with this approach is that it limits the examples to what a limited number of colleges have thought LBD is in the past. Perhaps the list of what might comprise LBD can be expanded.
- Since we already had a good amount of input on this topic in the 2007 proposal survey, it will be important to let people know they were heard by including a summary of the results of that survey.
- Is LBD significant in a student's decision to come to CP and how important is it in determining whether students and faculty stay here? How does their understanding of LBD change while they're here?
- Has LBD helped students meet ULOs and DLOs?
- Ask polyreps if they have something scripted as to what LBD is.
- There is some overlap with ISL—do students learn by doing/where are students learning.

### **Teacher-Scholar Model Survey Questions**

- The working group already has access to the COACHE survey, but it is only for untenured faculty. The working group wants some of this same information from more senior faculty.
- As background, the group included Boyer's definition of the four types of scholarship.
- The group wants to categorize possible responses so they don't have to categorize open-ended responses later.
- Some of the options for a teacher-scholar definition contain LBD.
- Characteristics that define a good teacher-scholar address some of the original questions from the Institutional Proposal.
- Don't want to dictate what the model is but ask faculty what they think it is.
- TSM needs questions that address ULOs and DLOs.
- Asking faculty what barriers they face in integrating scholarly activity with teaching will encourage them to fill out the survey. It could be difficult for them to answer if scholarship is not defined.

- Essentially the group wants to know, what is TSM; how do you do it; and how does it help student learning?
- How does staff fit into TSM? Some staff members are currently involved in professional development and scholarship, and some aren't. The approach to this theme could give others the opportunity to be involved in scholarship in the future. Staff could be included in the audience of the TSM survey questions.
- 20C: only faculty involved in scholarship; 21C: everyone involved.
- One question that still needs to be asked is “what have you done?”

### **General Discussion**

- Perhaps working groups are enough of a focus group to use to build the multiple choice options in the survey.
- ASI, Academic Advising Council, Academic Senate, and Assessment Council will be used as focus groups.
- LBD and TSM are both questions about the level of integration and the balance between two concepts. Where is the synergy between the pairs and what are the differences? What support do people feel for the balance and integration?
- As the questions are designed, we need to distinguish between ranking, rating, and checkboxes.
- LBD and TSM both lack working definitions, so the question should be asked in the same way, either by testing a definition, or components of a definition, or leaving it open-ended.
- Some thought there was nothing wrong with the working groups writing a definition to test because the working groups are representative.

### **Minutes**

Minutes from April 24, 2008 and June 11, 2008 were approved.